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You are welcome to attend this meeting which is open to the press and public, as an observer. You will however be asked to leave before the Committee considers any items in the Part II agenda. Special facilities may be made available for disabled or non-English speaking persons. Please contact the Democratic Services Officer shown above for further details.
Neighbourhoods and Renewal Scrutiny Panel – Meeting held on Monday, 27th October, 2008.

Present:- Councillors Haines (Vice-Chair in the Chair), Buchanan, Dale-Gough, Davis and Walsh.

Co-opted Members present:- Barbara Goldstein, Glynys Higgins and Heather Mason (Slough Federation of Tenants and Residents).

Also present under Rule 30:- Councillor Parmar.

Also present:- Councillor Michael Nye (Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council).

Apologies for Absence:- Councillors Coad and Pabbi.

PART I

19. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Davis and Walsh declared a personal interest in agenda items 4, 5 and 6 as they served as Board Members of the People 1st (Slough) ALMO.

20. Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting of the Panel held on 2nd September, 2008 were approved as a correct record, subject to the deletion of the word “Councillor” before the names of those listed as having given their apologies for the meeting.

21. Member Call-In: Cross Border Working

Councillor Walsh had submitted a call-in requesting the Panel to scrutinise how the current arrangements for cross-border co-operation between local authorities currently operated in respect of planning applications within one area that had a significant effect upon residents in an adjoining Borough. His concerns arose from a recent planning application within the Windsor and Maidenhead area in respect of gravel extraction from land to the east of Horton Road adjacent to Popes Close in Colnbrook. The application had been refused by the Royal Borough but their decision overturned by an Inspector following a public inquiry. The implication for Colnbrook residents was that there would be an additional 800 heavy goods vehicles per week using Horton Road and he was concerned that the very serious environmental impact for Colnbrook had not been properly dealt with through the planning process. He hoped that lessons learned from this application could be utilised in respect of any such future cross-border applications.

Officers reminded the Panel that whilst it was not entitled by the scrutiny protocol to examine an individual decision made by the Planning Committee,
it was important to understand how the process operated. The Royal Borough had consulted this authority under the “spheres of mutual interest” arrangements and Officers had decided, given the significance of the application, to report it to the Planning Committee. The Committee had objected to the proposals on the grounds that the additional traffic would adversely affect air quality in the Colnbrook area although the Committee did not object specifically on general traffic/capacity grounds. In addition, a series of measures had been requested in any future Section 106 Agreement to mitigate the implications of these additional HGV movements.

The Royal Borough had subsequently refused planning permission but it was allowed on appeal following a public inquiry. The public inquiry was jointly funded and supported by staff from both the Royal Borough and from Slough and the consultants employed to fight the appeal were also jointly funded. The spheres of mutual interest arrangements were well established and, in this case, had worked well with co-operation between the two Boroughs throughout the process although the final outcome was not what residents in Colnbrook would have wished.

With hindsight, whilst the process had worked well, it could perhaps have been made more widely known that Borough Council Officers were working with the Royal Borough as local residents and Members did not seem to appreciate this point. However, what needed to be borne in mind was that, as the Planning Committee had only objected on air quality grounds, it was not possible to pursue other traffic issues at the public inquiry.

However, having said all of this, Officers were more than happy to consider any further suggestions that Members may have to improve cross-border cooperation and, as an example of this, discussions were already taking place with adjoining authorities on the forthcoming Slough Intermodal Freight Exchange (SIFE) proposals at Colnbrook and would be actively engaged as and when further major proposals came forward for any growth at Heathrow.

The following points were raised in the subsequent debate:-

- Whilst noting that it was not possible for the Panel to scrutinise the decision made in this individual case by the Planning Committee, several Members expressed concern that an objection had not been made on transport infrastructure rather than air quality grounds and felt that the objection was not robust enough and the serious nature of the transport objections not fully conveyed. It was also felt that issues directly affecting Slough residents were not adequately represented by experts or Officers at the appeal and that the Inspector had taken the absence of anyone from Slough’s Transport Department as a signal that the Council had little concern on this issue. Officers reiterated that, given that the objection had been on air quality grounds rather than highway issues, it was not then possible to argue that particular case at the public inquiry. However, the traffic implications were addressed in the reports submitted to Slough’s Planning Committee and it should also be borne in mind that an earlier
A Member asked what consultation had taken place on the proposal. Officers replied that there had been extensive consultation in the Colnbrook area and a large number of objections received, all of which had been passed on to the Royal Borough.

A Member suggested that it may be appropriate for Officers to submit a further report looking at the current procedures for dealing with spheres of mutual interest applications with a view to perhaps involving Ward Councillors at an earlier stage so that they were alerted to such matters. Officers confirmed that they were more than happy to report in those terms. However, it may be appropriate, as a first step, to arrange for details of all such applications to be included in the fortnightly list of planning applications circulated to all Members of the Council. That would give Members early warning of any such matters coming forward. The effectiveness of this new arrangement could then be monitored over the next three months and, if Members did not feel that this new arrangement was adequate, then a further report would be prepared for the Panel's consideration.

Parish Councillor Mike Nye was given the opportunity to address the Panel and added his concerns over this issue to those already highlighted by Panel Members.

Resolved -

(a) That the call-in and the current arrangements for “spheres of mutual interest” planning applications be noted.

(b) That arrangements be made with immediate effect for details of all planning applications received under the “spheres of mutual interest” arrangements to be included in the fortnightly list of applications circulated to all Members of the Council.

(c) That the adequacy of these new arrangements be monitored over a three months' period and that, if Members do not feel that these new arrangements are adequate, Officers be requested to submit an options report to the Panel setting out alternative methods of ensuring that local Councillors have early and sufficient warning of any such planning applications coming forward.

22. LTP 2 Progress Review

The Transport Strategy Manager introduced his report updating Members on progress on the second Local Transport Plan (LTP). He advised that the LTP had been assessed as good by the Department for Transport and the transport and highways teams had made good progress towards achieving the targets set out therein. Key stakeholders including the Local Strategic
Partnership and Members had been consulted on the report and a copy had been sent to all Members earlier in the year through the Members’ Bulletin with a request for comments. It was noted that the progress report had been complimented by the Government Office for the South-East and its format was being cited as an example of good practice for other authorities.

Members highlighted the following issues in their debate:-

- A Member suggested that the improvements made to the bus routes serving Slough Trading Estate had been made at the expense of the residents of Northborough Estate and those living at the northern end of Farnham Road who had lost the services that they had previously relied upon. Officers replied that the new services on the Trading Estate were the successors to the “Lynx” service and were being predominantly supported financially by Slough Estates so as to enable their staff to travel from both Slough and Burnham stations. The issue of bus services for Northborough Estate and the Farnham Road area was therefore a separate issue but Officers would discuss with First Bus the issue raised by Members with a view to ascertaining whether it would be possible to make any new provision for the areas in question.

- Several Members referred to the recent failure of the traffic lights on the Brunel roundabout and commented that, whilst they were inoperative, traffic flows appeared to have improved. Officers commented that because of technical problems, it had been necessary to switch off the lights at times and it had been observed that, particularly at off-peak times, traffic flows appeared to have improved. However, given the size of the roundabout and the volumes of traffic using it during peak hours, Officers were of the opinion that the use of traffic lights at those times was essential to avoid accidents. However, a study was being undertaken into the possibility of the lights being switched off during off-peak periods.

- A Member referred to the appendix to the report and the summary of progress against targets, commenting that there did not appear to be any firm targets or other figures within the document. The Officer explained that the full document including all targets had been placed in the Members’ Room but that, if Members wished their own copy of the full document, this would be forwarded to them. Members indicated that a copy of the full document should be forwarded to all Panel Members.

- A Member asked whether it would be possible for some form of bus pass be provided for school children so that they could travel by bus to school rather than their parents having to drive them. The Panel was advised that discussions were taking place with Education & Children’s Services on a range of measures to encourage parents to get their children to school in ways other than the use of private vehicles and the possibility of a youth bus pass was also being considered. However, there were significant financial implications of any such scheme which would have to be considered by the Council through its budget setting process.
• A Member asked whether any penalties were imposed upon the authority if its air quality targets were not met. Officers commented that whilst there were no financial or other penalties as such, the authority would always strive to meet such targets as failure to do so was not well regarded by the DfT.

• A Member asked whether any work was being done to look into the reasons for the late running of buses in the town and was advised that discussions were taking place with First Bus to undertake a survey of late running so as to examine why this occurred and what action could be taken to remedy it.

• A Member asked what the income derived from parking fines was utilised for in the Borough. He was advised that the service was cost neutral so that all income received was ploughed back into providing the service.

It was noted that an annual update would be presented to the Panel on the LTP.

Resolved - That the report be noted and that the issues raised by Members be pursued by Officers.

23. People 1st- Performance Management Report

Andrew Billany, Chief Executive of People 1st (Slough) outlined his report updating Members on the level of performance relating to the twelve key business functions for the ALMO to 30th September, 2008. He drew attention in particular to those areas where performance was less than satisfactory. In respect of voids, this showed an increase in the number of days taken to re-let void properties. Mr Billany explained that there were month on month fluctuations in the time taken to deal with void properties depending on the individual premises in question but that the key figure was the average time taken across the year and, in this regard, they were just about on target.

Two other areas of concern were the proportion of estates attaining two or three star ratings as a result of mystery shopping and telephone response times within MyCouncil. With regard to the first issue, areas of concern had been picked up from walkabouts and action was being taken to ensure better engagement with tenants so that they gave early warning to Officers of particular problems on estates such as fly tipping and graffiti to enable early action to be taken. A new system was in place to ensure improvements highlighted by these reports were carried out but it may take some time for these to be reflected in the results. However, once repeat visits had been made, the success of the approach could be judged and hopefully an improvement in performance would be noted in the coming months.

With regard to telephone answering, there had been a noticeable dip in performance by MyCouncil during September and this was particularly disappointing given the period of consistent performance prior to that. MyCouncil had advised that the drop in performance was a temporary issue.
due to unseasonably high volumes of calls combined with staff sickness and action had been taken to combat this. It was to be hoped that performance would return to its previous levels but this would be closely monitored over the coming months.

Members raised the following matters in the subsequent debate:-

- A co-opted Member sought further clarification of the reasons why some void properties took so long to re-let. Mr Billany commented that there was a whole range of reasons for this but on occasions significant work was required. In addition, certain properties were held vacant so that work under the decent homes programme could be undertaken prior to them being re-let. However, action was being taken to ensure that properties were not left void for any longer than was absolutely necessary. Reference was also made as to whether additional inspections were required to ensure that properties were fit for letting on completion of the work. Mr Billany explained the current process whereby Interserve itself inspected works and People 1st also undertook spot checks to ensure the quality of work undertaken. In addition, there were occasional additional inspections by the client side.

- A number of Members were very concerned at the dip in performance in telephone answering by MyCouncil and referred to complaints received from residents and others about difficulty in getting through to the call centre. The Director of the Green & Built Environment advised that the performance of MyCouncil was being regularly monitored by the Community, Leisure and Environment Panel and that, if this Panel was concerned at performance as regards answering housing queries, then that Panel could be requested to carry out a further scrutiny of the issue. However, it was to be hoped that the current dip in performance was temporary but performance would be closely monitored over the coming weeks and months to ensure that it improved.

- A Member asked whether the former scheduled maintenance programme had now been abandoned by People 1st so that all repairs were undertaken on a responsive basis. If this was the case, he felt that this was to the detriment of the appearance of Council properties. Mr Billany responded that regular scheduled maintenance was still carried out and the Council’s stock was inspected on a regular basis. Reference was made to a particular issue where guttering and drains did not appear to have been cleaned out for many years and the work had only been undertaken following a recent complaint through a Councillor. Mr Billany explained that the particular issue in question was as a result of failings going back many years and People 1st was currently looking into setting up a system for the regular cleaning of drains and gullies which had not been in place previously.

- On the issue of voids, Mr Billany undertook to provide additional information for the next report demonstrating the fluctuations month on month and the broader picture across the year.
Resolved - That the report be noted.

24. People 1st- Rent Collection Performance

As requested by the Panel at an earlier meeting, a report was presented setting out the current level of rent collection performance by People 1st and how this compared against the rest of the year, previous years and performance when benchmarked against top performing ALMO organisations. He commented that there had been an improvement in performance and he was optimistic that it would soon match last year’s performance.

Resolved - That the report be noted.

25. Installation of Burglar Alarms in Council Housing Stock

The former Green & Built Environment Scrutiny Panel had requested consideration of the feasibility of installing burglar alarms for Council tenants. Currently, older people living in the private sector had access to grant funding support for the installation of burglar alarms but this specifically excluded Council tenants. Mr Billany submitted a report setting out the current position and advised that a report on the matter would be submitted to the People 1st Board in November.

Discussions had taken place with the police and statistical evidence did not identify older people as a primary target for burglary. However, this group was more likely to be the victims of distraction burglaries and doorstep crime which the provision of a burglar alarm would not resolve. It was also noted that crime within Slough had reduced by 8% over the last year and it was considered that some of the actions taken by People 1st over the past year had contributed to this. He outlined the various initiatives and preventative measures which had already been embraced and embedded to reduce the opportunity for crime in Council properties. The view was taken that the evidence did not support the supplying and fitting of burglar alarms to older people’s homes as a high priority in the prevention of crime whilst it was recognised that they could contribute to reducing the fear of crime. However, Officers were continuing to investigate the possibility of accessing funding streams such as those available to private sector.

Work was continuing to take place to ensure that the most vulnerable tenants were protected and a range of measures were being identified to this effect. It may be possible to identify a small grant funding source which could be used to target the most vulnerable tenants. However, it may be necessary for People 1st to raise additional income for such works through service charges and to carry out consultation with tenants on best use of resources.

He concluded that further strategic consideration of this issue would be given by the Board of People 1st at its meeting on 26th November. A broader approach to tackling crime and related concerns was proposed with room for targeted investment on initiatives such as burglar alarms where this was seen to be beneficial and of greatest need.
Members expressed a range of views on this particular issue. It was felt that elderly people on council estates may be more prone to burglary than residents in other parts of the town and alarms could act as a deterrent. However, it was noted that the number of burglaries was dropping and issues such as doorstep crime were more of a problem for the elderly. The view was however taken that the provision of grants for private sector residents to the exclusion of council tenants was inherently unfair. The non-availability of decent homes monies for a provision of alarms was noted.

Resolved –

(a) That the Panel note the position held by People 1st that they are not able to prioritise wide ranging initiatives to offer burglar alarms to all older council tenants.

(b) That the Panel note the intention of People 1st to keep under active consideration initiatives to support older tenants in respect of deterring and preventing crime and reducing the fear of crime.

26. Forward Work Programme

The Panel noted its forward work programme for future meetings. Councillor Dale-Gough advised that he had recently submitted a call-in requesting that Thames Water be again invited to attend the Panel to discuss the ongoing problem of flooding in various parts of Slough. He expressed the opinion that they had not adequately addressed major issues of concern for the Borough on their previous attendance. Following discussion, Members agreed that they should be invited to attend the meeting on 27th January, 2009. However, it was essential that Members “set the agenda” for that session. To this effect, it was suggested that all Members be requested through the Members’ Bulletin to provide information on parts of the town that were subject to flooding so that the key problem areas were addressed. In addition, prior notice needed to be given to Thames Water of the areas to be looked at so that they could come to the meeting readily armed with answers. It was also suggested that it would be useful for all Panel Members to hold a pre-meeting at least a week before the Panel meeting in January to ensure that the questioning of Thames Water was as effective and focussed as possible.

Resolved –

(a) That the forward agenda plan be noted.

(b) That Thames Water be invited to attend the Panel meeting on 27th January, 2009 and that appropriate arrangements be made to ensure that the meeting focuses on those areas of major concern for Members in respect of flooding around the Borough.
27. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday, 3rd December, 2008.

Chair

(Note: The Meeting opened at 6.30 p.m. and closed at 8.42 p.m.)
PART I

FOR COMMENT

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT UPDATE – OCTOBER MONTHLY FLYER

1. **Purpose of Report**

   To main purpose of this report is to update Members on the level of performance relating to the 12 key business functions for People 1st (Slough) in October 2008. The report identifies how People 1st (Slough) are performing against the targets set for 2008/09 and how that performance compares against the top performing ALMO’s (Arms Length Management Organisations) in the country.

2. **Recommendations**

   The Panel is requested to note:
   
   - The performance figures for People 1st (Slough)
   - The actions People 1st (Slough) are taking to continuously improve their performance figures

3. **Key Priorities**

   People 1st (Slough) are responsible for managing and improving Slough’s council housing and therefore support all of the Council’s priorities.

4. **Other Implications**

   (a) **Financial**
   
   There are no financial implications of proposed action.

   (b) **Human Rights Act and other Legal Implications**
   
   There are no Legal or Human Rights Act implications

5. **Performance Results**

   5.1 The monthly performance for October continues to show a high level of performance with 6 of the 12 key business functions indicating improved
performance from September levels. Some of the areas which did not show improvement were services were performance was at the optimum level (i.e. Urgent repairs and complaints response times at Stage 2 both at 100%). Only four service areas showed any true level of performance decline from the previous month (time taken for non-urgent repairs, communal repairs, leasehold collection rate and stage 1 repairs responded to within target time). Also encouraging was the fact that 8 of the 12 indicators show an improved level of performance against the same period in the last financial year.

5.2 Rent collection
The first area to focus on is performance in relation to Rent Collection which has seen an improvement from the previous month’s level from 97.04% to 97.17%. This is a significant rise from the previous month and shows evidence of the teams targeting of high arrears cases. Although the performance level is still behind that of 2007/2008, the rate of increase in rent collection is much sharper than the previous year with a deficit in collection between the two years figures falling from 0.37% in June to 0.06% in this report. If the current rate of increase continues the 2007/2008 collection level will be surpassed in the coming months and the 98% target will be reached. However there are two aspects that will have an impact on rent collection meeting its target; firstly the current economic climate may have an impact on collection levels, secondly December sees the implementation of the new Housing Management IT package. The latter aspect will have an impact as its implementation will mean that rent officers will not have access to an IT rent system for 2-3 weeks in the transition period. This will obviously have a negative impact on collection levels (especially as this encompasses the difficult lead up to Christmas). The rent team are re-doubling their efforts in November to minimise the impact of the IT change over.

5.3 Void properties
The area of void turnaround showed a significant drop last month following a period of consistent performance. The reason for the drop in the previous month was due to 4 long term voids entering the turnaround equation. It is therefore extremely encouraging that the figures for October have reversed this drop in performance and proved September’s performance to be the blip it was described as in last months report. Performance for October saw void turnaround at an average of 25.40 days per property; this is a figure in line with current top quartile performance. The performance for October has also ensured that average turnaround for the year has dropped below the 28 day target level at 27.79 days. An encouraging side note to this improved performance is that the Voids Manager has noted that there has been a significant improvement in the turnaround of properties from the Interserve contractor in recent months.

5.4 Repairs
Performance in regards to repairs maintains its top quartile performance in both urgent repairs completed within target and non-urgent turnaround. The latter although showing a minor decline to 5.99 days from 5.84 days in the month of September is still performing at a level where turnaround is 2 days faster than of other top quartile authorities. Appointments statistics and those of repairs completed first time require full validation not available for this report, therefore in order to get a greater idea of month on month performance the flyer will now show the previous months, fully validated, figures. These validated figures show a significant improvement in both service areas; for repairs first time (up 2.7% to 94.08%) a level that is both above the 93% target and performance at this time last year. Appoints statistics show an improvement for the second consecutive month, (up 0.65% to 98.48%) this area maintains its top quartile performance and
has also reached its challenging target level for the year. Although the only area of the repairs service that has shown a minor decline since last month, communal repairs continues to show consistent performance with 93.44% completed on target for, despite this decline this figure is at a higher level than last year only marginally behind target.

5.5 Decent homes investment
The numbers of properties receiving decent homes investment continues to feel the positive impact of the increased funding received due to the 2 star audit commission rating. 112 properties received decent homes investment in October a consistent level of activity since the start of the programme which is following estimated timelines closely, this is also obviously a greatly increased level of activity from the 2007/2008 year.

5.6 Condition of estates
Mystery shopping for September continues to show the condition of estates falling behind the 7 out of 10 target mark set for 2008/09, the combined rating of the three estates visited in September was 5.93 out of 10, a level although an improvement of the previous months figures shows performance marginally behind performance last year and the minimum 2 star level set for estate standard. Although performance can vary in this area depending on the three estates chosen for mystery shopping in any particular month, People 1st will need to continue to target improvement in these estates. As stated in the last report a new system is in place to ensure improvements highlighted by these reports are carried out and may take a period of time to be reflected in these results, once repeat visits are made the success of this approach can be judged and hopefully we will see a step change in performance that will see estates moving towards the 7 out of 10 target ratings.

5.7 Leasehold service charge
On first reflection it would seem that Leasehold Service Charge collection has fallen drastically from the previous months levels (down 13.54% to 72.31%). However this apparent decline in performance is due to the billing system operated; Leaseholder receive their first bill in April for the first half of the service charge and their second bill in October for the remainder. Therefore the October figure will show performance against a limited window of collection 2-3 weeks for monies owed for a six month period, which would certainly show a decline. It is fully expected that performance will show a significant improvement in the coming months. The figure also shows a significant drop against last years figures, the reason for this drop as explained in previous reports is due less in part to performance in this area but a revision of how this indicator is calculated. It is unlikely that we will be able to properly gauge whether performance has improved or declined until we have had a full year collecting performance using the new system. As a final note People 1st is aware that there may also be a negative impact on collection given the current economic climate.

5.8 Telephone answering
Encouragingly My Council performance in regards to responding to telephone calls within 20 seconds has reversed the disappointing performance in September with 86.46% of calls answered within target time. This improved performance level is the result of actions taken by My Council to address high levels of staff sickness, however it must be noted that performance is still below the 88% target set for 2008/2009. Although slightly delayed, an audit of this area is scheduled for completion in November/December that could help to push performance to target levels. A further positive in regards to telephone answering
is that the Interserve telephone answering performance has improved for a second consecutive month to 85.55%. This improvement shows telephone answering by Interserve is now in advance of the 83% target levels.

5.9 Complaints
A major and continuous positive in regards to performance in October is the continued high level of performance in relation to the percentage of complaints replied to within target time. All complaints at Stage 2 were replied to within target time. The complaints team only narrowly avoided attaining a fifth consecutive month where both stage 1 and stage 2 complaints achieved 100% response rate with stage 1 responses recording 96.2% in October. Although this is a minor decline, this equates to only one complaint missing response target in 5 months and performance in this area should be commended.

6. Conclusion
The report highlights People 1st (Slough) performance in key business areas and actions they are taking to remedy any underperformance.

7. Appendices
   'A' Basket of Indicators.
   'B' Rent collected as proportion of rent due.
   'C' Average re-let times for LA dwellings.
   'D' Percentage of urgent repairs completed within government time limits.
   'E' Average time taken to complete non urgent repairs to People 1st dwellings.
   'F' Percentage of repairs where appointment made and kept.
   'G' Communal repairs completed within timescales.
   'H' Percentage of repairs completed first time.
   'I' Number of properties reaching the decency level
   'J' Percentage of estates reaching 2/3* as a result of mystery shopping.
   'K' Leasehold service charge collection rate.
   'L' Telephone calls answered within 20 seconds.
   'M' Percentage of complaints replied to within time limit.

8. Supporting Information
People 1st (Slough) Management Information Report – July to September 2008
The 12 Key Business Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 55a Proportion of rent collected</td>
<td>97.77%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97.04%</td>
<td>97.17%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>98.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVPI 212 Average rent times for void properties</td>
<td>31.99 days</td>
<td>28 days</td>
<td>35.03 days</td>
<td>25.40 days</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>25.31 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of urgent repairs completed within Gov. time limits</td>
<td>99.38%</td>
<td>99.25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>98.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average time taken to complete non-urgent repairs to People 1st dwellings</td>
<td>7.58 days</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>5.84 days</td>
<td>5.99 days</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>8.42 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of responsive repairs for which People 1st both made and kept an appointment</td>
<td>97.71%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>97.83%* (August 2008)</td>
<td>98.48%* (Sept 2008)</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>97.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal repairs completed within timescales</td>
<td>91.39%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94.38%</td>
<td>93.44%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of repairs completed first time</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91.38%* (August 2008)</td>
<td>94.08%* (Sept 2008)</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of properties receiving ‘decent homes’ work**</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>A measure not a target</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Estates attaining 2** or 3*** star ratings as a result of mystery shopping</td>
<td>Average Score 5.43 out of 10</td>
<td>Average Score 7 out of 10</td>
<td>5.86 out of 10</td>
<td>5.93 out of 10</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Service Charge Collection rate (figure includes insurance collection)</td>
<td>96.35%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>85.85%</td>
<td>72.31%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone calls answered within 20 seconds</td>
<td>People 1st 77.8%</td>
<td>My Council 88%</td>
<td>My Council 83%</td>
<td>My Council 96.46%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interserve 82.4%</td>
<td>Interserve 83%</td>
<td>Interserve 82.11%</td>
<td>Interserve 85.55%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of complaints replied to within target time</td>
<td>99.1% (Stage 1)</td>
<td>98% (Stage 1)</td>
<td>100% (Stage 1)</td>
<td>96.2% (Stage 1)</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.2% (Stage 2)</td>
<td>98% (Stage 2)</td>
<td>100% (Stage 2)</td>
<td>100% (Stage 2)</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Appointments statistics and those of repairs completed first time require full validation not available for this report, therefore in order to get a greater idea of month on month performance the flyer will now show the Septembers, fully validated, figures against those of August.

For detailed trend data, a Quarterly Management Information Report for the Apr-June 2008 is available as a paper copy and through the People 1st website. Contact: Sam Carr-Hill Ext. 4023 Performance and Equalities Manager
This page is intentionally left blank
### SBC/ALMO Basket of Indicators

#### APPENDIX A

**BVPI 66a - Total Rent Collected as a Proportion of the Rent Due**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct-07</th>
<th>Nov-07</th>
<th>Dec-07</th>
<th>Jan-08</th>
<th>Feb-08</th>
<th>Mar-08</th>
<th>Apr-08</th>
<th>May-08</th>
<th>Jun-08</th>
<th>Jul-08</th>
<th>Aug-08</th>
<th>Sep-08</th>
<th>Oct-08</th>
<th>Nov-08</th>
<th>Dec-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Rent Collected</td>
<td>97.23%</td>
<td>97.24%</td>
<td>97.12%</td>
<td>97.26%</td>
<td>97.37%</td>
<td>97.77%</td>
<td>95.49%</td>
<td>96.68%</td>
<td>96.53%</td>
<td>96.79%</td>
<td>96.79%</td>
<td>97.04%</td>
<td>97.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Predicted Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Quartile Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BVPI 1212 - Average Re-let Times for Local Authority Dwellings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct-07</th>
<th>Nov-07</th>
<th>Dec-07</th>
<th>Jan-08</th>
<th>Feb-08</th>
<th>Mar-08</th>
<th>Apr-08</th>
<th>May-08</th>
<th>Jun-08</th>
<th>Jul-08</th>
<th>Aug-08</th>
<th>Sep-08</th>
<th>Oct-08</th>
<th>Nov-08</th>
<th>Dec-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Relet Time (days)</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>28.23</td>
<td>30.57</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>35.03</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Predicted Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Quartile Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of Urgent Repairs Completed Within Government Time Limits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct-07</th>
<th>Nov-07</th>
<th>Dec-07</th>
<th>Jan-08</th>
<th>Feb-08</th>
<th>Mar-08</th>
<th>Apr-08</th>
<th>May-08</th>
<th>Jun-08</th>
<th>Jul-08</th>
<th>Aug-08</th>
<th>Sep-08</th>
<th>Oct-08</th>
<th>Nov-08</th>
<th>Dec-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>99.73%</td>
<td>94.25%</td>
<td>99.21%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>99.61%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Predicted Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Quartile Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Loc. 66 Average Time Taken to Complete non-urgent repairs to People 1st Dwellings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct-07</th>
<th>Nov-07</th>
<th>Dec-07</th>
<th>Jan-08</th>
<th>Feb-08</th>
<th>Mar-08</th>
<th>Apr-08</th>
<th>May-08</th>
<th>Jun-08</th>
<th>Jul-08</th>
<th>Aug-08</th>
<th>Sep-08</th>
<th>Oct-08</th>
<th>Nov-08</th>
<th>Dec-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Taken (days)</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Predicted Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Quartile Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BVPI 185 - % of responsive (but not emergency) repairs for which People 1st both made and kept an appointment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct-07</th>
<th>Nov-07</th>
<th>Dec-07</th>
<th>Jan-08</th>
<th>Feb-08</th>
<th>Mar-08</th>
<th>Apr-08</th>
<th>May-08</th>
<th>Jun-08</th>
<th>Jul-08</th>
<th>Aug-08</th>
<th>Sep-08</th>
<th>Oct-08</th>
<th>Nov-08</th>
<th>Dec-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>96.50%</td>
<td>90.09%</td>
<td>92.26%</td>
<td>89.78%</td>
<td>98.08%</td>
<td>91.81%</td>
<td>89.97%</td>
<td>89.64%</td>
<td>98.57%</td>
<td>97.57%</td>
<td>97.83%</td>
<td>98.48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Predicted Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Quartile Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communal repairs completed within timescales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct-07</th>
<th>Nov-07</th>
<th>Dec-07</th>
<th>Jan-08</th>
<th>Feb-08</th>
<th>Mar-08</th>
<th>Apr-08</th>
<th>May-08</th>
<th>Jun-08</th>
<th>Jul-08</th>
<th>Aug-08</th>
<th>Sep-08</th>
<th>Oct-08</th>
<th>Nov-08</th>
<th>Dec-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>90.76%</td>
<td>90.24%</td>
<td>86.22%</td>
<td>91.85%</td>
<td>92.15%</td>
<td>85.02%</td>
<td>87.56%</td>
<td>86.64%</td>
<td>94.33%</td>
<td>94.91%</td>
<td>94.12%</td>
<td>94.38%</td>
<td>93.44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Predicted Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Quartile Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of repairs completed first time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct-07</th>
<th>Nov-07</th>
<th>Dec-07</th>
<th>Jan-08</th>
<th>Feb-08</th>
<th>Mar-08</th>
<th>Apr-08</th>
<th>May-08</th>
<th>Jun-08</th>
<th>Jul-08</th>
<th>Aug-08</th>
<th>Sep-08</th>
<th>Oct-08</th>
<th>Nov-08</th>
<th>Dec-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>90.55%</td>
<td>91.99%</td>
<td>85.68%</td>
<td>87.72%</td>
<td>92.17%</td>
<td>89.91%</td>
<td>86.85%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
<td>90.08%</td>
<td>92.00%</td>
<td>91.38%</td>
<td>94.08%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Predicted Performance</td>
<td>Oct-07</td>
<td>Nov-07</td>
<td>Dec-07</td>
<td>Jan-08</td>
<td>Feb-08</td>
<td>Mar-08</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td>Dec-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of properties reaching the 'decency' level</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running total</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Estates attaining 2** or 3*** star ratings as a result of mystery shopping.</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
<td>66.00%</td>
<td>59.70%</td>
<td>59.30%</td>
<td>58.60%</td>
<td>59.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Charge Collection rate (figure includes insurance collection).</td>
<td>84.90%</td>
<td>92.69%</td>
<td>93.59%</td>
<td>94.82%</td>
<td>96.67%</td>
<td>69.59%</td>
<td>76.96%</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
<td>81.92%</td>
<td>83.52%</td>
<td>85.85%</td>
<td>72.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter Telephine calls answered within 20 seconds</td>
<td>65.18%</td>
<td>75.70%</td>
<td>76.60%</td>
<td>72.30%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>85.30%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>79.00%</td>
<td>86.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interserve</td>
<td>74.58%</td>
<td>81.00%</td>
<td>81.06%</td>
<td>78.31%</td>
<td>86.16%</td>
<td>81.89%</td>
<td>85.91%</td>
<td>81.45%</td>
<td>84.39%</td>
<td>83.14%</td>
<td>80.97%</td>
<td>82.11%</td>
<td>85.55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of complaints replied to within target time</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.80%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>98.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*APPENDIX A*
APPENDIX C

BVPI 212 - Average time taken to re-let homes (days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct-07</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-07</td>
<td>22.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-07</td>
<td>22.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-08</td>
<td>24.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-08</td>
<td>28.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-08</td>
<td>30.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>28.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>30.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>19.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>22.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>35.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>25.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People 1st Target 2008/09 - 28 days
People 1st final figure 2007/08 - 31.99 days
% - urgent repairs completed within Government Time Limits

People 1st Target 2008/09 - 99.25%

People 1st final figure 2007/08 - 99.38%
Average time taken to complete non-urgent repairs (days)

People 1st Target 2008/09 - 8 days
People 1st final figure 2007/08 - 7.58 days
Percentage of repairs completed where appointments were made and kept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct-07</td>
<td>98.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-07</td>
<td>90.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-07</td>
<td>89.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-08</td>
<td>91.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-08</td>
<td>89.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-08</td>
<td>89.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>98.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>97.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>97.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>98.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>98.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>98.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td>97.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-08</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People 1st Target 2008/09 - 98.5%
People 1st final figure 2007/08 - 97.71%
Percentage of repairs completed first time

- Oct-07: 90.55%
- Nov-07: 91.99%
- Dec-07: 85.68%
- Jan-08: 87.72%
- Feb-08: 92.17%
- Mar-08: 89.91%
- Apr-08: 86.85%
- May-08: 89.50%
- Jun-08: 90.08%
- Jul-08: 92.00%
- Aug-08: 91.38%
- Sep-08: 94.08%
- Oct-08: 80.00%
- Nov-08: 82.00%
- Dec-08: 84.00%
- Jan-09: 86.00%
- Feb-09: 88.00%
- Mar-09: 90.00%
- Apr-09: 92.00%
- May-09: 94.08%
- Jun-09: 98.00%
- Jul-09: 100.00%

People 1st Target 2008/09 - 93%
People 1st final figure 2007/08 - 90.9%
Number of properties reaching the 'decency' level

People 1st end of year figure
2007/08 - 794 properties
Percentage of Estates attaining 2** or 3*** star ratings as a result of mystery shopping.

People 1st Target 2008/09 - 70%

People 1st final figure - 2007/08 - 54.3%
Leasehold Service Charge Collection Rate (figure includes insurance collection)

People 1st Target 2008/09 - 98%
People 1st final figure 2007/08 - 96.35%

- Oct-07: 92.68%
- Nov-07: 94.82%
- Dec-07: 95.87%
- Jan-08: 96.35%
- Feb-08: 96.59%
- Mar-08: 94.82%
- Apr-08: 93.59%
- May-08: 92.68%
- Jun-08: 83.52%
- Jul-08: 81.92%
- Aug-08: 76.96%
- Sep-08: 72.31%
- Oct-08: 85.85%
Telephone Calls answered within 20 seconds

- My Council Target: 88%
- Interserve Target: 83%
Percentage of complaints replied to within target time

People 1st Target 2008/09 - 98%

Stage 1 - 99.1%
Stage 2 - 88.2%
LEASEHOLDER SERVICE CHARGE COLLECTION AND OVERALL SATISFACTION

1. **Purpose of Report**

   This report seeks to establish the current level of leasehold service charge performance by People 1st (Slough), the report also highlights current leaseholder satisfaction with services and ways in which People 1st are looking to support leaseholders in payment of their service charge.

2. **Recommendations**

   The Panel is requested to consider and comment on:

   - The performance figures for People 1st (Slough) service charge collection and how the figures are subject to a new collection format.
   - The actions People 1st (Slough) are taking to continuously improve their support to their Leaseholder customers.

3. **Key Priorities**

   People 1st (Slough) are responsible for managing and improving Slough’s council housing and therefore support all of the Council’s priorities.

4. **Other Implications**

   (a) **Financial**
   
   It is imperative that the leaseholder service charge collection for the borough is maximised. The greater the collection rate the more resources are available to ensure comprehensive service provision.

   (b) **Human Rights Act and other Legal Implications**
   
   There are no Legal or Human Rights Act implications.
5. **Leasehold Service Charge Collection Levels**

5.1 The monthly flyer figure for Octobers Leaseholder service charge collection shows collection levels at this point of the year at 72.31%. At first sight this appears that performance in this area is poor, as this is showing a 13% decrease in collection levels from the previous month and also a figure 12% lower than performance at the same point in the 2007/2008 financial year. However there are a number of explanations behind the headline statistic which show that the figure is still performing in line with the high performance levels of previous years.

5.2 The first factor when looking at the leasehold service charge collection statistic, is that the way the performance figure is now collected differs from 2007/2008. At the start of 2008/2009 it was decided that in order to get a better understanding of the performance of the leasehold collection service, residents who paid their service charge by regular payment (standing order etc.) were removed from the performance statistic. Therefore the statistic only focused on residents we had billed but held no regular payment option with, obviously this approach will see an apparent decline in performance as you take away residents whose payment would equate to 100% for the year. However the new approach was seen to be both challenging and a way to gauge the performance of the team rather than of the function. Given this approach it is difficult to measure the performance of this year against that of last, but if we were to add the residents who pay by regular payment, October’s 72.31% statistic would not be 12% lower than last year.

5.3 The second factor when looking at the leaseholder service charge collection statistic is the apparent decline from Septembers performance level (85.85%) to that of October (72.31%). The reason for this decline is not due to performance, rather the billing pattern of the leasehold collection team. Leaseholders receive their first bill in April for the first half of the service charge and their second bill in October for the remainder. Therefore the October figure will show performance against a limited window of collection 2-3 weeks for monies owed for a six month period, which would certainly show a decline. It is fully expected that performance will show a significant improvement in the coming months when the collection team have a significant time period to gather the revenue.

5.4 The final factor that can affect leaseholder service charge collection figures is a mixture of economic circumstances. As the panel will be fully aware we are operating in a considerably different economic climate to that of 2007/2008. The impact of the uncertainty in the national economy will obviously have an effect on collection levels. The economic uncertainty is twinned with substantial rises in service charges over the last two years in response to recommendations raised by the audit commission at People 1st’s last two inspections. The audit commission discovered that the amount leaseholders were being charged for the estate services officers (formally caretakers) in their neighbourhoods had not been reflecting the cost of the service for a number of years. A full value for money assessment of the cost of the service saw an increase in service charge, which although fair, has understandably met some leaseholder dissatisfaction. The service charge has also been considerably affected by an increase in utility prices and a further recommendation by the audit commission to standardise the insurance premiums for all leaseholders which has lead to an increase for some. Now these changes have taken place it is envisaged that service charges should remain on a par (taking into account inflation) over the next few years.
5.5 Obviously the change in economic circumstances and increases in services charges do not only affect the performance statistics but more importantly the welfare of our leasehold customers. The leasehold team are increasing their efforts to provide advice in co-ordination with the revenues team to provide more flexible payment options and working with the Citizens Advice Bureau to provide advice on those with financial difficulties. People 1st are also actively investigating how financial assistance/advice can be extended, the recently formulated resident network (part of the wider tenant Participation Strategy) will be used to consult on ways in which further assistance could be provided. A meeting of the Leaseholder Forum scheduled for the January period which will seek leaseholder views on how assistance could be broadened. The issue will also be addressed with specific questions added to the annual Leaseholder satisfaction survey also scheduled for a February circulation.

5.6 Despite the increases in service charge and the current economic situation, Leaseholder satisfaction with People 1st services remains on a par with the majority of top quartile ALMO’s within the country. The last annual Leaseholder satisfaction survey showed overall satisfaction with services at 55%, although this seems to be a low satisfaction level, there are historically low levels of leasehold satisfaction experienced by all local authorities and ALMO’s. A recent benchmarking exercise showed that the majority of ALMO’s had leaseholder satisfaction at the low to mid 30% level. As stated in 5.5 People 1st will be repeated the Annual survey in February and will get a greater gauge of current opinion. However a recent Estate Service Survey that was circulated in 1st news gave an up to date poll of current leasehold satisfaction with the condition of their estate. Surprisingly satisfaction levels from leaseholders actually outscored the survey average in a number of areas. The following areas show where Leaseholders exhibited greater satisfaction than the survey average:

- 66% satisfaction with Estate Services Officers
- 89% satisfaction with removal of graffiti in Internal areas
- 76% satisfaction with removal of graffiti in external areas
- 88% satisfaction with removal of fly-tipping/bulk rubbish
- 90% satisfaction with removal of Abandoned Vehicles

Despite these positive overall satisfaction amongst leaseholders for estate maintenance in this survey stood at 42%, this is possibly due in part to the increase in service charge documented in 5.4. However there were also issues highlighted by Leaseholders in regards to lack of awareness of and difficulty in contacting both Housing Officers and Duty Housing Officers, this is an area People 1st will be looking to address in the near future with greater publicity and customer services training.

5.7 Although performance levels above indicate that People 1st is providing a service to Leaseholders on a par with that of other top quartile authorities the organisation is constantly seeking continuous improvement in this area via close scrutiny, benchmarking and monitoring of the function. The Leaseholder Forum as mentioned in 5.5 is a regular open quarterly forum that allows residents to discuss their service charges and challenge the value for money for the services they receive. The forum is also used to discuss Leaseholder service standards, procedures and policy and acts as a value point of scrutiny from stakeholders. The Forum is also used to identify actions that will form part of the annual Service Improvement Plan. One such action identified last year was the introduction of a
dispute resolution panel which People 1st plan to have in place by the end of the 2008/2009 financial year. This panel will act as an extra stage for Leaseholders in the complaints procedure to address Leaseholder specific problems within the service. As well as a resolution tool, the complaints that go to the panel will be monitored to see how they could be dealt with better and how the organisation can learn from these instances. People 1st have a wider complaints monitoring system which ensures feedback from each complaint is provided by staff via a feedback form, these are analysed on a bi-monthly basis and actions from the forms are then taken forward to SMT. Although these monitoring processes are in place the level of formal complaints received by Leaseholders is relatively low, in the July to September quarter only two complaints were received – one in relation to the high level of service charges and one in regards to an outstanding communal repair.

5.8 It is not just internally within our own staff and stakeholders where People 1st seek to identify actions to improve service. People 1st also use a wide array of benchmarking avenues to identify best practice. November is the time when People 1st (Slough) begin the formulation of their Service Improvement Plan for the next year, as well as seeking actions from residents within the forum (as noted in 5.7) People 1st use the following benchmarking avenues during the year to formulate the Leaseholder aspects of the plan:

- People 1st are in contact with top quartile ALMO’s and organisations with recent 3 star ratings (such as Poole and Solihull) to acquire best practice on their Leaseholder services.
- People 1st monitor on a monthly basis the best practice and inspection forums within the Housemark Benchmarking Forum to find the latest actions to improve service to Leaseholders.
- People 1st regularly attend the London and South East of England Leasehold Benchmarking Group.
- People 1st maintain a link with Jeff Platt from the consultants ‘Grand Union’ who are specialists in the field of Home Ownership services to Local Authorities and ALMO’s to ascertain any developments in best practice within the field.

6. Conclusion

The report highlights People 1st (Slough) performance in leaseholder collection and actions they are taking to remedy any underperformance.
# NEIGHBOURHOODS AND RENEWAL SCRUTINY PANEL
## AGENDA PLAN 2008/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Report Deadline</th>
<th>Final Report Deadline</th>
<th>Agenda Dispatch</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Cabinet Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Monday 5 January 2009 | Tuesday 13 January 2009 | Friday 16 January 2009 | • Thames Water - flooding in Slough.  
• Update on the new permitted development rights for household development in respect of paving over front gardens to domestic properties. | Tuesday 27 January 2009 | Monday 9 February 2009 |
| Wednesday 4 March 2009 | Thursday 12 March 2009 | Tuesday 17 March 2009 | • People 1st-Inspection Action Progress Plan  
• People 1st-Estate Management Services  
• Council Policy on dealing with chaotic tenants and residents | Wednesday 25 March 2009 | Monday 20 April 2009 |

### Unprogrammed Agenda Items / Other

- Northern Road/Cumberland Avenue Traffic Management scheme and result of safety audit.
- Implications of ‘Snooping’ (information held by public bodies)- are there safeguards in place to protect public?