

# Cabinet (Performance Management) Panel

27 February 2017

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Report title</b>                            | Housing Managing Agents Performance Monitoring Report – Quarter Three October 2016 to December 2016 |  |
| <b>Decision designation</b>                    | AMBER   |  |
| <b>Cabinet member with lead responsibility</b> | Councillor Peter Bilson<br>City Housing and Assets  |  |
| <b>Key decision</b>                            | No  |  |
| <b>In forward plan</b>                         | No  |  |
| <b>Wards affected</b>                          | All   |  |
| <b>Accountable director</b>                    | Lesley Roberts, Housing   |  |
| <b>Originating service</b>                     | Housing Services  |  |
| <b>Accountable employee(s)</b>                 | Liane Taylor  | Housing Strategy & Development Support Officer |
|  | Tel   | 01902 554758                                   |
|  | Email   | Liane.Taylor@wolverhampton.gov.uk              |
| <b>Report to be/has been considered by</b>     | N/A   |  |

---

## Recommendation(s) for action or decision:

The Cabinet (Performance Management) Panel is recommended to:

1. Review and comment on the performance of the housing management agents for quarter three 2016/17 and any areas for improvement.

## 1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 The primary purpose of this report is to provide the Panel with an evaluation of the performance of Wolverhampton Homes and the Tenant Management Organisations (TMOs) in managing and maintaining Council owned dwellings during the 2016-17 financial year.

## 2.0 Background

- 1.1 This report assists in clarifying and highlighting areas of performance and in particular where performance data suggests that intervention or revised working may be required or has been undertaken.
- 1.2 This report illustrates performance from quarter three 2015-16 to quarter three 2016-17 inclusively to allow comparison over the year.
- 1.3 The performance for each of the managing agents is grouped under three headings:
- a) Rents management
  - b) Repairs management
  - c) Voids and allocations
- 1.4 Wolverhampton Homes additionally reports on business planning, satisfaction with the handling and outcome of the Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) process, Stock Investment, Customer Care and Estate Services.
- 1.5 Tables indicate both the direction in which performance needs to move for improvement and performance trends between the current and the previous quarter.
- 1.6 Additionally, performance is categorised as:
- a) GREEN – where performance is in target and:
    - (i) Was in target the previous quarter, or
    - (ii) Was marked as Amber in the previous quarter.
  - b) AMBER – where performance is:
    - (i) Off target this quarter and was marked as Green in the previous quarter, or
    - (ii) In target this quarter and was marked as Red in the previous quarter.
  - c) RED – where performance is off target and,
    - (i) Was marked as Amber in the previous quarter, or
    - (ii) Was marked as Red in the previous quarter, or
    - (iii) Gives clear cause for concern

The left hand column of the table will show G, A, R or where there is no data available ND.

## **1.7 Governance**

- 1.7.1 The Housing Strategy Team continues to monitor the governance of the housing management organisations.
- 1.7.2 The Service Manager Housing Strategy and Development attends Wolverhampton Homes' board meetings as an observer. Wolverhampton Homes' board, committee and other minutes and papers are available on request to Council employees.
- 1.7.3 The TMOs have provided agendas, minutes and other documents from their regular meetings. Housing Services employees have observed TMO board and committee meetings where resources have permitted.

## **3.0 Progress for Wolverhampton Homes**

- 3.1 This section gives an outline of Wolverhampton Homes' performance for quarter three 2016/17. Performance details are available in Appendix 1a and 1b.
- 3.2 Wolverhampton Homes manages 20,388 properties on behalf of City of Wolverhampton Council. Generally, good performance has been maintained in the third quarter of the year and remains good overall. Of the twenty-one indicators included in this report;
- performance for fourteen are in target.
  - performance has improved or been maintained for thirteen of the twenty with applicable targets where comparison with the same quarter last year is possible.
  - performance has improved or been maintained for fourteen of the twenty-one with applicable data where comparison with the previous quarter is possible.
  - for the seven indicators where performance is not in target, the causes have been identified and addressed below.

## **3.3 Rents Management**

- 3.3.1 Changes in housing benefit brought about by Welfare Reform have had an impact on resources for Wolverhampton Homes. Some staffing resources have been diverted to respond to the needs of tenants and the organisation, including income/arrears collection and the provision of money and debt advice for example undertaking detailed financial assessments. Partnerships have also been developed, most notably with the CAB and Refugee and Migrant Centre, providing specialist advice and information which is tailored to meet the needs of individual households.
- 3.3.2 Performance for rents management was mixed in the third quarter of 2016-17. Two of the four target were missed.
- 3.3.3 The percentage of rent collected as a percentage of rent owed is off target for the second quarter, but only by a very small percentage of 0.2%. As the quarter three to date figure is within the annual target, there is no cause for concern.
- 3.3.4 Performance for the percentage of tenants with more than seven weeks arrears is off target and has weakened when compared to the previous quarter and the same quarter last year. The trend for this indicator suggests that the level of arrears will continue to rise

and so the year-end target is unlikely to be achieved. Manager continue to review all cases.

- 3.3.5 Performance for the percentage of rent arrears of current tenants is off target and has weakened when compared to the previous quarter and the same quarter last year.
- 3.3.6 There has been a total of 74 evictions for rent arrears so far in 2016-17 of which x was related to the non-payment of the removal of under occupancy subsidy. None were solely due to non-payment for reasons of benefit cap or Universal Credit. Wolverhampton Homes continues to advise and support tenants identified as having difficulty in maintaining their tenancy. The process of eviction is only taken when all other options have been exhausted.

#### 3.4 **Repairs Management**

- 3.4.1 Repairs performance was mixed in quarter three with one indicator in target and the other off target.
- 3.4.2 The percentage of total response repairs completed within target is off target by 2.02%, due to resourcing issues. The North and South repairs teams have been amalgamated to improve use and availability of resources. A revised performance monitoring regime will be implemented which aims to get performance back on target within three months.

#### 3.5 **Voids and Allocations**

- 3.5.1 Performance for voids and allocations was very good in the third quarter of 2016-17, meeting all targets. All performance was also improved or maintained when compared to the previous quarter and all four improved when compared to the same quarter in the previous year.
- 3.5.2 The average number of empty dwellings for quarter two is 80 out of the total stock, i.e. 0.4%.
- 3.5.3 Throughout 2016-17 Wolverhampton Homes' process for allocating properties has been monitored using a random sample of cases. No issues were flagged and good practise and adherence to the Council's allocations policy was demonstrated.

#### 3.6 **Business Planning**

- 3.6.1 Performance for average days lost through employee illness has improved and is back in target having improved when compared to the previous quarter and the same quarter last year.

#### 3.7 **Anti-Social Behaviour**

- 3.7.1 Performance for tenant satisfaction with the anti-social behaviour service remains in target with improvements on the previous quarter and the same quarter in the previous year.

### **3.8 Stock Investment**

- 3.8.1 Although the decent homes backlog funding has now come to an end, the Housing Capital Works programme for financial year 2016-17 and subsequent years includes budgetary allowances for continuing decent homes work, both to properties in the City that have not yet received decent homes work and for properties that fall out of decency over time.
- 3.8.2 Performance for stock investment has been mixed in quarter three. The percentage progress with the delivery of capital projects is in target and has improved when compared to the previous quarter and to the same quarter last year.
- 3.8.3 Tenant satisfaction with the completed work is very slightly off target by 0.03% has weakened when compared to the same quarter last year and the previous quarter. However, the quarter three to date figure is on target and the indicator is expected to meet the year-end target and so is no cause for concern.

### **3.9 Customer Care**

- 3.9.1 Wolverhampton Homes' Channel Shift programme aims to encourage tenants to utilise on-line facilities for making contact and reporting issues, in turn allowing officer time to be put to better use, for example, engaging with vulnerable tenants.
- 3.9.2 Performance for customer care continued to weaken in quarter three with three of the four indicators reported remaining off target, although two of the three with comparable data have improved when compared to the same quarter last year.
- 3.9.3 Performance of Homes Direct – average call answer wait time has been off target since the indicator was set up in quarter one of this year and has weakened for the third consecutive quarter.
- 3.9.4 Performance for complaints responded to in target timescales remains off target for the third consecutive quarter although this quarter it is off target by just 0.37% and has improved when compared to the previous quarter and when compared to the same quarter last year. Performance in the last month of quarter three was reported as 100%. A small number of cases running over time, (four this quarter) has had an impact on performance. There is currently no cause for concern.

### **3.10 Estate and Concierge Services**

- 3.10.1 Performance for fire safety inspections on low and medium rise blocks and on high rise blocks continues to be excellent, maintaining 100% checks completed since the same quarter last year.

## **4.0 Progress for Bushbury Hill Estate Management Board (EMB)**

- 4.1 This section gives an outline of Bushbury Hill EMB's performance for quarter three 2016-17. Performance details are available in Appendix 2.

4.2 Bushbury Hill EMB manages 832 properties on behalf of City of Wolverhampton Council. Generally, performance has been good this quarter. Of the eight indicators all are in target and all performance has improved or been maintained when compared to the same quarter last year. Performance for six of the indicators has improved when compared to the previous quarter.

#### 4.3 **Rents Management**

4.3.1 Performance for rents management was good in the third quarter of 2016-17, meeting all of the targets. Performance has weakened slightly for the percentage of tenants with more than seven weeks (gross) rent arrears.

4.3.2 The TMO has made efforts to reduce the 'percentage of tenants with more than seven weeks (gross) rent arrears' by focusing on collections, incentivising payment by Direct Debit, and producing literature on priority debts to support tenants in sustaining their tenancies. As a result, performance is within the tight target of 2.50%.

#### 4.4 **Voids and Allocations**

4.4.1 The TMO operates a local lettings plan and its own choice-based lettings scheme - Bushbury Choose Your Home. The Housing Strategy team is currently monitoring and reviewing the processes to ensure it fulfils the requirements of the Council's Allocations Policy.

4.4.2 Performance for voids and allocations has been very good this quarter. The 'average time to re-let housing' is well within target with improved performance when compared with the same quarter last year.

4.4.3 Void loss remains low and is well within target. Performance has improved this quarter and when compared with the same quarter last year.

4.4.4 Throughout 2016-17 BHEMB's process for allocating properties has been monitored using a random sample of cases. No issues were flagged and the TMO demonstrated good practise and adherence to the Councils allocations policy.

#### 4.5 **Repairs**

4.5.1 Bushbury Hill EMB delivers its repairs service to tenants through a contract with Wrekin Housing Trust and offers tenants a 'same day' repairs service. The methodology the Council uses to measure repairs performance cannot measure this service. As the focus on repairs services has shifted to customer convenience rather than government timescales, Bushbury Hill EMB has developed a suite of repairs indicators that will enable it to measure its performance.

4.5.2 Performance is good with all indicators in target. Two have improved this quarter when compared to the previous quarter and the same quarter last year.

#### 4.6 **General Governance**

4.7 Governance of Bushbury Hill EMB is good. There is a strong active board with clear leadership from the chair. Officers support the board and strive to improve and widen the services provided to tenants. For example through its relationship with Wrekin Housing Trust, BHEMB offers money advice to tenants. The EMB also operate life skills and getting ready for tenancy training courses from its offices.

#### 5.0 **Progress for Dovecotes Tenant Management Organisation (TMO)**

5.1 This section gives an outline of Dovecotes TMO's performance for quarter three 2016-17. Performance details are available in Appendix 3.

5.2 Dovecotes TMO manages 814 properties on behalf of City of Wolverhampton Council. Generally performance is good this quarter. Of the ten indicators eight are in target, five have improved this quarter and six have improved when compared to the same quarter last year.

#### 5.3 **Rents**

5.3.1 Performance for rents management was mixed in the third quarter of 2016-17, meeting one of the three targets. The percentage of tenants with more than seven weeks rent arrears and arrears as a percentage of the rent roll are off target and have weakened when compared to the same quarter last year. The TMO has referred some tenants to Wolverhampton Homes' Money Smart service to assist with tenancy sustainment and is looking into ways to improve performance.

#### 5.4 **Voids and Allocations**

5.4.1 Performance for voids and allocations has been good this quarter with levels of void loss and the average housing re-let time both target and improved this quarter.

5.4.2 The TMO's process for allocating properties continues to be monitored using a random sample of cases. Any issues are flagged and addressed to improve good practise and adherence to the Council's allocations policy.

#### 5.5 **Repairs**

5.5.1 Performance for repairs is generally good. All of the indicators were in target with one improving since last quarter and four improving when compared to the same quarter last year.

#### 5.6 **Governance**

5.6.1 The TMO continues to engage with a consultant from Open Communities Ltd to develop a new training plan and deliver bespoke training sessions where appropriate.

## **6.0 Progress for New Park Village Tenant Management Co-operative (TMC)**

6.1 This section gives an outline of New Park Village TMC's performance for quarter three 2016-17. Performance details are available in Appendix 4.

6.2 New Park Village TMC manages 297 properties on behalf of City of Wolverhampton Council. Generally, performance has been good this quarter. Of the nine indicators seven are in target, five have improved or been maintained when compared to the previous quarter and seven have improved or been maintained when compared to the same quarter last year.

### **6.3 Rents**

6.3.1 Performance for rents management was good in the third quarter of 2016-17, with all indicators in target. All performance has improved or been maintained when compared to the same quarter last year and is well within target.

### **6.4 Voids and Allocations**

6.4.1 New Park Village has reported difficulties in letting some of the three bedroom properties on the estate due to the size of the third bedroom. This has, on a number of occasions, lead to tenancy offers being declined and in some cases to new tenants leaving the estate and entering the private rented market.

6.4.2 Performance for voids and allocations has been very good this quarter. The level of void loss is well within target and has improved when compared to the previous quarter and to the same quarter last year.

6.4.3 The average time to re-let housing continues to improve. It is well within target, highlighting the TMO's efforts to improve its allocations process. The TMO attributes the longer re-let time in the previous quarters partly to multiple re-advertising of properties when tenancy offers were declined. In response, the Council agreed to introduce a small change to the Allocations Policy allows difficult to let properties to be advertised in a different way. The 'immediately available property' pilot will commence in January 2017 and run for six months.

6.4.4 Throughout 2016-17 the TMO's process for allocating properties has been monitored using a random sample of cases. No issues have been flagged and the TMO demonstrates good practise and adherence to the Council's allocations policy.

### **6.5 Repairs**

6.5.1 Performance for repairs is mixed in quarter three, with two indicators off target, although all are in target when looking at the quarter three to date figure. Due to the small number of repairs cases this quarter even one repair not completed on time, as it the case for urgent repairs and emergency repairs, causes a significant dip in performance when expressed as a percentage. In both cases, the repairs were missed by just one day.



## **7.0 Progress for Springfield Horseshoe Housing Management Co-operative (HMC)**

7.1 This section gives an outline of Springfield Horseshoe HMC's performance for quarter three 2016-17. Performance details are available in Appendix 5.

7.2 Springfield Horseshoe HMC manages 266 properties on behalf of City of Wolverhampton Council. Performance has been very good this quarter. Of the nine indicators all are in target, eight have improved or been maintained this quarter and eight have improved or been maintained when compared to the same last year.

### **7.3 Rents Management**

7.3.1 Performance for rents management was very good in the third quarter of 2016-17, with all of the indicators well within target, all three improving or being maintained when compared to the previous quarter and two improving when compared to the same quarter last year.

7.4 Performance for the percentage of tenants with more than seven weeks rent arrears has improved this quarter and is in target, although it is still slightly off target when looking at the quarter three to date figure. The TMO is pursuing arrears cases to encourage tenants to seek advice and assistance where necessary, and is aiming to improve performance to meet the end of year target.

### **7.5 Voids and Allocations**

7.5.1 Performance for voids and allocations has been very good this quarter. Levels of void loss and the average time to re-let housing are both well within target and improved when compared with the same quarter last year.

7.5.2 Throughout 2016-17 the TMO's process for allocating properties has been monitored using a random sample of cases. No issues were flagged and the TMO demonstrated good practise and adherence to the Council's allocations policy.

### **7.6 Repairs**

7.6.1 Performance for repairs remains excellent with all indicators in target and all performance maintained at very high levels. All repairs are completed within timescales with the average time to complete non-urgent repairs being one day.

### **7.7 Governance**

7.8 The TMO is currently reviewing its policies and procedures with external assistance and is undertaking a programme of board member training.

## **8.0 Re-negotiation of Tenant Management Organisation Management Agreements**

- 8.1 Each of the TMOs has now completed their internal approval process for adoption of the new management agreement with the exception of Dovecotes TMO. Dovecotes TMO are due to complete very soon.
- 8.2 The Governance Review is due to be completed by the end of February at which stage the Council and the TMOs will each sign the management agreements.

## **9.0 Financial implications**

- 9.1 The performance of the managing agents, and in particular Wolverhampton Homes, impacts on the Council's Housing Revenue Account Business Plan. The financial impact is reflected in the quarterly financial monitoring of the HRA which is included as part of the quarterly corporate budget monitoring reports to Cabinet (Resources) Panel.  
[JM/15022017/L]

## **10.0 Legal implications**

- 10.1 The services provided by the managing agents relates to the discharge of the Council's duties to its tenants. Failure to undertake relevant repairs to housing stock within a reasonable time following notice to the Council of disrepair can result in a tenant commencing proceedings in the civil courts against the Council for breach of repairing obligations under S11 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985.  
[RB/16022017/O]

## **11.0 Equalities implications**

- 11.1 There are no direct equality implications arising from this report, however the delivery of housing management services has an impact on the accessibility of housing for residents in the city.

## **12.0 Environmental implications**

- 12.1 There are no direct environmental implications arising from this report, however the proper management of the Council's housing stock including investment to repair and improve properties considerably enhances the built environment.

## **13.0 Human resources implications**

- 13.1 This report has no human resources implications.

## **14.0 Corporate landlord implications**

14.1 This report relates to the performance of the housing management agents and council housing stock and therefore has no corporate landlord implications.

## **15.0 Schedule of background papers**

### **Appendix 1a:**

Wolverhampton Homes – 2016-17 Quarter Three Performance (by category)

### **Appendix 1b:**

Wolverhampton Homes – 2016-17 Quarter Three Performance (by Green Amber Red)

### **Appendix 2:**

Bushbury Hill EMB – 2016-17 Quarter Three Performance (by category)

### **Appendix 3:**

Dovecotes TMO – 2016-17 Quarter Three Performance (by category)

### **Appendix 4:**

New Park Village TMC – 2016-17 Quarter Three Performance (by category)

### **Appendix 5:**

Springfield Horseshoe HMC – 2016-17 Quarter Three Performance (by category)

This report is PUBLIC  
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| Appendix 1a<br>Wolverhampton Homes<br>by category |   | Good<br>performance<br>is | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17<br>to date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual   | Housemark<br>Benchmark<br>Top Quartile | Comment   | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|----------------|
| <b>Anti-social behaviour</b>                      |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                  |  |   |                |
| <b>G</b>  | % satisfied with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with | <b>H</b>                  | 98.05       | 97.14       | 97.03       | 98.55       | 98.65       | 98.19                  | <b>[P] 97.00<br/>[A] 97.00</b>   | <b>94.75</b>                           | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.   | <b>+</b>       |
| <b>G</b>  | % satisfied with the outcome of their ASB complaint         | <b>H</b>                  | 96.75       | 95.00       | 96.04       | 97.10       | 98.65       | 97.42                  | <b>[P] 96.00<br/>[A] 96.00</b>   | <b>90.70</b>                           | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.   | <b>+</b>       |
| <b>Business planning</b>                          |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                  |  |   |                |
| <b>G</b>  | Average days lost through illness                           | <b>L</b>                  | 5.52        | 5.97        | 6.86        | 7.10        | 6.42        | 6.42                   | <b>[P] 6.50<br/>[A] 6.50</b>     | <b>1.61</b>                            | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target.   | <b>+</b>       |
| <b>Customer Care</b>                              |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                  |  |   |                |
| <b>R</b>  | Homes Direct - Average call answer wait time (in seconds)   | <b>L</b>                  | ND          | ND          | 130.00      | 159.00      | 218.00      | 168.00                 | <b>[P] 120.00<br/>[A] 120.00</b> | <b>13.00</b>                           | The target for this indicator has changed significantly - data from the same quarter last year is not suitable for comparison. Performance is off target. | <b>-</b>       |
| <b>G</b>  | Homes Direct - % of calls abandoned                         | <b>L</b>                  | 16.10       | 19.20       | 16.50       | 19.30       | 19.40       | 18.50                  | <b>[P] 20.00<br/>[A] 20.00</b>   | <b>N/A</b>                             | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target.   | <b>-</b>       |

This report is PUBLIC  
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| <b>Appendix 1a<br/>Wolverhampton Homes<br/>by category</b> |   | <b>Good<br/>performance<br/>is</b> | <b>Q3<br/>15/16</b> | <b>Q4<br/>15/16</b> | <b>Q1<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q2<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17<br/>to date</b> | <b>Target<br/>Profile Or<br/>Annual</b> | <b>Housemark<br/>Benchmark<br/>Top Quartile</b> | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Trend<br/>Q-O-Q</b> |
|--|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------|
| <b>Customer Care (continued)</b>                           |   |                                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                                 |   |   |  |                        |
| <b>R</b>   | Complaints responded to in target timescales - %                                    | <b>H</b>                           | 93.10               | 86.44               | 87.27               | 86.21               | 94.67               | 89.89                           | <b>[P] 95.00<br/>[A] 95.00</b>          | <b>N/A</b>                                      | Performance has improved year-on-year and is off target.       | <b>+</b>               |
| <b>R</b>   | Councillor enquiries responded to in 14 days  | <b>H</b>                           | 92.54               | 95.95               | 92.99               | 91.76               | 93.75               | 92.99                           | <b>[P] 95.00<br/>[A] 95.00</b>          | <b>N/A</b>                                      | Performance has improved year-on-year and is off target.       | <b>+</b>               |
| <b>Estate Services</b>                                     |   |                                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                                 |   |   |  |                        |
| <b>G</b>   | % of fire safety inspections completed on low rise & medium rise blocks (concierge) | <b>H</b>                           | 100.00              | 100.00              | 100.00              | 100.00              | 100.00              | 100.00                          | <b>[P] 99.00<br/>[A] 99.00</b>          | <b>N/A</b>                                      | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | <b>=</b>               |
| <b>G</b>   | % of fire safety inspections completed on high rise blocks (concierge)              | <b>H</b>                           | 100.00              | 100.00              | 100.00              | 100.00              | 100.00              | 100.00                          | <b>[P] 99.00<br/>[A] 99.00</b>          | <b>N/A</b>                                      | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | <b>=</b>               |
| <b>Rent management</b>                                     |   |                                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                                 |   |   |  |                        |
| <b>R</b>   | Rent collected as a percentage of rent owed   | <b>H</b>                           | 97.57               | 98.14               | 96.83               | 97.08               | 97.67               | 97.67                           | <b>[P] 96.87<br/>[A] 97.50</b>          | <b>98.39</b>                                    | Performance has improved year-on-year and is off target.       | <b>+</b>               |
| <b>R</b>   | Tenants with more than 7 weeks arrears as a percentage of all tenants               | <b>L</b>                           | 1.70                | 1.74                | 1.90                | 2.20                | 2.40                | 2.40                            | <b>[P] 1.90<br/>[A] 1.90</b>            | <b>N/A</b>                                      | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is off target.       | <b>-</b>               |
| <b>G</b>   | Tenants evicted for rent arrears as a percentage of all tenants                     | <b>L</b>                           | 0.34                | 0.47                | 0.12                | 0.23                | 0.36                | 0.36                            | <b>[P] 0.36<br/>[A] 0.48</b>            | <b>0.17</b>                                     | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target.        | <b>-</b>               |

This report is PUBLIC  
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| Appendix 1a<br>Wolverhampton Homes<br>by category |   | Good<br>performance<br>is | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17<br>to date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Housemark<br>Benchmark<br>Top Quartile | Comment  | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|---|---|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|----------------|
| <b>Rent management (continued)</b>                |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |  |                |
| R   | Rent arrears of current tenants as a % of the rent roll (WH only) | L                         | 1.39        | 0.98        | 1.46        | 1.75        | 1.57        | 1.57                   | [P] 1.30<br>[A] 0.98           | 1.95                                   | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is off target. | +              |
| <b>Repairs</b>                                    |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |  |                |
| G   | % of responsive repairs for which an appointment was made & kept  | H                         | 96.63       | 96.78       | 96.06       | 96.13       | 95.47       | 95.90                  | [P] 95.00<br>[A] 95.00         | 99.62                                  | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target.  | -              |
| R   | % total response repairs completed within target                  | H                         | 96.65       | 96.35       | 98.23       | 97.35       | 96.98       | 97.47                  | [P] 99.00<br>[A] 99.00         | N/A                                    | Performance has improved year-on-year and is off target. | -              |
| <b>Stock investment</b>                           |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |  |                |
| G   | % progress (by Value) with the delivery of capital projects       | +/- 5%                    | 22.41       | 26.06       | 23.91       | 24.26       | 23.47       | 71.64                  | [P]23.76<br>[A] 71.31          | N/A                                    | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.  | +              |
| R   | Tenant satisfaction with the completed work                       | H                         | 95.06       | 97.37       | 94.98       | 97.17       | 94.97       | 95.60                  | [P] 95.00<br>[A] 95.00         | N/A                                    | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is off target. | -              |
| <b>Voids and allocations</b>                      |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |  |                |
| G   | Average time taken to re-let standard voids                       | L                         | 28          | 23          | 21          | 19          | 17          | 19                     | [P] 30.00<br>[A] 30.00         | 19.43                                  | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.  | +              |
| G   | Average time taken to re-let major works voids                    | L                         | 15          | 14          | 9           | 8           | 8           | 8                      | [P] 15<br>[A] 15               | N/A                                    | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.  | =              |

This report is PUBLIC  
 [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| <b>Appendix 1a<br/>Wolverhampton Homes<br/>by category</b> |   | <b>Good<br/>performance<br/>is</b> | <b>Q3<br/>15/16</b> | <b>Q4<br/>15/16</b> | <b>Q1<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q2<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17<br/>to date</b> | <b>Target<br/>Profile Or<br/>Annual</b> | <b>Housemark<br/>Benchmark<br/>Top Quartile</b> | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Trend<br/>Q-O-Q</b> |
|--|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|---|------------------------|
| <b>Voids and allocations (continued)</b>                   |   |                                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                                 |   |   |   |                        |
| <b>G</b>   | % of tenancy offers accepted first time     | <b>H</b>                           | 83.17               | 82.40               | 84.04               | 84.69               | 85.13               | 84.59                           | <b>[P] 80.00<br/>[A] 80.00</b>          | <b>81.77</b>                                    | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | <b>+</b>               |
| <b>G</b>   | % Rent lost through properties being vacant | <b>L</b>                           | 1.52                | 1.44                | 0.92                | 0.88                | 0.81                | 0.81                            | <b>[P] 0.94<br/>[A] 0.94</b>            | <b>0.57</b>                                     | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | <b>+</b>               |

This report is PUBLIC  
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| Appendix 1b<br>Wolverhampton Homes<br>by GAR |   | Good<br>performance<br>is | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17<br>to date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Housemark<br>Benchmark<br>Top Quartile | Comment  | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|--|---|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|----------------|
| <b>Green - Anti-social behaviour</b>         |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |  |                |
| <b>G</b>                                     | % satisfied with the way their ASB complaint was dealt with                         | <b>H</b>                  | 98.05       | 97.14       | 97.03       | 98.55       | 98.65       | 98.19                  | <b>[P] 97.00<br/>[A] 97.00</b> | <b>94.75</b>                           | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.        | <b>+</b>       |
| <b>G</b>                                     | % satisfied with the outcome of their ASB complaint                                 | <b>H</b>                  | 96.75       | 95.00       | 96.04       | 97.10       | 98.65       | 97.42                  | <b>[P] 96.00<br/>[A] 96.00</b> | <b>90.70</b>                           | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.        | <b>+</b>       |
| <b>Green - Business planning</b>             |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |  |                |
| <b>G</b>                                     | Average days lost through illness   | <b>L</b>                  | 5.52        | 5.97        | 6.86        | 7.10        | 6.42        | 6.42                   | <b>[P] 6.50<br/>[A] 6.50</b>   | <b>1.61</b>                            | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target.        | <b>+</b>       |
| <b>Green - Customer care</b>                 |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |  |                |
| <b>G</b>                                     | Homes Direct - % of calls abandoned   | <b>L</b>                  | 16.10       | 19.20       | 16.50       | 19.30       | 19.40       | 18.50                  | <b>[P] 20.00<br/>[A] 20.00</b> | <b>N/A</b>                             | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target.        | <b>-</b>       |
| <b>Green - Estate services</b>               |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |  |                |
| <b>G</b>                                     | % of fire safety inspections completed on low rise & medium rise blocks (concierge) | <b>H</b>                  | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00                 | <b>[P] 99.00<br/>[A] 99.00</b> | <b>N/A</b>                             | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | <b>=</b>       |
| <b>G</b>                                     | % of fire safety inspections completed on high rise blocks (concierge)              | <b>H</b>                  | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00                 | <b>[P] 99.00<br/>[A] 99.00</b> | <b>N/A</b>                             | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | <b>=</b>       |



This report is PUBLIC  
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| Appendix 1b<br>Wolverhampton Homes<br>by GAR |  | Good<br>performance<br>is | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17<br>to date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Housemark<br>Benchmark<br>Top Quartile | Comment   | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|--|--|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------------|
| <b>Green - Rent management (continued)</b>   |  |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |   |                |
| <b>G</b>                                     | Tenants evicted for rent arrears as a percentage of all tenants  | <b>L</b>                  | 0.34        | 0.47        | 0.12        | 0.23        | 0.36        | 0.36                   | <b>[P] 0.36<br/>[A] 0.48</b>   | <b>0.17</b>                            | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target. | -              |
| <b>Green – Repairs</b>                       |  |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |   |                |
| <b>G</b>                                     | % of responsive repairs for which an appointment was made & kept | <b>H</b>                  | 96.63       | 96.78       | 96.06       | 96.13       | 95.47       | 95.90                  | <b>[P] 95.00<br/>[A] 95.00</b> | <b>99.62</b>                           | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target. | -              |
| <b>Green - Stock investment</b>              |  |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |   |                |
| <b>G</b>                                     | % progress (by Value) with the delivery of capital projects      | <b>+/- 5%</b>             | 22.41       | 26.06       | 23.91       | 24.26       | 23.47       | 71.64                  | <b>[P]23.76<br/>[A] 71.31</b>  | <b>N/A</b>                             | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | +              |
| <b>Green - Voids and allocations</b>         |  |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |   |                |
| <b>G</b>                                     | Average time taken to re-let standard voids                      | <b>L</b>                  | 28          | 23          | 21          | 19          | 17          | 19                     | <b>[P] 30.00<br/>[A] 30.00</b> | <b>19.43</b>                           | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | +              |
| <b>G</b>                                     | Average time taken to re-let major works voids                   | <b>L</b>                  | 15          | 14          | 9           | 8           | 8           | 8                      | <b>[P] 15<br/>[A] 15</b>       | <b>N/A</b>                             | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | =              |
| <b>G</b>                                     | % of tenancy offers accepted first time                          | <b>H</b>                  | 83.17       | 82.40       | 84.04       | 84.69       | 85.13       | 84.59                  | <b>[P] 80.00<br/>[A] 80.00</b> | <b>81.77</b>                           | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | +              |

This report is PUBLIC  
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| Appendix 1b<br>Wolverhampton Homes<br>by GAR     |   | Good<br>performance<br>is | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17<br>to date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Housemark<br>Benchmark<br>Top Quartile | Comment   | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|--|---|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|----------------|
| <b>Green - Voids and allocations (continued)</b> |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |   |                |
| G  | % Rent lost through properties being vacant                       | L                         | 1.52        | 1.44        | 0.92        | 0.88        | 0.81        | 0.81                   | [P] 0.94<br>[A] 0.94           | 0.57                                   | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.   | +              |
| <b>Red - Customer care</b>                       |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |   |                |
| R  | Homes Direct - Average call answer wait time (in seconds)         | L                         | ND          | ND          | 130.00      | 159.00      | 218.00      | 168.00                 | [P] 120.00<br>[A] 120.00       | 13.00                                  | The target for this indicator has changed significantly - data from the same quarter last year is not suitable for comparison. Performance is off target. | -              |
| R  | Complaints responded to in target timescales - %                  | H                         | 93.10       | 86.44       | 87.27       | 86.21       | 94.67       | 89.89                  | [P] 95.00<br>[A] 95.00         | N/A                                    | Performance has improved year-on-year and is off target.  | +              |
| R  | Councillor enquiries responded to in 14 days                      | H                         | 92.54       | 95.95       | 92.99       | 91.76       | 93.75       | 92.99                  | [P] 95.00<br>[A] 95.00         | N/A                                    | Performance has improved year-on-year and is off target.  | +              |
| <b>Red - Rent management</b>                     |   |                           |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |   |                |
| G  | Rent collected as a percentage of rent owed                       | H                         | 97.57       | 98.14       | 96.83       | 97.08       | 97.67       | 97.67                  | [P] 96.87<br>[A] 97.50         | 98.39                                  | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.   | +              |
| R  | Rent arrears of current tenants as a % of the rent roll (WH only) | L                         | 1.39        | 0.98        | 1.46        | 1.75        | 1.57        | 1.57                   | [P] 1.30<br>[A] 0.98           | 1.95                                   | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is off target.  | +              |

This report is PUBLIC  
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| <b>Appendix 1b<br/>Wolverhampton Homes<br/>by GAR</b> |  | <b>Good<br/>performance<br/>is</b> | <b>Q3<br/>15/16</b> | <b>Q4<br/>15/16</b> | <b>Q1<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q2<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17<br/>to date</b> | <b>Target<br/>Profile Or<br/>Annual</b> | <b>Housemark<br/>Benchmark<br/>Top Quartile</b> | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Trend<br/>Q-O-Q</b> |
|---|--|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------|
| <b>Red – Repairs</b>                                  |  |                                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                                 |   |   |  |                        |
| <b>R</b>  | % total response repairs completed within target | <b>H</b>                           | 96.65               | 96.35               | 98.23               | 97.35               | 96.98               | 97.47                           | <b>[P] 99.00<br/>[A] 99.00</b>          | <b>N/A</b>                                      | Performance has improved year-on-year and is off target. | -                      |
| <b>Red - Stock investment</b>                         |  |                                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                                 |   |   |  |                        |
| <b>R</b>  | Tenant satisfaction with the completed work      | <b>H</b>                           | 95.06               | 97.37               | 94.98               | 97.17               | 94.97               | 95.60                           | <b>[P] 95.00<br/>[A] 95.00</b>          | <b>N/A</b>                                      | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is off target. | -                      |

This report is PUBLIC  
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| Appendix 2<br>Bushbury Hill EMB<br>by category |   | Good is  | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 to<br>date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Comment   | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|--|---|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| <b>Rents management</b>                        |   |          |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |   |                |
| <b>G</b>                                       | % tenants with more than seven weeks (gross) rent arrears | <b>L</b> | 1.94        | 1.61        | 1.74        | 2.14        | 2.16        | 2.01                   | <b>[P] 2.50%</b>               | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target. | -              |
| <b>G</b>                                       | % of tenants evicted as a result of rent arrears          | <b>L</b> | 0.00        | 0.12        | 0.12        | 0.24        | 0.12        | 0.48                   | <b>[A] 1.00%</b>               | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target. | +              |
| <b>G</b>                                       | Arrears as % of rent roll (cumulative)                    | <b>L</b> | 1.74        | 0.67        | 1.50        | 1.67        | 1.55        | 1.55                   | <b>[A] 1.75%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | +              |
| <b>Voids and allocations</b>                   |   |          |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |   |                |
| <b>G</b>                                       | Void Loss as a % of rent roll                             | <b>L</b> | 0.27        | 0.13        | 0.14        | 0.18        | 0.11        | 0.43                   | <b>[A] 1.00%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | +              |
| <b>G</b>                                       | Average time to re-let housing                            | <b>L</b> | 29.17       | 38.46       | 23.33       | 29.00       | 20.78       | 24.82                  | <b>[P] 35 days</b>             | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | +              |

This report is PUBLIC  
 [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

**Appendix 2  
 Bushbury Hill EMB  
 by category**

|                |   | <b>Good is</b> | <b>Q3<br/>15/16</b> | <b>Q4<br/>15/16</b> | <b>Q1<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q2<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17 to<br/>date</b> | <b>Target<br/>Profile Or<br/>Annual</b> | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Trend<br/>Q-O-Q</b> |
|----------------|---|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|------------------------|
| <b>Repairs</b> |   |                |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                                 |   |   |                        |
| <b>G</b>       | % Repairs attended within time (WHT & WH)             | <b>H</b>       | 92.10               | 96.42               | 96.55               | 96.37               | 98.39               | 97.10                           | <b>[P] 95.00%</b>                       | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | <b>+</b>               |
| <b>G</b>       | % Rapid Response Repairs attended same day (WHT only) | <b>H</b>       | 97.32               | 98.05               | 98.63               | 97.96               | 97.88               | 98.16                           | <b>[P] 97.00%</b>                       | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target. | <b>-</b>               |
| <b>G</b>       | % Rapid Response completed same day (WHT only)        | <b>H</b>       | 79.67               | 89.85               | 83.30               | 82.64               | 87.03               | 84.32                           | <b>[P] 80.00%</b>                       | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | <b>+</b>               |

| Appendix 3<br>Dovecotes TMO<br>by category |   | Good is  | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 to<br>date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Comment  | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|--|---|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| <b>Rent management</b>                     |   |          |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |                |
| <b>R</b>                                   | % tenants with more than seven weeks (gross) rent arrears | <b>L</b> | 5.61        | 5.88        | 5.68        | 6.29        | 6.63        | 6.20                   | <b>[P] 5.25%</b>               | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is off target. | -              |
| <b>G</b>                                   | % of tenants evicted as a result of rent arrears          | <b>L</b> | 0.12        | 0.12        | 0.12        | 0.37        | 0.00        | 0.49                   | <b>[A] 1.50%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.  | +              |
| <b>R</b>                                   | Arrears as % of rent roll (cumulative)                    | <b>L</b> | 3.06        | 2.53        | 2.89        | 3.13        | 3.12        | 3.12                   | <b>[A] 3.00%</b>               | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is off target. | +              |
| <b>Voids and allocations</b>               |   |          |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |                |
| <b>G</b>                                   | Void Loss as a % of rent roll                             | <b>L</b> | 0.82        | 0.09        | 0.41        | 0.22        | 0.17        | 0.80                   | <b>[A] 2.00%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.  | +              |
| <b>G</b>                                   | Average time to re-let housing                            | <b>L</b> | 25.05       | 18.41       | 30.91       | 29.31       | 27.85       | 29.67                  | <b>[P] 30 days</b>             | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target.  | +              |

| Appendix 3<br>Dovecotes TMO<br>by category |   | Good is  | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>15/16 to<br>date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Comment   | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|--|---|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| <b>Repairs</b>                             |   |          |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |   |                |
| <b>G</b>                                   | % of urgent repairs completed within government time limits (Right to Repair) | <b>H</b> | 97.60       | 96.18       | 97.67       | 100.00      | 98.95       | 98.88                  | <b>[P] 96.00%</b>              | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | -              |
| <b>G</b>                                   | Average time taken (calendar days) to complete non-urgent repairs             | <b>L</b> | 6.21        | 6.36        | 5.97        | 6.16        | 6.45        | 6.20                   | <b>[P] 9 days</b>              | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target. | -              |
| <b>G</b>                                   | % of responsive repairs for which an appointment was made and kept            | <b>H</b> | 95.54       | 95.53       | 97.29       | 97.71       | 97.46       | 97.50                  | <b>[P] 90.00%</b>              | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | -              |
| <b>G</b>                                   | % of emergency repairs completed on time                                      | <b>H</b> | 96.74       | 97.37       | 94.44       | 98.00       | 96.88       | 96.24                  | <b>[P] 96.00%</b>              | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | -              |
| <b>G</b>                                   | % of routine repairs completed on time  | <b>H</b> | 97.92       | 99.52       | 99.53       | 98.25       | 99.32       | 99.05                  | <b>[P] 96.00%</b>              | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | +              |

| Appendix 4<br>New Park Village TMC<br>by category |   | Good is  | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>2015/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17<br>to date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Comment  | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|---|---|----------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| <b>Rent management</b>                            |   |          |             |               |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |                |
| <b>G</b>  | % tenants with more than seven weeks (gross) rent arrears | <b>L</b> | 4.43        | 3.74          | 3.97        | 2.55        | 3.20        | 3.24                   | <b>[P] 6.00%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.        | -              |
| <b>G</b>  | % of tenants evicted as a result of rent arrears          | <b>L</b> | 0.00        | 0.34          | 0.00        | 0.34        | 0.00        | 0.34                   | <b>[A] 3.00%</b>               | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | +              |
| <b>G</b>  | Arrears as % of rent roll                                 | <b>L</b> | 2.75        | 1.89          | 2.37        | 2.11        | 2.18        | 2.18                   | <b>[A] 3.00%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.        | -              |
| <b>Voids and allocations</b>                      |   |          |             |               |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |                |
| <b>G</b>  | Void Loss as a % of rent roll                             | <b>L</b> | 0.29        | 0.20          | 0.18        | 0.23        | 0.17        | 0.57                   | <b>[A] 2.50%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.        | +              |
| <b>G</b>  | Average time to re-let housing                            | <b>L</b> | 42.88       | 24.44         | 21.88       | 19.83       | 19.40       | 20.58                  | <b>[P] 35 days</b>             | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target.        | +              |



| <b>Appendix 4<br/>New Park Village TMC<br/>by category</b> |   | <b>Good is</b> | <b>Q3<br/>15/16</b> | <b>Q4<br/>2015/16</b> | <b>Q1<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q2<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17</b> | <b>Q3<br/>16/17<br/>to date</b> | <b>Target<br/>Profile Or<br/>Annual</b> | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Trend<br/>Q-O-Q</b> |
|--|---|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|------------------------|
| <b>Repairs</b>   |   |                |                     |                       |                     |                     |                     |                                 |   |  |                        |
| <b>A</b>   | % of urgent repairs completed within government time limits (Right to Repair) | <b>H</b>       | 100.00              | 100.00                | 100.00              | 100.00              | 96.00               | 98.76                           | <b>[P] 97.00%</b>                       | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is off target.       | -                      |
| <b>G</b>   | Average time taken (calendar days) to complete non-urgent repairs             | <b>L</b>       | 1.00                | 1.00                  | 1.00                | 1.00                | 1.00                | 1.00                            | <b>[P] 5 days</b>                       | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | =                      |
| <b>A</b>   | % of emergency repairs completed on time                                      | <b>H</b>       | 97.00               | 98.00                 | 98.00               | 98.00               | 95.00               | 97.51                           | <b>[P] 97.00%</b>                       | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is off target.       | -                      |
| <b>G</b>   | % of routine repairs completed on time  | <b>H</b>       | 100.00              | 99.00                 | 97.00               | 97.00               | 100.00              | 97.69                           | <b>[P] 97.00%</b>                       | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | +                      |

This report is PUBLIC  
[NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| Appendix 5<br>Springfield Horseshoe<br>by category |   | Good is  | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 to<br>date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Comment   | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|--|---|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| <b>Rents management</b>                            |   |          |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |   |                |
| <b>A</b>   | % tenants with more than seven weeks (gross) rent arrears | <b>L</b> | 4.26        | 5.00        | 5.47        | 5.20        | 4.45        | 5.04                   | <b>[P] 5.00%</b>               | Performance has weakened year-on-year and is in target. | <b>+</b>       |
| <b>G</b>   | % of tenants evicted as a result of rent arrears          | <b>L</b> | 0.37        | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00                   | <b>[A] 2.00%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | <b>=</b>       |
| <b>G</b>   | Arrears as % of rent roll                                 | <b>L</b> | 1.96        | 1.85        | 2.44        | 2.18        | 1.94        | 1.94                   | <b>[A] 3.00%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | <b>+</b>       |
| <b>Voids and allocations</b>                       |   |          |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |   |                |
| <b>G</b>   | Void Loss as a % of rent roll                             | <b>L</b> | 0.15        | 0.15        | 0.13        | 0.04        | 0.07        | 0.24                   | <b>[A] 2.00%</b>               | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | <b>-</b>       |
| <b>G</b>   | Average time to re-let housing                            | <b>L</b> | 15.67       | 25.38       | 20.00       | 16.33       | 7.33        | 16.23                  | <b>[P] 32 days</b>             | Performance has improved year-on-year and is in target. | <b>+</b>       |

This report is PUBLIC  
 [NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED]

| Appendix 5<br>Springfield Horseshoe<br>by category |   | Good is  | Q3<br>15/16 | Q4<br>15/16 | Q1<br>16/17 | Q2<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 | Q3<br>16/17 to<br>date | Target<br>Profile Or<br>Annual | Comment  | Trend<br>Q-O-Q |
|--|---|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| <b>Repairs</b>                                     |   |          |             |             |             |             |             |                        |                                |  |                |
| <b>G</b>   | % of urgent repairs completed within government time limits (Right to Repair) | <b>H</b> | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00                 | <b>[P] 98.00%</b>              | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | =              |
| <b>G</b>   | Average time taken (calendar days) to complete non-urgent repairs             | <b>L</b> | 1.00        | 1.00        | 1.00        | 1.00        | 1.00        | 1.00                   | <b>[P] 2 days</b>              | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | =              |
| <b>G</b>   | % of emergency repairs completed on time                                      | <b>H</b> | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00                 | <b>[P] 98.00%</b>              | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | =              |
| <b>G</b>   | % of routine repairs completed on time  | <b>H</b> | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00      | 100.00                 | <b>[P] 98.00%</b>              | Performance has been maintained year-on-year and is in target. | =              |