

Public Document Pack



Please note that the following documents were published separately from the main agenda for this meeting of the Performance Scrutiny Committee to be held on Thursday, 28th September 2023 at 6.00 pm in Committee Rooms 1-2, City Hall.

2. To Receive Minutes of Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee - 10 August 2023
(Pages 3 - 18)

This page is intentionally blank.

Present: Councillors Councillor Gary Hewson (*in the Chair*), Alan Briggs, Liz Bushell, Mark Storer, Pat Vaughan and Loraine Woolley

Apologies for Absence: Mike Asher

Also in Attendance: Mick Barber (Chair of LTP), Caroline Coyle-Fox (Vice Chair of LTP), Sean Newton (Member of LTP) and Debbie Rousseau (Member of LTP)

14. Confirmation of Minutes -21 June 2023

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2023 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a true record

15. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

16. Lincoln Tenants Panel Project Updates

Mick Barber, Chair of Lincoln Tenants Panel (LTP), provided a written report on the panel's continued work on a variety of projects with tenancy services, fire safety assurance, maintenance, business management and resident involvement teams. The briefing note, designed as a regular update to members of Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee, covered the following areas:

- LTP continued to hold quarterly meetings with the Voids Team Leader to review void inspections and targets. The number of voids inspections had increased and all had surpassed standards. Further discussions would be held with the Voids Team Leader to establish how multiple void inspections could be conducted with limited disruption to the team. LTP members recently attended a void recharge workshop and provided recommendations.
- The Complaints Review Group continued to hold quarterly meetings. There were no further updates relating to complaints or anti-social behaviour (ASB) working groups. Recommendations from the LTP were being reviewed and the ASB accreditation was still under review, an outcome of which was expected in the near future.
- The Schedule of Repairs (SOR) Working Group had received positive information relating to performance with repair timescales. LTP offered their thanks to Amy Larder, Interim Maintenance Manager. A detailed action plan to enhance and increase the SOR programme on Facebook was currently being rolled out. LTP had reviewed the latest tenant satisfaction measure progress, reviewed the kitchen and bathroom work programme and confirmed colour choices of kitchen carcasses, worktops and panelling together with style of handles. LTP had attended a 30 Year Business Plan and Estate Regeneration workshop, provided feedback and discussed engagement methods with residents. LTP had provided a set of questions to form part of the tenant wide consultation that was due to go out in August. All estate inspections had been attended by LTP members.

- LTP continued to represent City of Lincoln Council (CoLC) at Association of Retained Council Housing (ARCH), TPAS (the leading tenant engagement experts) and Social Housing Quality Resident Panel.

RESOLVED that the content of the written update from the Chair of LTP be noted with thanks, to be continued as a regular agenda item.

17. **Performance Monitoring Report Quarter 1 2023/24**

Paula Burton, Housing Strategy & Investment Manager:

- a. presented Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee with a verbal summary on performance indicators for the Directorate of Housing and Investment (DHI) for Quarter 1 of 2023/24 (April – June)
- b. added that regular monitoring of the Council's performance was a key component of the Local Performance Management Framework and supported its ongoing commitment to continuous improvement of Council services
- c. confirmed that there was a total of twenty-one performance indicators monitored by DHI. An overview of performance for the first quarter of 2023/24, against such indicators, was attached at Appendix A to the report, circulated separately to the main agenda
- d. reported that of the 21 measures in total; eight had met or exceeded their agreed target and eleven had performed below target. Three of the measures found to be performing below target were 'year-end' measures; one of which recorded the proportion of homes not at 'decent homes standard,' and the remaining two cumulatively recorded expenditure on maintenance and capital works
- e. referred to Appendix A of the report which attempted to simplify the overall analysis by listing performance on a service functional basis (rents, repairs etc) and then showing the source of the indicator (reason)
- f. added that further information on the areas highlighted was provided within the report
- g. invited comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

Members discussed the content of the verbal report, commented, asked questions and received relevant responses from Officers as follows:

Question: The percentage of rent collected as a percentage of rent due in 2022/23 was 98.36%. In quarter 1 of 2023/24, the figure stood at 96.81%. What was the difference between the percentages in monetary terms?

Response: Information pertaining to the monetary terms would be distributed to Members further to the meeting.

Question: What was the target set for rent collections?

Response: The target set for rent collections was 97.5%. Rent collections had been more successful than anticipated.

Comment: There had been improved performance in one-day repairs. To achieve this, the Council had increased the number of operatives carrying out Priority and Urgent repairs. This helped to maintain performance despite an increase in priority repairs being reported.

Comment: The percentage of urgent repairs carried out within time limits (3 days) had fallen below target during Quarter 1. Measures had been put in place to improve performance within the area. This included the creation of a rota which would see a member of the Customer Services Team work weekly from Hamilton House alongside the Planning Team. In addition, a team leader or resource planner was being made available for those still based at City Hall to provide additional support and guidance to ensure urgent repairs were reported correctly.

Recruitment continued to be a difficulty. It was hoped that the measures implemented would deliver a positive impact against the performance measure.

Question: When was the planned reduction of the work calendar from a 12 week cycle to a 9 week cycle, due to be implemented?

Response: A meeting had been scheduled for the end of August to plan the approach and it was hoped that we would have the new calendar in place by November.

Comment: The reduction of the work calendar was in the early stages however attendance from Donald Nannestad, Portfolio Holder for Quality Housing, would be positive to provide an update to Members in the next Quarter.

Question: Had there been issues with the online system and reports not going through to customer services?

Response: There had been ongoing issues with the online system, it was not currently being supported. Newark and Sherwood District Council were the lead on it previously.

Response from Donald Nannestad, Portfolio Holder for Quality Housing: The CoLC were not the only Council on the pilot scheme who had problems. Newark and Sherwood District Council had experienced issues also. The new IT system should link everything up.

Question: If there were issues with the online system, why was it being continued?

Response: Operatives still received repairs reports and they were still attending however it was taking longer. Issues had been resolved however the process had been made longer.

Question: Was the recharge mechanism the CoLC's determination of works that may be required in a void property?

Response: Yes, the recharge mechanism considered a property's condition when repairs were needed and what charges could be raised. The recharge mechanism was a more robust approach to charges for works needed inside and outside of a property.

Question: If deemed repair works were required, were items previously listed in the tenancy agreement to outline what could be charged for? There may be items

that should be the responsibility of the Council. It was important for tenants to be made aware of policies.

Response: All information was explained and communicated to tenants at the point of sign up. The main list was within the policy that was in place. Applicants/tenants were made aware of items that were recharged. When the policy changed in the future, a full communication strategy would be carried out to ensure tenants were made fully aware.

Question: Did the policy apply to tenants that may have signed up many years ago?

Response: The Policy had always been in place for all tenants and was part of the sign-up process.

Comment: Tenants should be advised that costs to remove items from a property would be charged at a 'like for like rate' to save instances whereby a tenant may not fulfil obligations to remove items in the instance that a recharge cost was lower than arranging it themselves.

Comment from Donald Nannestad, Portfolio Holder for Quality Housing: It may be the case that a tenant who passed away had not kept the property in the condition that even they would have liked due to ill health. Individuals who had contracted Covid-19 were more likely to pass away from another illness within two years.

Comment: There were incidents where tenants entered into an Individual Voluntary Agreement (IVA) and the money for cleansing was written off.

Response: The cost of cleansing alone was very high.

Comment: Each tenant was individual and the policy could affect them all differently. Housing was a business however compassion and discretion was important. It was essential that all tenants understood the policy and continued to be informed of all of the details from the beginning.

Response: Discretion could become very interpretable. The appeals process was in place instead of the typical complaints process and it involved an appeals panel, not left to a single officer's discretion. The policy signposted tenants to the appeals panel.

Comment: It may be the case that many tenants were not aware that they could appeal against the Council's decision. However, as long as all the information had been made fully available, it was the responsibility of the tenant to read all of the pages before they signed the tenancy agreement.

Response: There was a quality checklist that was in place to ensure individuals were aware that they were fully supported.

Comment: Tenant recharge/s were not uncommon across the whole sector. There would be cases whereby a tenant was unwell and there would be exceptions. The panel removed the decision on one person's behalf.

Response: Information shared on the appeals panel was positive as it made it accountable and fair. Tenants should be given every opportunity to make right any work to the relevant standard.

Question: Was there scope to reduce the average re-let period to 32 days?

Response: Staffing levels continued to be problematic not just for the Council but within the wider building trade. In addition, rising costs created problems. There were lots of elements. It was not possible to predict the future however we would continue in our efforts to drive down the number of void days.

Question: What was the target set for voids? It had been left open since Covid-19 and there didn't appear to be a target set.

Response: The average relet time was 32 days excluding major works and 38 days including major works for all dwellings.

Comment: Further information from Customer Services was required to report to Members on the percentage of calls answered within 90 seconds.

Comment: It was hoped that the repairs policy would reduce complaints because they would be communicated with fully so it reduced the need for complaints.

Question: Customer services operatives were knowledgeable but would it be quicker to pass through to the relevant department as they had the expertise?

Response: Work with resource planners was ongoing. Therefore, as information was received they would be able to answer queries before it scaled up to a complaint.

RESOLVED that:

1. Additional information be provided by Officers in relation to:
 - A figure in monetary terms as to the difference in the percentage of rent collection in 2022/23 compared to Quarter 1 of 2023/23.
2. The Democratic Services Officer be tasked with the circulation of the Performance Monitoring Report Quarter 1 – 2023/24 and associated appendices to Members of the Committee.
3. The current performance outcomes during the financial year 2023/24 to date, be noted.

18. Management of Communal Areas

Paula Burton, Housing Strategy & Investment Manager:

- a. presented Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee with a report on the introduction of a Management of Communal Area's Policy
- b. added that the proposed Management of Communal Areas Policy laid out the approach that the CoLC would take to manage enclosed communal areas and the areas that immediately surrounded blocks of flats
- c. confirmed that such a policy would have a number of benefits for all stakeholders including residents, Council staff and members of the public as detailed at paragraph 4.3 to the report

- d. reported that Management of Communal Area policies were implemented by the vast majority of social housing providers in order to set out the required standards relating to safety, repairs, maintenance and aesthetics
- e. referred to paragraph 3.1 of the report which defined a communal area, some of which included; communal entrances, any shared stairwell, balcony, or access path and communal parking areas
- f. added that an agreed standard would ensure consistency during the maintenance and refurbishment of communal areas. In addition, it would ensure that safety critical aspects relating to communal areas met legal and regulatory requirements as detailed at 4.4 to the report
- g. invited comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

Members discussed the content of the report, commented, asked questions and received relevant responses from Officers as follows:

Question: Why were maisonettes not included?

Response: The policy covered any communal blocks.

Comment: The report from the commissioned company would consider overall estates, the overall appearance, not specific communal areas. Consideration of an identified area would be the assessment of the regeneration of a specific area.

Question: Had LTP been consulted with on the proposed policy?

Response: Consultation with LTP had taken place.

Question: The policy was welcomed. Who would be responsible for enforcement of the policy?

Response: Expectations and enforcement would be by way of tenancy agreement as it concerned communal areas. Expectations would be communicated clearly and subsequently enforced by HRS and Investment.

Question: The policy was positive as many areas were dirty, smelly and cluttered. The policy provided for mobility scooters. Was it possible for pushchairs to be included?

Response: Suggestions would be fed back for consideration.

Comment: The report was encouraging and the policy greatly needed. All tenants and housing officers should be given a copy of it. Compliments offered to the individuals responsible for the devisal of the policy.

Question: How did the Council plan to enforce a 'zero tolerance' approach?

Response: Identification of the individual responsible was an essential step in any potential enforcement action. Methods of enforcement action would be contained within tenancy agreements. Previous attempts to discover the identity of a perpetrator included work with community services, often opening bin bags to ascertain if the identity of the person responsible for rubbish could be discovered. It was not always easy to identify who owned items and/or rubbish. It was essential for the policy to be in place to enable any action to be taken.

Comment: It was hoped that the policy would give officers the authority to enforce action to reduce the cluttered appearance of areas such as the Ermine East.

Comment: It was important to consider the suitability of accommodation offered to families. It could be problematic to place a family in accommodation on a third floor with a pushchair. The policy would not allow for them to be left in communal areas. A mechanism to record inspections of these areas was important. It was important to consider provision for all access routes.

Comment: A defined policy would provide more diligence and authority. Therefore, if something was wrong, as long as the tenant had a copy of the policy, something could be done to put it right.

Comment: Inspections should be documented to create a record to refer to.

Question: If an individual were to smoke cannabis a number of blocks away which resulted in other tenants being unable to hang their washing out, what enforcement action would the policy allow?

Response: Issues of smoking would be addressed under anti-social behaviour and in the circumstance of cannabis, criminal activity. Such activities should be dealt with that way.

Comment: It would be positive to view performance indicators on the policy.

Note: *(Daren Turner, Strategic Director of Housing and Investment, joined proceedings at this stage)*

Comment: The policy was a great start and development of performance monitoring was anticipated. If there was a caretaking system, it would be positive for there to be a paper trail. In addition, it was important to share all information with tenants.

Response: There would be a communication plan for tenants to ensure all were made aware of the policy.

Comment: Consideration should be given to social media communication also.

Request from Mick Barber, Chair of LTP: If any changes were to be made to the policy, that they be made known to LTP prior to progression to Executive for formal approval.

Response: Any changes to the policy would be submitted to LTP for consideration.

RESOLVED that:

1. Additional information be provided by Officers in relation to:
 - Performance indicators relating to the Management of Communal Areas Policy
2. The policy be proceeded to Executive for formal approval.

19. **Ellie's Memorial Garden**

Paula Burton, Housing Strategy & Investment Manager:

- a. presented Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee with an update on the intention to request authorisation from Executive to proceed to lease the land to the side of Tower Flats, to Green Synergy
- b. added that the leasing of the land would enable the continuation of management and maintenance of the area by Green Synergy as a community garden in memory of Ellie Bradford, a former member of Council staff in the Housing Department who had passed away whilst still in service. Ellie was a Housing Officer and Area Housing Manager
- c. confirmed that the Council and Green Synergy had entered into an informal agreement in 2013 when Green Synergy expressed an interest in the creation of a community garden with the Tower Action Group on the Tower Estate
- d. reported that the garden was no longer open to the public and was awaiting a formal lease agreement to be in place
- e. referred to 4.4 of the report whereby details of Green Synergy's vision could be seen. The vision for the garden was to secure a formal lease for the land to enable Green Synergy to bid for available funding to encourage community participation in looking after the garden, develop the planting and increase the biodiversity in the garden.
- f. added that the charity also sought to support sustainability through the development of compost bays on the garden and maintaining a beautiful community green space which it was hoped would contribute to the Lincoln Climate Commission challenges by increasing the native species on the garden
- g. invited comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

Members discussed the content of the report, commented, and received relevant responses from Officers as follows:

Comment: Plantation would reintroduce plants and wildlife that had not been seen in Lincoln for a long time.

Comment: Proposals were for a 25-year lease, with break clauses included at five yearly intervals. Permission was necessary from Ellie Bradford's family. Contact still needed to take place with Ellie's son and daughter.

Question: Gardening and green spaces helped with mental health issues. Green Synergy's work was fantastic. Was it possible to include a memorial plaque?

Response: It was possible to include a memorial plaque and that was what permission from Ellie's family was needed for.

Comment: A memorial plaque would be very heart-warming in Ellie's memory.

RESOLVED that Members agreed the contents of the report to progress to Executive for formal approval.

20. Anti-Social Behaviour Management

Paula Burton, Housing Strategy & Investment Manager:

- a. presented Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee with an update on the management of anti-social behaviour across introductory and secure tenancies
- b. added that the Antisocial Behaviour (ASB) Crime and Policing Act (2014) gave local authorities increased powers and tools to deal with ASB. Tenancy Services worked closely with the Public Protection & Anti-Social Behaviour (PPASB) and Legal Teams to combat ASB and ensure the robust and proportionate management of cases
- c. confirmed that there were 72 open ASB cases within Tenancy Services as at the end of June 2023
- d. reported that there were 53 ASB cases open for noise nuisance which equated to 74% of all open ASB cases. Most of the complaints received were noise related. Ten cases (14%) were currently open for verbal abuse/harassment/intimidation and/or threatening behaviour. Four cases (6%) were open for other general tenancy breaches. Two cases (2.8%) were open for pet nuisance. One case (1.4%) was open for physical violence. One case (1.4%) was open for drug related activity and one case (1.4%) was open for litter/fly-tipping
- e. added that there were six notable cases as outlined in 3.4.1 of the report
- f. highlighted that Tenancy Services were undergoing a review of its ASB management with the purpose of obtaining the HQN ASB Accreditation. The review was almost finalised with a decision due within the next month
- g. invited comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

Members discussed the content of the report, commented, asked questions and received relevant responses from Officers as follows:

Question: How far back did the figures go?

Response: Figures contained within the report were indicative of the number of cases at June.

Comment from Donald Nannestad, Portfolio Holder for Quality Housing: It would be useful to include cases that concerned non-council properties to provide a useful comparison. Figures to demonstrate the comparison between private housing compared to Council housing.

Response: A comparison between both housing sectors would be provided in numerical format to Members, further to the meeting.

Comment: The information at paragraph 3.2 of the report was the total number of open ASB cases. It was possible that there could be ten complainants to one case. The data demonstrated the cases, not necessarily the resources that had gone into it.

Question: Were figures for ASB contained within the Lincoln City Profile?

Response: Information on ASB was held by the Public Protection & Anti-Social Behaviour (PPASB) Team.

Question: How were non-Council tenant complaints about a Council tenant resolved?

Response: The report contained information about Council tenants. Non-Council tenant complaints would be included within figures from the PPASB Team that went to Performance Scrutiny Committee.

Question: ASB cases concerning pets and animals seemed low. Was it the case that people had not reported them?

Response: Yes. Individuals may not have reported ASB complaints about pets and animals.

Comment: Information contained within the report were ASB issues. It may be that there were complaints that weren't ASB complaints. The report highlighted issues that had been reported to the Council, not necessarily the Police.

Comment: Officers took time to identify the data. Consideration was given to common themes and particular areas. Data consideration may result in the identification of a reason for a common theme, e.g. a new tenant. The Council used the data to try and improve services.

Comment: Individuals affected by ASB were required to record a diary of events. Had consideration been given to methods of recording incidents by way of diary, online?

Response: Officers would investigate and provide feedback to Members, further to the meeting.

Comment from Donald Nannestad, Portfolio Holder for Quality Housing: An Officer from the PPASB team responsible for the investigation of a complaint/s, collected diaries every two weeks.

Comment: Consideration of people's use of CCTV camera equipment was useful. It may also be beneficial to consider tenants' use of CCTV equipment within the communal areas policy.

RESOLVED that:

1. Additional information be provided by Officers in relation to:
 - A comparison between ASB cases relating to non-Council tenants and Council tenants to be circulated, in numerical format, to Members.
2. The content of the report be noted.

21. Downsizing Policy Update (Verbal Report)

RESOLVED that this item be deferred to the next meeting of the Housing Scrutiny Cub Committee to be held on 2 November 2023.

22. Repairs Policy Update

Amy Larder, Maintenance Manager:

- a. presented Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee with a report to detail the changes and updates made to the Repairs Policy since its previous review in 2017
- b. added that the key areas for clarification were on fencing, specifically guidance on replacements and the tenant responsibility for maintaining installed fencing. Other key alterations included responsibility to include maintenance of ventilation to the property and the cleaning/clearing of air vents by tenants
- c. confirmed that the Repairs Policy aimed to identify within the provision of the Housing Act 1985 (amended) the tenants right to repair and identify the repairs that the CoLC were responsible for and those of which tenants were responsible for within the terms and conditions of their tenancy agreement
- d. reported that the policy looked to provide key information on service delivery, information on services provided by CoLC and how to report a repair
- e. highlighted that the items added to the policy within the tenants' responsibilities were detailed at paragraph 4.7 to the report
- f. added that the Policy had been reviewed and updated by HRS, the Investment Team and in consultation with Lincoln Tenants Panel
- g. invited comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

Members discussed the content of the report, commented, asked questions and received relevant responses from Officers as follows:

Question: Who was responsible for repairs on enclosed porches? Was that the responsibility of the Council or the tenant?

Response: Some areas had been enclosed by a previous tenant that should not have been. They were not classed as a habitable space. The CoLC were responsible for canopies. Areas would be referred back and then maintained from there.

Question: Would it be more appropriate for the bleeding of radiators to be a Council responsibility rather than a tenant responsibility? If radiators were not bled correctly, it could result in the loss of heating and hot water.

Response: The Council would be responsible for a boiler issue that resulted in no heating.

Question: Could Officers provide some clarification around the provisions for textured ceilings and walls?

Response: Textured ceilings and walls in good condition would only be removed at the point where a repair was needed to them. If either were already in situ, it would not present a problem, however tenants were not to install any.

Comment: Should radiators come under the service per year to be checked and removed from the tenant's responsibility. A tenant should report if a radiator was not producing heat effectively.

Response: There were DIY videos that would accompany the Repairs Policy in order to aid tenants with the tenant's responsibilities.

Question: When were DIY videos planned to be rolled out?

Response: The videos were planned to accompany the Repairs Policy update on the website.

Comment: Referred to electrics within the home. Changing a fuse should be a Council responsibility only.

Response: Fuses were for individual appliances only. The Council would not expect a tenant to change a fuse on a fuse box.

Question: If there were a vulnerable tenant, disabled or elderly, and there was wear and tear on the toilet seat, would the Council replace it or would they help them to renew?

Response: There was a section for vulnerable tenants and this was where discretion would be exercised. Each case would be considered on an individual basis.

Question: Could Officers provide clarification on the 16 days difference between 12 weeks for schedule repairs and the 100 days stated?

Response: The figure of 100 days was included as a rounded figure. Repairs were scheduled within the twelve-week planning period. The 100-day target related to how IT systems were set up.

RESOLVED that Members agreed the contents of the report to progress to Executive for formal approval.

23. Work Programme - 2023/24

The Democratic Services Officer:

- a. presented Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee with the Work Programme for 2023/24 as detailed at Appendix A to the report
- b. advised members that a draft work programme for 2023/24 had been circulated to the Chair and Vice/Chair of Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee and the Chair/Vice Chair of Lincoln Tenant's Panel for individual input/comments prior to the first meeting of the new Municipal Year ready for use as a working document.

RESOLVED that:

1. A report on the timescale for scheduled repairs be presented to Committee in March 2024.
2. An update on the Downsizing Policy be deferred to the next committee meeting on 2 November 2023.

The content of the work programme be noted.

24. De Wint Court-Post Implementation Review

Andrea Ripley, Housing Strategy Officer:

- a. presented Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee with a report to outline the Post Implementation Review (PIR) findings of the delivery of De Wint Court Extra Care facility, following handover from the developers in March 2022
- b. added that In July 2016, Executive approved, as part of the Housing New Build Strategy, to consider a detailed appraisal of options for the refurbishment or redevelopment of De Wint Court, a 37 unit supported scheme
- c. confirmed that following the open procurement exercise in the summer of 2019, ESH Construction Limited were awarded the contract to build De Wint Court with an anticipated build time of 80 weeks
- d. reported that there were delays to the delivery of the scheme due to the Covid-19 pandemic restrictions. The availability of materials and labour impacted delivery substantially with a 41-week extension to the contract
- e. highlighted that De Wint Court was handed over from the contractors at practical completion to City of Lincoln Council on 11 March 2022
- f. added that the findings of the post implementation review could be seen at Appendix 1 to the report
- g. reported that the scheme had achieved the scope to deliver a 70-unit extra care facility within the budget allocated. Lessons learned had been captured as detailed within Appendix 2 to the report
- h. invited comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

Members discussed the content of the report, commented, asked questions and received relevant responses from Officers as follows:

Question: Had all units been taken?

Response: Yes. There were a small number of voids due to the nature of the scheme however all units were signed up as of October 2022.

Question: Could Officers share an update in regard to the onsite hairdressing salon?

Response: A meeting had taken place with a working hairdresser. There had been interest in the lease however, the original design included three hair wash basins. One of these basins was being replaced with a forward-facing hair wash basin for ease of use for wheelchair users and another basin would be removed

to enable a clear view to the mirror whilst hair was being cut. This work was being progressed and once completed, the hairdressing salon would be ready to let.

Comment: There were lessons to be learnt in every scheme.

Question: Would the building benefit from full staff cover?

Response: Staff cover should be 07:00-22:00. Any absence of staff could be attributed to sickness. Comments regarding staffing would be fed back.

Question: Should the situation arise, was there provision for a tenant to complain to the Council regarding the Service Charge?

Response: Yes. The right to reply on the level of service charge was lawful.

Comment: A percentage of the staff charge was covered by the Council. It was a very good scheme and feedback received from residents had been very positive.

Question: The rent breakdown included an element for void properties and rent arrears. Why was this?

Response: Rent breakdowns were important to demonstrate transparency. It was not uncommon within the sector to include an element for void properties. The advice of the finance team was sought and acted upon.

Question: Would the Council consider another building similar to De Wint Court?

Response: Future buildings would be dependent on demand. The Council worked with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) and would need to consider available land.

Comment: LCC would approach CoLC and request involvement. The additional care package that LCC provided was expensive however, the idea was that we kept people within the community, rather than hospital.

Comment: It was positive to hear that the hairdressers had progressed as it had been a year.

Response: The end of defects had been concluded. The list was set and contractors had been back for the last couple of weeks. They were also scheduled to come back next week.

Comment: There had been the advertisement of a unit on Home Find. It was important to be careful with advertisement of units due to the nature of the residents within the building. It needed to be monitored carefully.

Response: The building was accessible with secure areas that needed a key fob to gain entry.

RESOLVED that the contents of the report and associated appendices be noted.

25. Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item(s) of business because it was likely that if members of the public were present there would be a disclosure to them of

'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

26. De Wint Court- Post Implementation Review

The Housing Strategy Officer provided members with details of the De Wint Court financial revenue income and expenditure.

RESOLVED that the verbal update be noted.

This page is intentionally blank.