

Housing and Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Monday 29 November 2010
7.00 pm
Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

Supplemental Agenda

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
8.	Housing Repairs Case-Tracking	1 - 4
10.	4 Squares Housing	5 - 7

Contact

Karen Harris on 020 7525 0324 or email: karen.harris@southwark.gov.uk

Date: 22 November 2010

Source	Issue	Reason for case tracking	Officer comments on the case	Was a customer survey carried out?
8005067838	Appointment for plumber to come and fix leak. Plumber did not turn up,	Straightforward example of an appointment being missed. We should check if it was recorded on icasework (and consequently in the KPIs) if it was indeed recorded as a missed appointment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tenant had to call several times • SBS repeatedly cancelled the job or put it to complete without recommendations • CSC incorrectly raised new job rather than nil value recall • The contractors did not self-report it as a missed appointment • The tenant was given the number to make a formal complaint but did not. <p><u>Ways to improve these problems:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We now use the customer survey report to monitor missed appointments rather than contractor self-reporting • CSC operative will be retrained regarding raising recalls. • The cost of the duplicate jobs will automatically be reclaimed by the QS team • There is now a new interface so that when SBS cancel a job the reason is visible to all • Contractor cancellations are now monitored 	Yes, this tenant completed a survey on one of the recall works orders raised before this call and rated the service 3 out of 5
8005091108	Morrison were supposed to work in the flat last week. Guy who came had no idea of the job they were going to do. Replace the bath. Contractor said he was going back to his office to re-book the call. Supposed to have been done in November.	Obviously we need to know how this is reflected in the KPIs. Interesting that the operator doesn't ask for a call number. She says she'll "get on to Morrison" Did Morrison re-open the call?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bath does not need replacing, • It was not Morrison who attended but asbestos contractor who later returned to complete the work 	Yes there were two surveys, one for a heating job (rated 4 out of 5) and one was attempted for a plumbing job, but the tenant was not available
8005114382	Leak reported Contractor went upstairs to fix it. Leak stopped but then restarted. Water leaking through the light.	Was the original job recorded as completed? Or was it re-opened following this call.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first leak was fixed temporarily • It is not council policy to recall out-of-hours jobs so the CSC acted correctly in raising a new job • The works orders were completed on time • The leak was caused by major works contractors in the upstairs flat who fixed the leak permanently 	Yes, the tenant was called about the original job and scored the service 5 out of 5

8005115165	Recall on a lock that has not been properly fixed. Operator says "Back office on that one said it wasn't a missed appointment". Tenant - "I've got a letter saying it was."	To find out if a missed appointment was recorded on icasework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CSC acted correctly by raising a recall and logging a missed appointment to be investigated • The contractors did not agree to pay compensation as they claimed they had attended but needed to refer the work to a specialist contractor • The work to renew the door was then completed within target • The tenant answered the survey incorrectly saying that first the appointment was kept, but then adding that they had attended in the afternoon rather than the morning <p><u>Ways to improve these problems:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSC operatives carrying out the surveys to use intelligence and change previous answers if the tenant adds information later in the survey 	Yes, this tenant was surveyed about the missed appointment and scored the service as 5 out of 5 but mentioned the appointment as an additional comment
8005115570	General repair on bathroom. Stayed in all day but contractor never turned up.	Was this recorded as a missed appointment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor cancelled the first job incorrectly • The contractor did not self-report this as a missed appointment, and the tenant was unavailable for a survey. • CSC acted correctly in raising a new job to the out-of-hours service <p><u>Ways to improve these problems:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor self-reporting is no longer used for missed appointment recording • Contractor cancellations are now monitored 	The tenant was unavailable

8005115713	Was supposed to have an appointment today. Blocked sink. Call saying they were going to come was received, but nobody turned up. New job raised. Will need to wait for confirmation of appointment. Job was "cancelled" on system.	Really bad example. Why was job cancelled. Was it recorded as a missed appointment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor cancelled the jobs without giving explanation • CSC gave incorrect information and were not very sympathetic • Previous recommendations from the contractor had not been communicated for follow-on works to be organised, as per agreed procedure. • The tenant had to phone several times to get this repair resolved <p><u>Ways to improve these problems:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is now a new interface so that when SBS cancel a job the reason is visible to all • CSC operatives being retrained • Contractor cancellations are now monitored 	No, two were attempted but the tenant was unavailable
8005122417	Emergency call for Electrician. They did not turn up in two hours	Was this emergency call recorded as an appointment made and kept?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work was completed, but after 6 hours rather than 2 hours, and only after the tenant called the CSC back. • The contractor incorrectly reported the job as complete on time by post-reporting <p><u>Ways to improve these problems:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hand-held technology will prevent contractors post-reporting the completion time. 	No, a survey was attempted but tenant unavailable
Gavin Edwards Casework	Serious leak not fixed for months. Contractor appears to have put call down as completed even though no work was carried out	Find out how this job was recorded in KPIs		

Stephen Govier casework	Heating Complaint. Job appears to have been classed as completed when it was not.	Find out how this job was recorded in KPIs		
--------------------------------	---	--	--	--

4 SQUARES

Introduction

Residents from 4 squares made a deputation to Cabinet on 19th October to request the urgent completion of security works across the estate. Their request was as follows:-

The residents of the Four Squares Estate would like to bring a deputation to the Cabinet because we desperately need our long-promised security works to be completed. We understand that £8 million funding was allocated to the estate, but that the work for the first two blocks ran over budget, leaving only £1.5 million for the remaining two blocks (Marden and Layard Squares).

We believe that we have an extremely strong case for the security works to be completed across the full estate. This is supported by the police and the housing office, and this strong need for works across the whole estate led to the money being allocated in the first place. We notice that the new council have made a manifesto commitment to make every home in the borough warm, dry, and safe. Homes in Layard and Marden Squares are not currently safe, and we would like to explain the problems that we are experiencing on the estate to the Cabinet, so that the remaining work can be carried out.

We have three main questions:

- 1. How was the budget so badly overspent, and what has been done to tackle the council officers and contractors who were responsible for this?*
- 2. Will the council finish the security works on the full estate as promised?*
- 3. Will the council commit to spending the remaining £1.5 million from the initial budget on the Four Squares estate?*

4 SQUARES QUESTIONS POSED BY THE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

1. Why was most of the budget for these security works on Four Squares spent on just two of the blocks?

To date the Council has spent more than £6.7m on the security works at New Place and Lockwood Squares. This includes a grant of £2.3m from the London Housing Board to the Council made in 2004/2005. The anticipated total spend for the whole estate was £8m. Each package of security works was designed to a high standard following extensive consultation with residents. In the end, the costs for each square were more than anticipated.

2. Has additional funding ever been allocated by the council over and above the initial budget for these works?

As mentioned, In 2004/5 the Council obtained a grant from the London Housing Board (LHB) of £2.3m. The terms of the award required the Council to match fund the grant from its own resources. In the event, in November 2005 the Council more than match funded the scheme by earmarking council resources of £5.7m from the Housing Investment Programme giving an overall anticipated maximum expenditure level of £8,025,514

3. Have officers stated internally to Cabinet Members that further money will be spent without there being an agreed budget to match their statements?

The approved budget for the works has only ever been £8m, officers have maintained this position. When the capital allocation was reduced in 2009, Officers made clear that this scheme could not be funded in the current two year programme and that any decision would need to be deferred, and considered only in the context of the overall investment needs of the borough.

4. Did representatives of Southwark Council (Either Officers or Councillors) make commitments to residents without allocating a budget and without a budget being available for the work?

As mentioned above, the allocated budget has only ever been £8m and this position has been maintained. Although the scheme started on the basis that it would extend to all blocks, this was on the understanding that it would be met within the existing allocation. These resources were not adequate even at the outset. The reductions in capital allocation to the decent homes programme in 2009 meant that no further additional commitment could be made to this project.

5. Have cuts to Government Grants for capital funding for housing had any impact on the delivery of these security works?

There was a reduction to the annual Decent Homes allocation from £45m to £40m in 2009/10 due to a combination of factors:

Resources constraints:

- discontinuation of supported borrowing*
- slippage in achieving capital receipts*
- expenditure pressures on regenerations sites and new initiatives*

This reduction had no impact on the overall budget for 4 Squares. The original allocation was £8m of which £6.7m has been spent to date leaving a balance of £1.3m. Last known estimates for the outstanding security schemes at Marden and Layards were £2.2m and £2.3m respectively.

6. What are the current proposals/prospects for the completion of these works?"

There is no existing funding identified in the present two year programme.

Priorities for future investment in the Council's stock will be considered by the Cabinet in December 2010. The delivery of the Decent Homes target will take precedence given the overwhelming need to bring Southwark to the standard of its peers. Residents will be fully consulted, between December and February 2011 with a final post consultation report back to the Cabinet in March 2011 to enable future investment programmes to be finalised. The residents of Four Squares will be able to feed their views into this wider consultation before the future programme is agreed by Cabinet.

This page is intentionally blank.

DISTRIBUTION LIST**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2010/11****COMMITTEE:** HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**NOTE:** Please notify amendments to Scrutiny Team (0207 525 0324)

<u>OPEN</u>	<u>COPIES</u>	<u>OPEN</u>	<u>COPIES</u>
<u>MEMBERS/RESERVES</u>		Libraries	3
Councillor Gavin Edwards (Chair)	1	Local Studies Library	1
Councillor Poddy Clark	1	Press	2
Councillor Stephen Govier	1	Scrutiny Team SPARES	10
Councillor Claire Hickson	1	Nicki Fashola/Debbi Gooch, Legal Services	1
Councillor Linda Manchester	1	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Wilma Nelson	1	Dan Falchikov, Liberal Democrat Political Assistant	1
Councillor Michael Situ	1	John Bibby, Labour Political Assistant	1
Councillor Michael Bukola (Reserve)	1		
Councillor Paul Kyriacou (Reserve)	1	<u>EXTERNAL</u>	
Councillor Darren Merril (Reserve)	1		
Councillor Martin Seaton (Reserve)	1		
Councillor Cleo Soanes (Reserve)	1		
<u>CO-OPTED MEMBERS</u>			
John Nosworthy (Homeowners' Council)		TOTAL HARD COPY DISTRIBUTION	34
Jane Salmon (Homeowners' Council – Reserve)			
Miriam Facey (Tenants' Council)			
Lesley Wertheimer (Tenants' Council reserve)			
<u>OTHER MEMBERS</u>			
Councillor Lisa Rajan	1		
<u>DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS</u>			

HARD COPIES OF THIS AGENDA ARE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST FROM THE SCRUTINY TEAM Tel: 0207 525 0324