



**GGHT Panel of  
Excellence and Scrutiny  
27 March 2013  
10am  
The Gateway  
Meeting Room 3**

## Minutes

<b>Attendance:</b>	Lynda Johnson, Jean Bullock, Ayo Akinrele, Dot Thacker, Charlie Martin
<b>Apologies:</b>	Fiona Roberts, Alan Rankin, Linda Booth, Mick Rivington

		Action
1.	<p><b>Apologies/Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>Due to apologies received the panel did not have a quorum and was unable to approve the Regulatory Framework Report (Agenda Item 4) or elect a Deputy Chair.</p> <p>Jean Stringer has resigned from the Panel and has written to say that she has thoroughly enjoyed her time as an involved tenant and deputy chair of PEAS. The Panel members extended their thanks to Jean for all her support and agreed that she will be missed. A 'thank you' card was circulated to the Panel and will be forwarded to Jean.</p>	<b>CM</b>
2.	<p><b>Minutes of last meeting 13<sup>th</sup> February 2013</b></p> <p>The Minutes were approved as a true and accurate record.</p> <p><b>Matters Arising:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Update: The panel had asked whether the percentage of monthly repair surveys could be increased to enable GGHT to capture a larger representation of tenants. GGHT completes 800 response repairs each month and surveys are completed on 10% (80) of these jobs. Surveys are carried out by the in-house team who, in addition to repairs, carry out surveys for the following services: Capital Investment programme, Star and Mini Star surveys, handy person scheme, income management, welfare reform, gas servicing and ASB. Increasing the number of repair</li> </ul>	

	<p>surveys could impact on the responses received from other surveys. However, in relation to repairs: GGHT completes a full annual review of the 960 responses it receives throughout the year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Update: JS had been advised by an operative that the capital investment programme was not carried out on a Ward by Ward basis. James Doran advised that this was not the case and the investment programme will still be carried out on a ward by ward basis.</li> <li>❖ Update: CRB checks are now called Disclosure Barring Service Checks. GGHT are currently reviewing the new guidance and whether checks should be carried of on Board Members and panel members.</li> <li>❖ The Housemark Benchmark Report had been circulated to the Panel at the previous meeting. The Panel had asked why some housing associations ranked a higher figure then the number of properties included within the sample. CM explained that this was due to a printing error. CM circulated a revised Housemark report that included Housing Providers within the Northwest.</li> </ul>	
3.	<p><b>Responses to Panel’s Queries – Fiona Graham</b></p> <p>FG advised that she wanted to ensure the relationship between the Panel and GGHT had not broken down following the feedback from the special meeting. It is important that the panel members are receiving the right information and are able to make informed decisions – it is sometimes challenging to find the right balance as some members have been overwhelmed by the amount of information provided. It is often more efficient for senior staff to attend meetings and provide immediate responses to queries that members might have.</p> <p>CM advised that the Panel had asked to carry out phone surveys as part of the repairs review. The panel would prefer to complete surveys without members of GGD present but understood that there were issues relating to Data Protection and a need to ensure queries were logged onto the system. FG advised that the panel could carry out customer surveys at the end of the next CCP meeting. It was suggested that invites were also sent out to tenants that had receive a repair in the last 3 months. This approach will be trialed at the May CCP meeting.</p> <p>Blackpool Coastal Homes had been ranked consistently high within the recent HouseMark performance Benchmark report. CM advised that, without understanding the strength and weaknesses of GGHT’s responsive repairs system, a visit to Blackpool would be costly and might not be effective use of the Panel’s time. CM agreed to find out if BCH Scrutiny Panel had completed a review of repairs. The outcomes and finding of the review will be shared with PEAS.</p> <p>DT advised that, during a recent tenant inspection, she had queried the heavy stair handrails that had been installed within the flats at Alder Lane. DT feels that the hand rails posed a significant health and safety risk but has not yet received a response to her query. It was agreed that this will be followed up and a response will be forwarded to DT.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Tenant Inspectors were a useful resource and could be used for future reviews. FG agreed that Tenant Inspectors are an excellent resource and an outcome of the repairs review could be that Tenant Inspectors</p>	<p><b>CM</b></p> <p><b>CM</b></p>

	<p>carry out additional site visits. It was agreed that tenants could visit properties with technical inspectors and carry out 'spot checks'. FG advised that this would be useful if GGHT were look to re-tender a contract as tenant inspectors could be asked to assess the quality of checks carried out by Contractors.</p> <p>DT advised that road repair work had recently been carried out near Booth Hill Close. However, the local residents had not been advised that the works would be carried out and some tenant's had to move their cars to enable the works to proceed. CM agreed to find out why residents had not been contacted in relation to the works.</p> <p>LJ advised that GGHT operatives had expressed dissatisfaction with having to attend repair works that had been carried out by contractors and had not been completed satisfactorily. FG advised that contractors are responsible for programme works and would be expected to re-visit properties if programme work has not been completed to the required standard.</p> <p>The Panel advised that some issues are overlooked when bathrooms are often signed-off and GGHT operatives have to revisit the properties at a cost to the business. DT advised that the quality of paint used in bathrooms was 'poor' and there have been reports of contractors tiling over tiled walls.</p> <p>FG advised that responsive repairs are carried out by members of the in-house team and contractors are largely responsible for programme repairs. 50 kitchens will be repaired by contractors each year and the standard of repairs will be used to benchmark GGHT services. Subcontractors are occasionally appointed for areas of slippage (e.g. bathrooms and heating.).</p> <p>FG advised that responsive repairs are a very broad area and it might be worth 'honing in' on a specific area, for example, emergency repairs or communication issues.</p> <p>The Panel felt that it would be effective to focus on contractor and sub-contractor performance given the disproportionately high number of complaints within this area. Reviewing contractor performance will mean that the review could 'cross over' between programmed and responsive repairs and the Panel will need to be aware of this. Communications is another theme that emerged from the Panel's review and should be given further scrutiny.</p> <p>JB advised that the complaints panel had received detailed complaints linked to repairs and asked whether these could be broken down to show those complaints that related to contractors. FG advised that this would be difficult as whilst complaints were allocated a 'work number' the system does not distinguish between in-house and contractor jobs. Sometimes GGD ask tenants whether the work was completed by a contractor and this is included within the call log.</p> <p>DT advised that she had shadowed an operative after the February meeting. The operative was unable to repair guttering at a tenant's property due to the wet weather. The operative had to wait for a second job to be sent through to his handhelds. Other organisations have more immediate live systems in place that enable operatives to move onto another job.</p>	<p><b>CM</b></p> <p><b>CM</b></p> <p><b>PEAS</b></p>
--	--	--

	<p>JB asked whether GGHT agree the percentage of quality checks contractors should complete during the initial tender? FG advised that this was correct and that in-house team also complete quality checks on a proportion of works completed by contractors. DT asked whether work completed by Bramall's was monitored. FG advised that this was the case.</p> <p>LJ advised that the panel should review the costs linked to in-house repairs. FG advised that it was important to ensure a balance between the quality of service provided and the overall costs. Mark Burrows has agreed to provide an overview of the costs at the next panel meeting.</p> <p>DT asked whether WBC had a set amount of money to carry out repairs on roads near GGHT's properties. FG advised that WBC is responsible for land that had not been transferred to GGHT at point of transfer and the transfer document would need to be checked to determine if GGHT owned the land. DT advised that road repairs had been carried out at Booths Hill Close. However, these works had not been communicated to tenants and some residents had to move their cars to enable the works to proceed. FG advised that this will be followed up with James Doran, Investment Programme Manager.</p> <p>FG advised that the panel could review the contractor monitoring forms used by GGHT, establish how frequently contractor meetings take place and review the minutes from these meetings.</p> <p>The Panel asked whether the gas contract has been retendered. FG advised that the Board have approved the appointment of Sure Group on a 2 year contract. Sure will cover all GGHT properties, whereas previously the service had been split between 2 contractors. JS advised that performance was previously benchmarked between 2 contractors and asked whether having one contractor will remove this element of competition. FG advised that contractor performance will be carefully monitored to ensure customer expectations are met.</p> <p>CM circulated the scrutiny review report template that Linda Levin had provided. It was agreed that a brief report should be drafted to update the Board on the Panel's progress. The Panel agreed to review the template and email suggestions to CM.</p>	<p><b>CM</b></p> <p><b>PEAS</b></p> <p><b>PEAS</b></p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>HCA Regulatory Framework</b></p> <p>FG provided an overview of GGHT's gap analyses against the HCA's consumer standards. The gap analysis highlighted areas of compliance against the standards and areas where GGHT does currently does to meet the standard. Where GGHT fails to meet the standard evidence is provided that demonstrates how GGHT will look to resolve these gaps. The gap analyses had been signed-off by Customer Consultation Panel on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2013.</p> <p>FG advised that the HCA will not regulate GGHT's compliance against the consumer standard. However, the Board will need to get assurance that customers are satisfied with the self assessment and areas identified for improvement. DT advised that there had been slippage against the target dates under the Neighbourhoods and Communities standard. FG advised that managers will be asked to provide new target dates where the original dates</p>	

	<p>have slipped.</p> <p>DT queried the following use of the phrase “I thought looking local reporting was already live” under Neighbourhoods &amp; Communities. FG advised that the statement will be reviewed and amended.</p> <p>FG advised that GGHT has achieved 91% customer satisfaction and is in line with its annual target. DT asked how many customers had been included within the survey. FG advised that the survey included approx. 658 customers and that this exceeded the number required for the survey to be statistically valid.</p> <p>LJ asked if any queries had been raised during the Customer Consultation Panel. FG advised that CCP had not raised any queries in relation to the Gap Analyses.</p> <p>LJ asked when the gap analyses will need to be signed off. FG advised that the final draft will need to be signed by the Board in May 2013.</p>	<b>AF</b>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Panel of Excellence and Scrutiny Annual Review</b></p> <p>CM provided an overview of the PEAS Annual Review. The Panel were pleased to see that their recommendations had been taken into account in relation to the Gas Servicing Tender.</p> <p>The Panel asked whether the DVD that was developed to promote the capital investment programme had been circulated to all customers. CM agreed to follow up.</p>	<b>CM</b>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>A.O.B</b></p> <p>The Panel asked if the Conference room at Eagle Park could be used at future meetings. FG advised that the conference room is often used by the property services team and availability of rooms at Eagle Park is limited.</p> <p>DT asked for an update on the new head office accommodation. FG advised that GGHT received the keys on the 18/03/13 and an update will be forwarded to the panel.</p> <p>LJ asked whether Choosehome allocated points to ex-servicemen based on their length of service. CM agreed to follow up.</p> <p>LJ asked whether GGHT has its own decent homes standard or whether it is required to follow the Government’s standard. CM agreed to follow up.</p>	<b>CM</b> <b>CM</b> <b>CM</b>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p>The Panel felt it had been an effective meeting.</p>	
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Meeting Costs</b></p> <p>Postage: £15.36</p>	

	Out of Pocket Expenses: £34.60 Room Hire: £43.00 Catering Expenses: 23.20 <b>Total: £116.16</b>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Date of next meeting: 24th April 2013, 10am, Orford Jubilee Park</b>	