



**GGHT Panel of  
Excellence and Scrutiny  
24 April 2013  
10am  
Orford Neighbourhood  
Hub**

## Minutes

<b>Attendance:</b>	Lynda Johnson, Dot Thacker, Ayo Akinrele, Alan Rankin. Linda Booth, Mick Rivington  Alison Foy, Mark Burrows (part), Clair Philips (part)
<b>Apologies:</b>	Fiona Roberts, Charlie Martin, Jean Bullock

		Action
1.	<p><b>Apologies/Declarations of Interest</b></p> <p>Apologies as above, no declarations of interest.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Election of Deputy Chair</b></p> <p>Linda Booth was elected Deputy Chair of the Panel.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Minutes of last meeting 27 March 2013</b></p> <p><b>Matters Arising:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Time has been allocated for panel members to speak with CCP members at the next scrutiny panel meeting on 19 June 2013 to obtain feedback regarding response repairs satisfaction.</li> <li>❖ The rails identified during a tenant inspection are safe.</li> <li>❖ Tenant inspectors will be used to undertake spot checks. CP confirmed that tenant participation team have already approached property services team</li> <li>❖ Feedback was provided in relation to the notification of works in Lymm</li> <li>❖ It was agreed that the panel need to focus on responsive repairs review and if other issues are identified as part of the review this should be considered but the need to be mindful that it's focused on response repairs and not other aspects which could include repairs.</li> <li>❖ Scrutiny report template – discussed as an agenda item</li> <li>❖ Regulatory Framework Gap analysis – discussed as an agenda item</li> <li>❖ DVD will be circulated</li> <li>❖ Head office update – work has commenced on site</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ CAH – points are not awarded to ex-servicemen based on length of time served</li> <li>❖ Decent Homes standard – GGHT has the Warrington Standard which is included in the Offer Document and the principles behind decent homes were explained. Information to be forwarded.</li> <li>❖ Tiling over tiles – MB confirmed that this was only undertaken in a small proportion of properties.</li> </ul> <p>The minutes were agreed as an accurate record</p>	<b>AF</b>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Benchmarking Cost Report</b></p> <p>MB provided an overview on the benchmarking report. The report looks at the overall cost to deliver repairs not the individual cost per repair. It includes the overheads, staff, premises etc nor does it take into account the position of what investment has been made in the stock.</p> <p>The report does highlight where there is a high cost service and poor performance.</p> <p>The void costs in the report are favourable even though the current void standard is limited.</p> <p>The panel asked questions regarding the void information in the report.</p> <p>Void costs can be expensive where they require a rewire, electrical upgrade, cleaning, bathroom and kitchens to be fitted.</p> <p>A recent change in electrical regulations also had an impact on void cost.</p> <p>Tenants and previous tenants are being recharged for repairs that are their responsibility or are as a result of damage/neglect.</p> <p>Tenants are also advised that they should not make improvements to their homes without permission. This is covered at the pre-tenancy workshop. Panel members to attend a workshop.</p> <p>GGHT repairs operatives also have to correct work that has been completed without correct certification to ensure properties remain safe.</p> <p>GGHT classify plastering as a response repair and other organisations that are included in the benchmarking report classify it as a programmed repair which can impact on the figures.</p> <p>GGHT still utilise priority 1,2 and 3 repairs whereas other organisations are moving away from this.</p> <p>Response repairs is a heavily scrutinised area as it is a major part of the business and there have been internal audits, external reviews and the scrutiny review examining the area. The budget area gets the highest scrutiny.</p> <p>GGHT have also introduced new technology which needs to be maintained. It was agreed that the report needed further detailed analysis by staff rather than</p>	<b>AF</b>

	the panel.	
<b>3b.</b>	<p><b>Feedback from operatives for review</b></p> <p>During the review the panel have observed operatives at work and have also met with operatives who deliver the repairs service, without other staff/managers present, to obtain an insight into their experiences of service delivery.</p> <p>The panel members appreciated the time operatives took to meet with the panel and following on from this the panel had questions to ask MB &amp; CP.</p> <p>The areas which were discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheduling of work</li> <li>• 2 hour appointment system</li> <li>• Appointment times</li> <li>• Hours of operation</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many jobs were completed in time?</li> <li>• How many out of hours</li> </ul>	<b>AF AF</b>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Repairs Review Report Format</b></p> <p>The format of the report to the Board was discussed. The panel agreed with the template and it was agreed that the panel would begin to populate information into the report.</p> <p>The focus of the review was discussed and the panel agreed that it should focus on responsive repairs and that there was a danger of looking into voids, capital investment programme, communication. If the panel had any specific issues from these that related to response repairs they could be considered but there is a need to stay focused.</p>	<b>PEAS</b>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Regulatory Framework Gap Analysis</b></p> <p>An overview was provided on the regulatory framework and the action plan that was presented to the Board to ensure that the panel are aware of what GGHT is doing to meet the regulatory standards, in particular the consumer standards.</p> <p>The amended plan was approved by the panel.</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>AOB &amp; May Agenda</b></p> <p>Meeting dates to be arranged in advance. It was noted that meetings are usually planned in advance however due to individual circumstances this had impacted on the dates.</p> <p>MR stood down from the panel with immediate effect.</p>	<b>CM</b>

	<p>Quorum – the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the panel state that there should be 9 members and 5 members present to ensure that the meeting was quorate therefor decisions are able to be made. The panel discussed the practical implications this had especially when there are vacancies on the panel and also when people are unable to make the meeting due to other commitments.</p> <p>It was agreed that the TOR should be amended to 4 members and if membership drops this could be a minimum of 3. The CCP will be updated in June and asked to approve this change.</p> <p><b>May agenda:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operative feedback</li> <li>• Costs</li> <li>• Ideas on report content</li> </ul>	
7.	<p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p>The panel felt that there was a lot of information to look at and at time heavy going.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Meeting Costs</b></p> <p>Postage: £ 6.00</p> <p>Out of Pocket Expenses: £44.75</p> <p>Room Hire: £45.00</p> <p>Catering Expenses: 23.25</p> <p><b>Total: £119.00</b></p>	
9.	<p><b>Date of next meeting: 22 May 2013, The Gateway</b></p>	