



Contact: John Wickenden, Data Analysis Manager, HouseMark

Tel 07908 150585

john.wickenden@housemark.co.uk

Average re-let time in days (standard re-lets)

Void re-let times rose between 2012/13 and 2013/14, but fell during 2014/15. The changes between years were small - one or two days at each quartile threshold – with a median figure of 25.7 days at the end of both 2012/13 and 2014/15.

Vacant and available / unavailable to let

While the median rate of vacant and available to let properties fell by 0.03% points between 2013/14 and 2014/15, it rose by 0.02% points at the lower quartile and 0.07% points at the upper quartile. By contrast, the proportion of vacant and unavailable to let properties fell by 0.06% points at the lower quartile and remained the same at the upper quartile over the same period.

This mixed pattern is evident across the regions. While London and Central regions recorded rises in median vacancy rates across both measures, the North recorded falls against both measures and the South recorded the same figure for available to let and a rise in the proportion of unavailable to let properties.

Number of tenancies terminated as % of properties managed

Tenancy turnover reduced across each quartile between 2013/14 and 2014/15, with the median rate decreasing from 8.37% to 8.00% over the period. This ties in with a reduction in re-let times and void rent loss over the same period. Although comparable figures for 2012/13 are not available for this report, our Welfare Reform Impact Club research suggests that, like re-let times and rents measures, tenancy turnover rose in 2013/14 as tenants moved to avoid welfare reforms such as the bedroom tax

There remain considerable differences in the rate of tenancy turnover between regions – the median rate in the North (10.1%) was more than double that of London (4.1%) in 2014/15. However, the pattern of reduction over the two year period is evident in all regions.

Rent loss due to empty properties (voids) as % rent due

Median void rent loss reduced between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 0.16% points to 1.04% of rent due. This reduction is evident at each quartile threshold.

Similar reductions in this measure were achieved by housing association and local authority / ALMO landlords. Smaller landlords managing fewer than 5,000 properties recorded a rise in rent loss, but above this figure landlords tended to record a reduction. Regionally, London-based landlords recorded a rise in this measure, but other regions recorded decreases, from 0.05% in the South to 0.23% in the North.

Notes to editors

This commentary is taken from HouseMark's Priority Performance Benchmarking analysis 2015. This is a series of infographics being circulated to HouseMark members on a topic per week basis this summer. The Voids and Lettings infographic is to be sent out around in the week commencing 17 August.

The figures are based on consistent cohorts of landlords submitting relevant data at the end of each financial year for two or three consecutive years up to March 2015. The number of participants for each measure and characteristic is indicated in the accompanying data.

Priority Performance Benchmarking (PPB) data is collected by HouseMark on a quarterly basis and covers a wide range housing management and maintenance activities. In total, 454 social landlords submitted data over the three years analysed.

Accompanying data

The tables below outline the median result across each characteristic for a number of measures covering voids and lettings.

Organisations falling outside the characteristics shown below have been excluded from the table, so the sum of each characteristic may not add up to the 'ALL' total.

Financial year	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	
Measure	Average re-let time in days (standard re-lets)	Average re-let time in days (standard re-lets)	Average re-let time in days (standard re-lets)	Number of landlords
Housing Association	25.59	27.14	24.60	132
LA/ALMO	26.00	30.38	28.75	46
<5,000 properties	24.61	24.07	23.05	64
5-10,000 properties	25.90	28.00	25.25	57
10,000+ properties	27.49	32.24	29.00	57
Central	24.00	24.39	24.74	51
London	26.27	30.65	27.13	27
North	26.91	32.28	29.00	63
South	23.48	22.84	22.28	33
ALL	25.70	27.92	25.70	178

Financial year	2013-14	2014-15	2013-14	2014-15	
Measure	Percentage of properties vacant and available to let	Percentage of properties vacant and available to let	Percentage of properties vacant but unavailable to let	Percentage of properties vacant but unavailable to let	Number of landlords
Housing Association	0.56	0.53	0.44	0.38	69
LA/ALMO	0.65	0.59	0.68	0.58	27
<5,000 properties	0.45	0.49	0.30	0.31	36
5-10,000 properties	0.56	0.61	0.51	0.40	36
10,000+ properties	0.80	0.77	0.68	0.55	24
Central	0.47	0.62	0.34	0.49	31
London	0.37	0.45	0.42	0.47	12
North	0.91	0.90	0.56	0.48	29
South	0.42	0.42	0.52	0.32	21
ALL	0.58	0.55	0.47	0.45	96

Accompanying data continued.

Financial year	2013-14	2014-15	
Measure	Number of tenancies terminated as % of properties managed	Number of tenancies terminated as % of properties managed	Number of landlords
Housing Association	8.60	8.36	69
LA/ALMO	7.96	7.46	27
<5,000 properties	8.71	8.27	36
5-10,000 properties	8.27	8.32	36
10,000+ properties	8.37	7.35	24
Central	8.38	8.15	31
London	4.35	4.13	12
North	10.27	10.09	29
South	7.40	6.80	21
ALL	8.37	8.00	96

Financial year	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	
	Rent loss due to empty properties (voids) as % rent	Rent loss due to empty properties (voids) as % rent	Rent loss due to empty properties (voids) as % rent	Number of landlords
Measure	due	due	due	
Housing				
Association	1.00	1.15	0.97	112
LA/ALMO	1.36	1.60	1.24	36
<5,000 properties	0.98	1.08	0.91	55
5-10,000 properties	1.14	1.27	1.09	48
10,000+ properties	1.27	1.46	1.16	45
Central	0.93	1.10	0.91	39
London	0.81	0.78	0.92	19
North	1.27	1.61	1.38	57
South	1.00	0.86	0.81	28
ALL	1.11	1.20	1.04	148

Notes

Data is entered within a month of quarter end and subject to validation by HouseMark staff and online reports are made available to HouseMark members within two months of the end of each quarter.

Most recent data relates to financial year ending March 2015.

Where trend comparisons are made, only landlords that submitted data for all three years have been included.

All averages quoted are based on the median average.

Organisations that participate in our quarterly benchmarking exercise can compare their own results on our website.