



Value for Money Performance – Based on 2016/2017 HouseMark Results

This updates the benchmarking information reported in the 2016/2017 Value for Money Assurance Statement, based upon the most recent performance information validated by HouseMark.

The following tables examine performance relative to that of peers. The peer group is based on a variety of factors, including the size of the organisation and whether they were created through stock transfer. Since last year's exercise, 16 organisations have been removed from the peer group and seven have been added, resulting in a net decrease of nine. This means that the peer group for 2016/2017 consist of 32 organisations, including WDH.

Major works and cyclical maintenance benchmarking

We have improved our ranking among peers in all three of the major works and cyclical maintenance measures, despite a marginal reduction in SAP (Standard Assessment Procedure) rating. An increase of 1% of respondents satisfied with the overall quality of their home has improved our rank by three places up to sixth and reinforced our position within the upper quartile.

We have reduced the cost per property relating to major works by 8.4% (£126.64) since last year, improving our relative position by five places. The cost reduction relates directly to underspend on both property and estate improvement programmes. However, this has had a significant impact on overhead allocation for a number of other indicators within this report, as these overheads have subsequently been shared over a smaller cost base.

Major Works and Cyclical Maintenance Benchmarking Comparison												
Performance Measure	2015/2016 Annual HouseMark Data						2016/2017 Annual HouseMark Data					
	Benchmark 2015/2016			WDH 2015/2016			Benchmark 2016/2017			WDH 2016/2017		
	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile
Cost per property of major works and cyclical maintenance	1,252.82	1,509.79	1,945.17	1,509.79	22	Median	1,169.48	1,337.31	1,582.93	1,383.15	17	Median
% of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the overall quality of their home	89.7	87.3	85	89.7	9	Upper	90.7	89.4	86.9	90.7	6	Upper
Average SAP rating of self-contained dwellings	72.3	71.3	69.2	71	22	Median	72.2	71.3	68.5	70	17	Median

Responsive Repairs Benchmarking

We remain in the top five among peers in four of the seven responsive repairs measures and is top performer for the second year running in cost per property of management provision responsive repairs and for the third year in succession, for average number of days to complete repairs.

Although the cost per property of responsive repairs has increased by £12.75 from the previous year, our position remains upper quartile with our ranking unchanged. The increase in cost relates to a year on year increase of direct responsive repairs expenditure combined with the increased allocation of overheads that was referred to previously. The impact of the change in overheads is confirmed by the average cost of a responsive repair, which excludes overhead allocation. This performance measure shows a marginal increase in cost and shows that our ranking has improved when compared to our peers.

Responsive Repairs Benchmarking Comparison												
Performance Measure	2015/2016 Annual HouseMark Data						2016/2017 Annual HouseMark Data					
	Benchmark 2015/2016			WDH 2015/2016			Benchmark 2016/2017			WDH 2016/2017		
	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile
Average number of calendar days taken to complete repairs	7.06	9.02	10.79	4	1	Upper	7.32	9.45	12.16	4	1	Upper
Cost per property of responsive repairs (service provision)	362.58	428.63	555.58	330.34	6	Upper	336.08	374.31	473.47	352.45	10	Median
Average cost of a responsive repair	108.16	121.23	154.97	108.66	11	Median	106.5	116.68	155.1	109.17	9	Median
Cost per property of responsive repairs	453.93	544.88	696.86	376.13	4	Upper	390	533.07	724.26	388.88	4	Upper
% of respondents very or fairly satisfied with repairs and maintenance	87.3	84	79.9	89.1	5	Upper	88.8	87	83.1	90.8	2	Upper
Percentage of repairs completed at the first visit	93.73	91.62	88.2	88	23	Lower	94.59	92.78	88.24	91	12	Median
Cost per property of responsive repairs (management)	91.35	116.25	141.28	45.79	1	Upper	88.52	118.27	132.58	36.43	1	Upper

Antisocial behaviour (ASB) benchmarking

HouseMark have removed two of the indicators used previously to measure ASB performance. One of these was the direct cost per ASB case and the other was the percentage of cases successfully resolved. As the cost per property of ASB is still available, we have added two satisfaction indicators, one relating to how the case was handled and the other relating to the outcome of the case.

We have recorded a 1% decrease in satisfaction with the way their complaint was handled. However, the relative score has moved our ranking up two places. The other satisfaction measure (final outcome of the complaint) is upper quartile, but has seen a reduction of 3%.

The cost indicator shows an increase in cost of £1.12 per property and whilst the ranking has improved, performance has moved into lower quartile. Our overall expenditure on ASB reflects the priority our tenants attach to this area. The marginal increase is largely as a result of the overhead reallocation referred to earlier.

Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) Benchmarking Comparison												
Performance Measure	2015/2016 Annual House Mark Data						2016/2017 Annual HouseMark Data					
	Benchmark 2015/2016			WDH 2015/2016			Benchmark 2016/2017			WDH 2016/2017		
	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the way their ASB complaint was handled	94	90.59	77.27	95	5	Upper	93	91	78.5	94	3	Upper
Cost per property of ASB	53.1	65.28	78.55	71.12	27	Median	43.26	55.76	68.7	72.24	25	Lower
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the final outcome of their ASB complaint	90.93	83.53	68.93	96	1	Upper	92.48	81.95	67.2	93	4	Upper

Lettings benchmarking

The cost per property of lettings remains upper quartile, however, the cost has increased marginally due to the increase in overhead allocation.

The average re-let time has reduced by three days since 2015/2016 and has improved the ranking by four places, cementing the position within the upper quartile.

Whilst the average re-let time has improved and the rent loss due to void properties has reduced and our ranking improved, our performance is now deemed lower quartile, reflecting an apparent overall shift in improvement across peer organisations. Contact will be made with the highest ranking peers to ascertain how this is being achieved and the basis of the calculations of their performance.

Our rent loss figure includes the rent lost due to holding properties empty for use by tenants whilst their homes are undergoing works as part of the Independent Living Scheme Improvement Programme. Had these properties not been held empty, our performance would have been median quartile.

Lettings Benchmarking Comparison												
Performance Measure	2015/2016 Annual House Mark Data						2016/2017 Annual HouseMark Data					
	Benchmark 2015/2016			WDH 2015/2016			Benchmark 2016/2017			WDH 2016/2017		
	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile
Cost per property of lettings	62.91	70.65	95.29	31.56	2	Upper	49.62	66.02	74.72	33.64	3	Upper
Average re-let time in days (standard re-lets)	20.41	25.21	35.59	20	9	Upper	18.65	22.25	31.35	17	5	Upper
Rent loss due to empty properties (voids) as a % of rent due	0.61	1.04	1.71	1.63	30	Median	0.55	0.85	1.43	1.46	23	Lower

Rent arrears and collection benchmarking

We have remained in the same quartiles for all but one of the rent arrears measures. The percentage of rent collected (excluding current arrears brought forward) has seen a drop in ranking of 10 places. It is argued that this is mainly due to the timing of the year end but this anomaly was thought to have been resolved.

Ranking has fallen one place in respect of the cost per property of rent arrears and collection, although we remain within the upper quartile despite costs having increased by £0.61.

Gross arrears written off as a percentage of rent due increased by 26% in 2015/2016 and 37% in 2016/2017 as we have brought our policy in to line with others in the sector. Despite this second annual increase in a row, ranking improved by four places. We have improved our ranking by 11 places for former tenant arrears as a percentage of rent due.

Rent Arrears and Collection Benchmarking Comparison												
Performance Measure	2015/2016 Annual HouseMark Data						2016/2017 Annual HouseMark Data					
	Benchmark 2015/2016			WDH 2015/2016			Benchmark 2016/2017			WDH 2016/2017		
	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile
Cost per property of rent arrears and collection	118.06	137.67	157.59	92.06	3	Upper	117.65	133.09	149.87	92.67	4	Upper
Percentage of rent collected (excluding current arrears brought forward)	100.08	99.63	99.18	99.93	12	Median	100.5	99.77	99.26	99.2	22	Lower
Gross arrears written off as % of rent due	0.27	0.43	0.81	0.43	20	Median	0.25	0.55	0.83	0.59	16	Median
Current tenant rent arrears as % of rent due (excluding voids)	2.03	2.86	3.8	2.69	19	Median	1.55	2.45	3.49	2.78	16	Median
Former tenant rent arrears as % of rent due (excluding voids)	0.87	1.4	2.2	2.69	33	Lower	0.91	1.35	2.18	2.23	22	Lower

Overhead cost benchmarking

There has been an improvement in all except one of the overhead indicators as a result of the continued focus on efficiencies.

Quartile positions remain the same for all indicators. However, rankings now place us within the top five for five out of six of the measures in 2016/2017 compared to four of six in the previous year. We are the top performer in the peer group for the cost of the finance function as a percentage of adjusted turnover.

The cost per property of housing management has increased by £22.83 since last year, but remains upper quartile. The apportionment of employee time is calculated annually to reflect the element of customer engagement. This increase is also affected by the increase in overhead allocation referred to previously.

Overhead Cost Benchmarking Comparison												
Performance Measure	2015/2016 Annual House Mark Data						2016/2017 Annual House Mark Data					
	Benchmark 2015/2016			WDH 2015/2016			Benchmark 2016/2017			WDH 2016/2017		
	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile	Upper	Median	Lower	WDH	Rank	Quartile
Total overhead as % adjusted turnover	9.42	10.93	12.16	7.66	4	Upper	9.03	10.35	11.46	7.11	2	Upper
Cost per property of housing management	377.13	425.86	475.15	335.3	3	Upper	378.84	404.03	447.38	358.13	4	Upper
Finance as % adjusted turnover	1.27	1.46	1.75	0.78	4	Upper	1.31	1.49	1.78	0.71	1	Upper
Central and other overheads as % adjusted turnover	4.2	4.69	5.99	3.54	5	Upper	4.07	4.61	5	3.26	3	Upper
IT and communications as % adjusted turnover	2.19	2.74	3.37	2.07	6	Upper	2.23	2.78	3.22	1.98	5	Upper
Office premises as % adjusted turnover	1.07	1.39	1.85	1.27	19	Median	1.09	1.27	1.68	1.17	12	Median