Title: Implications of implementing the detailed recommendations made in the Resident Scrutiny report on the ASB Service.	**Meeting:** THH Board	
Report authorised by: David Thompson, Acting Director of Neighbourhood Services	**Date of the meeting:** 19 February 2013	**Item No.** 11
Report author: Trevor Kennett, ASB Manager	**Classification:** Open – published	**Report type:** Discussion & Information

Business Priorities:

Reducing and preventing anti social behaviour by encouraging residents to be good neighbours supports all of our business priorities.

1: Enhance the quality of the resident experience.

7: Realise resident focused improvement through supporting resident scrutiny of transparency and cost reduction.

Impact for Customer:

Reducing the number of problems, such as anti social behaviour and encouraging residents to work with us to tackle issues they face is a core principle for THH in delivering services. This report looks at the implications of implementing the detailed recommendations made in the Resident Scrutiny report on the ASB Service.

Diversity Impact:

Tackling anti social behaviour to improve the quality of life for residents supports our commitment to put residents at the heart of everything we do. Maintaining a high standard of performance in tackling ASB also ensures that services are appropriate and flexible enough to meet resident's needs and preferences; helps fulfil their full potential, to be part of and participate in their community.

Cost and Income Implications:

As our services to tackle ASB are based around preventative tools that stop anti social behaviour before it happens, this approach supports THH as being Lo Cost because if preventative actions work expensive and time consuming staff interventions are not required.

Risk Management:

This report supports and helps address the following organisational risks as stated in the strategic risk register:

3 – Making a difference
5 – Organisational Coherence

Summary:
In the summer of 2012 the first resident-led in-depth scrutiny exercise of the ASB service run by Tower Hamlets Homes was undertaken by the Residents' Scrutiny Panel. This report looks in detail at the implications of implementing the recommendations made by residents in that scrutiny report.
Recommendations: **Discussion:** That the Board discuss the issues raised and comment. **Decision:** That the Board support and approve the recommendations made by officers in section 3 of this report.

1 Introduction

1.1 The Review of Social Housing Regulation in 2010 recommended that:

- Fundamental responsibility for effective service delivery lies with landlords, not regulatory system
- Landlords are accountable to their tenants, not the regulator
- Tenants must have information and opportunities they need to hold landlords to account and shape service delivery
- Regulator will only intervene if there are serious failures.

1.2 The THH Residents' Scrutiny Panel was created in response to the recommendations of that review. The purpose of the panel is to have a strategic group of residents who will work with THH and scrutinise services with a particular focus on those that are perceived to be failing or performing poorly and hold THH to account.

1.3 The panel decided as part of its annual work programme to scrutinise the ASB service provided by THH. The ASB scrutiny is the Panels first full scale scrutiny of a THH service.

1.4 The Panel made 58 recommendations for change across the following areas of service delivery within the ASB Team:

- Policies, procedures and processes (11 recommendations)
- Staffing (7 recommendations)
- The APP Flare ASB Case Management System (7 recommendations)
- ASB Data (3 recommendations)
- Value for money (6 recommendations)
- Putting victims first 'White Paper' (2 recommendations)
- Youth (9 recommendations)
- Partner relationships (5 recommendations)
- THH Website (4 recommendations)
- Diversity (3 recommendations)
- Independent advice (1 recommendation)

1.5 The Board, at its last meeting on the 10th December, thanked the Panel for the work it had undertaken and welcomed the ASB Scrutiny Report and

asked Officers to return to the next meeting with a response to each of the recommendations.

1.6 A regular progress report on the implementation of these recommendations will be presented to the Board as part of performance monitoring.

2 Response to the Recommendations on Policies, Procedures and Processes (Appendix 1, 1 - 11)

2.1 All recommendations are agreed and 9 out of the 11 recommendations will be implemented by April 2013 as they require operational changes to current operating procedures and have either been changed or are in the process of being changed.

2.2 The recommendation 'Seek House Mark accreditation for the ASB services by September 2013' is achievable but will require approximately £10,000 of revenue resources to make the application and to implement.

2.3 The recommendation 'On estates bring back the 'No Ball Games' signs. This recommendation is not supported by officers as there is no evidence to support that signage works and this type of signage is expensive and very difficult to enforce.

3 Staffing (12 - 18)

3.1 All of the 7 recommendations made will be implemented as part of the new Neighbourhood restructure and will be in place by April 2013.

4 APP Flare – ASB Case Management System (19 - 25)

4.1 The main recommendation is to purchase a new ASB Case Management System as the panel felt that APP Flare was not suitable.

4.2 A review of the gaps that exist within Flare and a scanning exercise of existing applications in the marketplace will be undertaken. As the Council currently use Flare for handling its ASB cases the review will include any integration issues.

4.3 Also to purchase a new system would require a revenue growth bid next year in the region of £20,000 per annum. Currently APP Flare costs THH around £14,000 per annum so a small amount of additional growth resources will be required to implement this recommendation.

4.4 While this recommendation is being considered the remaining interim 6 recommendations will all have been implemented into Flare by April 2013.

5 ASB Data (26 - 28)

5.1 All 3 recommendations have all been implemented.

6 Value for Money (29 - 34)

6.1 5 out of the 6 recommendations will be implemented by April 2013 as they require only procedural changes.

6.2 The recommendation 'Investigate the cost-effectiveness of having ASB case administrative assistants' has not been implemented for the following reasons:

- ASB Officers are more focused with the introduction of the ASB Manager
- There is support assistance as part of the neighbourhood restructure
- A new case management system will reduce administration.

7 Putting Victims First – White Paper (35 - 36)

7.1 Both recommendations have been actioned on the 6th December 2012.

8 Youth (37 - 45)

8.1 8 out of the 9 recommendations will be implemented by April 2013.

8.2 The recommendation 'Tower Hamlets Homes enter into a Service Level Agreement with the Youth Service so that their Rapid Response Unit could deploy Youth Workers to ASB hot spots on the request of the Housing Management staff. This recommendation is not supported by officers as evidence has shown that the majority of young persons causing the nuisance behaviour are aged over 19, which is the maximum age the Youth Service can work with and any service level agreement would require substantial revenue funding.

9 Partner Relationships (46 - 50)

9.1 4 out of the 5 recommendations are agreed and will be implemented by April 2013 as they only require procedural changes.

9.2 The recommendation 'Set up a service level agreement with Tower Hamlets Environment Health dog nuisance team to deliver a dog fouling patrol and clear up service' is not supported by officers as the enforcement of dog fouling is a statutory obligation by the local authority and is extremely difficult to undertake. A service level agreement would be expensive (around £20,000 per annum) and there is no evidence to suggest that it would effectively deal with the issues.

10 THH Web Site (51 - 54)

10.1 All recommendations are agreed and have been implemented.

11 Diversity (55 - 57)

11.1 All 3 recommendations are agreed and will be implemented by April 2013.

12 Independent advice (58)

12.1 The recommendation was agreed and the Strategic Engagement Team will ensure that all scrutiny projects have input from, and access to, an independent mentor.