Durham City Homes Performance 2010/11

| Performance Indicator | 2009/ 10 | Top | 2010/ 11 | Performance 2010/11 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| | Actual | Quartile 09/10 | Target | 2010/11 |
| Excellent services | 7101441 | 00/10 | ranget | |
| Proportion of rent collected | 97.45 | 99.5% ¹ | 98.0% | 97.58% |
| Number of tenants with | 3.9% | 4.67 ² | 3.8% | 3.64% |
| more than 7 weeks arrears | | | | |
| Proportion of tenants in | 24.6% | 11.99 ² | 22% | 15.78% |
| arrears served with a NOSP | | | | |
| Proportion of tenants evicted | 0.40% | 0.15 ² | 0.35% | 0.49% |
| for arrears | | | | |
| % Tenants on Direct Debit | 29.06% | Na | 32% | 28.86% |
| Former Tenant Arrears | | Na | 6.5% | 7.17% |
| Average relet times | 57 days | 21days ¹ | 35 days | 46 days |
| % new tenancies lasting less | 4.8% | Na | 4% | 8% |
| than 6 months | | | | |
| DKO – % of new | Na | Na | 90% | Na |
| registrations completed | | | | |
| within 10 days | | 1 | | |
| Satisfaction with overall | * | 85% ¹ | 82% | 83% |
| service (Bi-ennial STATUS) | | | | |
| Satisfaction that landlord | * | 79% ³ | 65% | 59.8% |
| takes views into account (Bi- | | | | |
| ennial STATUS) | | | | |
| Proportion of responsive | 94.8% | 98.55% ¹ | 96.5% | 98.5% |
| repair appointments made | | | | |
| and kept | | | | |
| Percentage of emergency | 94.1% | 99.2% ² | 96% | 96.5% |
| repairs completed within | | | | |
| timescales | | | | |
| Percentage of urgent repairs | 98.2% | 98.5% ² | 98.5% | 98% |
| completed within timescales | 2011 | | 40.1 | |
| Average time taken to | 3.64 days | Na | 10 days | 9.5 days |
| complete non-emergency or | | | | |
| urgent repairs | 70.70/ | 050/2 | 770/ | EO 00/ |
| Proportion of planned to | 76.7% | 65% ² | 77% | 56.6% |
| responsive repairs | EO 70/ | 13% ² | 400/ | E2 00/ |
| Proportion of emergency | 50.7% | 13% | 40% | 52.9% |
| and urgent repairs to non- urgent | | | | |
| Proportion of responsive | 98.5% | 89.6% ¹ | 98.75% | 98.1% |
| repairs completed right first | 30.5% | 09.070 | 30.7370 | 30.170 |
| time | | | | |
| unc | | | | |

| Percentage of homes with a | 100% | 100% ¹ | 100% | 99.98% |
|------------------------------|------|--------------------|------|--------|
| valid gas safety certificate | | | | |
| % no access - repairs | 10% | Na | 9.5% | 3.7% |
| Number of changes made | Na | Na | 25 | 20 |
| resulting from customer | | | | |
| involvement | | | | |
| Modern Homes | | | | |
| Number of homes made | 630 | Na | 675 | 676 |
| Decent | | | | |
| % homes that are Non- | 11% | 0.90% ² | 0% | 0% |
| Decent (1 April) | | | | |
| Average SAP rating | 75 | 72 ³ | 76 | 76 |
| Decent Homes refusals | 12% | Na | 11% | 8.14% |
| % DH work completed within | 97% | Na | 98% | 99.95% |
| 15 working days | | | | |
| Communities and Places | | | | |
| % of planned estate | Na | Na | 50% | 38% |
| walkabouts carried out with | | | | , |
| tenants present | | | | |
| Number of Tenants | 0 | Na | 250 | 168 |
| registered on Involvement | | | | |
| database | | | | |
| Number of empty homes | 91 | Na | 80 | 79 |
| % of ASB cases closed with | Na | Na | 90% | 99% |
| customer's agreement | | | | |
| CRE Code of Good Practice | No | Yes ¹ | Yes | No |
| Compliance | | | | |
| % of Tenant demographic | 0 | Na | 50% | 69% |
| profile Info held | | | | |
| Tenant Satisfaction with | * | Na | 90% | 87% |
| Neighbourhood (Bi-ennial | | | | |
| STATUS) | | | | |