



Tuntum Housing Scrutiny Panel

**Review into the turnaround
time of Void properties**

November 2016



Contents

1.0 Who are we and what do we do?	3
2.0 Why did we choose this topic?	3
3.0 What we aim to achieve through this review.	4
4.0 What we did and our key findings.	4 - 15
5.0 Conclusion.	16
6.0 Recommendations.	17
7.0 Appendices.	18 – 24

1.0 Who are we and what do we do?

We are Magnify, the Tuntum Housing Scrutiny Panel. We were formed in 2015 and this is our second report. This review commenced in February 2016 and was undertaken by the following members:

- ❖ Carol Edwards
- ❖ Valerie Griggs-Beasley
- ❖ Christopher Griggs-Beasley

We are grateful to all members of staff who took part in this review with special thanks to Julie Martin, Salim Yasin and Denise Watt who provided us with valuable information and insight regarding Tuntum's current void processes.



Salim (Tuntum), Carol, Valerie, & Christopher

The main purpose of the Panel is to:

- ❖ Be a critical friend to Tuntum Housing.
- ❖ Take an independent look at Tuntum Housing's services, plans and performance.
- ❖ Assess and challenge Tuntum Housing's performance against expected standards.
- ❖ Hold the Board and management team to account for performance and standards.

2.0 Why did we choose to investigate the turnaround time of Void properties?

This review concerns void (empty) properties and the length of time taken for remedial works to be completed where necessary and the re-let time for new tenants to be allocated.

Magnify are very aware that Tuntum's investment in its assets is extremely important to the association as this financial table (Appendix 1) shows and in the Annual Accounts/Financial Statements Report for the year ended 31st March 2016 it states the following: *"Tuntum actively manages its assets and there is an ongoing survey of 10% of all properties carried out annually. This informs the plan for major works more effectively. Tuntum is also proactive with the assessment of properties at the voids stage with an assessment done to consider long term viability. The property is assessed for demand, future major repairs cost, voids repair costs and the historical annual cost of maintaining these properties."*

Unfortunately, however, it is a common experience for tenants to see a property remaining empty sometimes for several months when there is no obvious reason for this to be happening. At the same time Tuntum Housing's Key Performance Data states that average void times are much shorter than this, currently well under 1 month. This creates a disparity between customer perception and actuality.

The Magnify panel was concerned that these long void times were wasting a valuable asset and losing income, frustrating potential tenants and leading to a loss of customer confidence in performance figures produced by Tuntum Housing. Consequently, because of these significant factors the panel members decided that the issue of extended re-let times was an excellent subject for our next in-depth scrutiny.

3.0 What we aim to achieve through this review:

- ❖ To gain a better understanding of the management of void properties.
- ❖ To ensure vacant properties are brought back into use as quickly as possible to provide homes for those in need.
- ❖ To maximise revenue for Tuntum Housing by ensuring properties are not left un-let and vacant for longer periods than necessary.
- ❖ To improve the wider public perception of Tuntum Housing by finding solutions to ensure a faster turnaround of vacant properties.
- ❖ To provide recommendations for improvements in identified areas, if and where applicable, in order to better manage and improve void processes.

4. What we did and our key findings:

The panel used a variety of methods to examine these issues including scrutiny of financial and performance data, void policies and procedures, interviews with staff, site visits and benchmarking data.

Initially Magnify asked Tuntum to provide us with relevant information from the last five financial years, but Steve White (Director of Operations & Care) suggested that we use the last two years i.e. 2014-15 and 2015-16 as it would be more useful to Tuntum and the panel agreed with this recommendation. Steve White also met with us during February in order to identify the important differences between Supported Housing and General Needs Housing, and Magnify decided to only review the General Needs Housing aspect as it should be easier to conduct a benchmarking exercise with other providers.

Jassmin Alltoft (Temporary Tenant Engagement Officer) initially provided the panel with Void Policy and Procedures documents and the Tenants Annual Report data from 2014 and 2015. This was followed in March by an Excel spreadsheet (Appendix 2 shows page 1 of 5) covering the period 23.03.14 – 07.02.16 which identified 228 properties. Using the data provided the Magnify panel then created ten Excel spreadsheets of their own using the following specific headings generated from the spreadsheet Tuntum supplied:

Area, Choice Based Letting, Days Void After Major Works, Days Void Time, Hard to Let, Housing Officer, Number of Bedrooms, Property Type, Tenancy Start Date and Vacancy Reason.

At that point one of the Magnify spreadsheets entitled ***Days Void Time***, showing highest to lowest in terms of how long properties had been void in the period covered, was deemed by the panel as a good starting point to begin their first evaluation of the data. However, it became evident at their meeting in March that when the panel compared the 'Days Void After Major Works' column with the 'Tenancy Start Date', the 'Major Repairs Completion Date' and the 'Void Date' that the data entered in the 'Days Void After Major Works' column was seriously wrong. Jassmin apologised and said it seemed there were errors in the figures that had been entered by Tuntum. Unfortunately this wrong information was permeated throughout the ten spreadsheets that the panel had produced and so invalidated them all.

Following Magnify's reworking of the data to make corrections and their production of revised spreadsheets the panel decided they would start investigating voids of 30 days and over. This covered 53 properties and ranged from 30 to 113 days total void time, but only 4 properties were identified as having 30 days or more AFTER major works had been completed. The relevant spreadsheet was given to Jassmin so that where relevant prospective tenant Refusal Reasons could be provided by Tuntum for these 53 properties.

However, we were later informed that when the Housing Management Team were compiling the refusal information they checked with the Maintenance Team database and it was found that an additional 13 of the known 53 properties had in fact had major works time that needed to be factored in. Once again the panel reworked the data and produced corrected spreadsheets to enable the information to be re-evaluated. All but one of the 13 properties was then excluded from the 53 as the applicable void time was reduced below our 30 days or more review criteria. We were told this other property from the 53 had been given an inaccurate start date and the new date ruled that one out also. In total 13 of our selected 53 properties needed to have additional data entered against them in the panel's master spreadsheet before any recalculations could be made. So once again another set of spreadsheets produced by Magnify had been made invalid and corrected ones had to be created. It should also be mentioned that when 'Major Work Days' and 'After Major Work Days' were calculated for the properties with missing or erroneous data provided by Tuntum it transpired that 4 properties had 'Major Works End Dates' and 'Tenancy Start Dates' that were in fact identical.

By 10th April 2016 Magnify were finally able to identify the following:

- 1) 228 properties were void in the period 23.03.14 – 07.02.16.
- 2) 79 of these properties had a void time of 30 days and over.
- 3) 28 of the above 79 properties had major works of 30 days or more.
- 4) 51 of the above 79 properties either had no major works or those done were completed in under 30 days.

Magnify's spreadsheet v.6.3a was sent electronically to Jassmin Alltoft for Tuntum to identify on it what major works were undertaken in each case regarding item 3) above:

i.e. 28 of the 228 properties void in the period 23.03.14 - 07.02.16 had major works that took between 31 and 111 days to complete.

Jassmin subsequently handed to the panel a handwritten sheet linking the actual property addresses with the Property Codes shown on the spreadsheet (Appendix 3). This list had been used by staff to identify what major works were carried out and each property had been given a number (1 – 28) which was annotated on our spreadsheet (v.6.3a) and returned to the panel by Jassmin as handwritten completed copies showing the information requested.

The following two pages show the spreadsheet and the answers provided by Tuntum which provide a description of the major work undertaken for each property.

Property Code	Void Start Date	Major Repairs End Date	Tenancy Start Date	Total Void Days	Major Work Days	Description of Major Work Undertaken	Area	Postcode
MHTS007 ①	23-08-15	12-12-15	14-12-15	113	111	Damp proof, plus painting & decoration works	Hyson Green	NG7 5AG
MOUNT011 ②	28-06-15	17-08-15	30-08-15	94	81	New external doors. Time to make	New Basford	NG7 7AH
HOMT016 ③	14-12-14	03-03-15	09-03-15	85	79	? Damp proofing work	Leicester	LE4 6EG
HOMX027 ④	13-07-14	29-09-14	06-10-14	85	78	Staircase as minor - needed to fit bricks on P/P	Mansfield	NG18 2HF
P&R009 ⑤	23-02-14	08-05-14	12-05-14	78	74	? New kitchen, bathroom & heating system	Strelley	NG8 6JU
NCHA016A ⑥	16-11-14	28-01-15	09-02-15	85	73	Put on hold days	Sherwood	NG5 2JP
REHA006A ⑦	23-08-15	03-11-15	09-11-15	78	72	New kitchen/bathroom suite.	Hyson Green	NG7 5AS
MHTS021 ⑧	23-08-15	02-11-15	09-11-15	78	71	Damp proofing works	Hyson Green	NG7 5BG
NCHA009 ⑨	07-09-14	14-11-14	01-12-14	85	68	Damp proofing work	Sneinton	NG2 4PP
HOMT037 ⑩	13-09-15	16-11-15	16-11-15	64	64	New bathroom suite	Leicester	LE5 4BL
MHTS023 ⑪	01-03-15	03-05-15	18-05-15	78	63	Re-wiring all electrical	Sherwood	NG5 2JP
DERW140 ⑫	23-11-15	25-01-16	25-01-16	63	63	Asbestos Re-wiring & new kitchen	Beechdale	NG8 3AA
P&RLEI039 ⑬	08-11-15	06-01-16	11-01-16	64	59	Re-decoration plus new kitchen Re-wiring & new kitchen	Leicester	LE4 1AT
MHTS048 ⑭	25-10-15	21-12-15	21-12-15	57	57	Re-plastering, re-decoration plus new kitchen	Ratford	NG7 3QZ

Property Code	Void Start Date	Major Repairs End Date	Tenancy Start Date	Total Void Days	Major Work Days	Description of Major Work Undertaken	Area	Postcode
						19 EDEN GARDENS TOP VALLEY NG5 9HL		
EXSA019 (15)	06-04-14	30-05-14	23-06-14	78	54	Ten from 18 Eden Garden was temporarily	De-converted to this property Top Valley	NG5 9HL due to fire
SNEI004 (16)	22-11-15	11-01-16	11-01-16	50	50	New kitchen & utility room renewal	Sneinton	NG2 3GF
LONG009 (17)	19-12-14	04-02-15	23-02-15	66	47	Major work windows & bathrooms sink of MAUDSL - near BASFORD NG7 7AP	New Basford	NG7 7AP
HOMX019A (18)	19-04-15	03-06-15	08-06-15	50	45	new kitchen	Manfield	NG18 2HF
HOMX050 (19)	16-02-14	01-04-14	14-04-14	57	44	New kitchen	Strelley	NG8 6LA
BRID043 (20)	09-02-15	25-03-15	30-03-15	49	44	kitchen bathroom bedrooms Major Refurbishment - Rebuild boundary walls	St Anns	NG3 1DU
CIND220A (21)	17-05-15	29-06-15	27-07-15	71	43	Extensive work due to smoke damage.	Cinderhill	NG6 8SB
MHTS001A (22)	30-11-14	12-01-15	26-01-15	57	43	new kitchen plus re-decoration work	Hyson Green	NG7 5EE
HOMX054 (23)	19-04-15	31-05-15	29-06-15	71	42	new kitchen	Gedling	NG4 3LL
REHN166 (24)	07-06-15	13-07-15	20-07-15	43	36	New kitchen & Bathroom	Aspley	NG8 5PJ
HOMX010B (25)	03-05-15	08-06-15	08-06-15	36	36	Access & power issues - lots of work	Old Basford	NG6 0BZ
HOMX005A (26)	27-07-14	29-08-14	08-09-14	43	33	? ED BUILDERS - FOLDED	Arnold	NG5 8AA
HELS009A (27)	07-06-15	10-07-15	13-07-15	36	33	New kitchen & windows	Strelley	NG8 6QL
NCHA00F/C (28)	13-12-15	13-01-16	01-02-16	50	31	new boiler	Arboretum	NG7 4DT

Shown below is the void data contained in the Tenants' Annual Report (published in Tuntum's Engage Newsletter - Summer 2016). It is very limited in its information as it only refers to the number of void properties as a percentage of all properties - typically 1% (Appendix 4) shows the full report).

Table 1

Empty properties (voids)		
Target: below 1%		
Quarter End	2015/16	2014/15
June	0.7%	1%
September	0.7%	1%
December	0.8%	1%
March	0.8%	0.9%
Average	0.8%	1%

Tuntum's Key Performance Indicator targets below (supplied to Magnify by Steve White) for the years 14/15 and 15/16 are for a re-let time of 21 days maximum with an actual average performance of 19 days being achieved in 15/16.

Table 2	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17
Re-let target (days)	28	21	21	21
Average performance	21	21	19	N/A
Void rent loss target as % rent due	1.5% or less	1.5% or less	1% or less	1% or less
Average performance	0.9%	1%	0.7%	N/A

Tuntum's letting performance for standard re-lets deserves praise as it is well below the HouseMark median average for standard re-lets for 2014/15 of 25.7 days as stated in its Voids and Lettings Analysis 2015 report, published by Inside Housing (available online at www.insidehousing.co.uk/journals/2015/08/20/p/j/l/void-survey.pdf). The relevant extract from the report is reproduced below:

Table 3

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

However, it is most important to note that these HouseMark [Table 3](#) figures like Tuntum's [Table 2](#) figures are all for Voids that *do not have major works scheduled only standard works*. Hence this would also appear to be applicable to the Void rent loss target shown in Tuntum's [Table 2](#). That is, it only applies to the rent lost through the Void time of standard re-lets or the void time after the property becomes available for re-let *following the completion of major works*.

A quick calculation covering the 28 Tuntum properties with a major works time of between 31 – 111 days in the period 23.03.14 - 07.02.16 provides a figure of 1,594 days which is just under 228 weeks. At an average rent loss of say £90 per week this equates to £20,520. It can be seen, therefore, that any reduction in the timescale that major works take to complete could save a substantial amount of money.

Regrettably this omission in measurement and recording of major works void days and the corresponding loss of rent appears to be endemic generally across social housing and thus benchmarking it was not possible. When the panel met with Julie Martin (Head of Assets Management) she corroborated this fact and said she did not know any Housing Associations the currently published any data. Certainly the benchmark report Julie gave the panel, which was carried out by Paul Moat of Nottingham Community Housing Association on behalf of Efficiency East Midlands, also only identified standard void repairs and not major repairs. The EEM project measured performance for the financial year 2014-15 in the areas of repairs, maintenance and housing (Appendix 5 shows the relevant page 9 of 12) for nine of its members, including Tuntum:

- A1 Housing
- Ashfield Homes
- Bolsover District Council
- Derby Homes
- Gedling Homes
- Newark and Sherwood Homes
- Nottingham City Homes
- Nottingham Community Housing Association
- Tuntum Housing

These housing providers (anonymised except for one's own details) were made up of a cross-section of housing providers from small multiple area providers to medium-sized and large scale / single area providers. However, it can be seen from Appendix 5 that with regard to the item entitled 'Average time to complete void works' Tuntum was unfortunately not able to provide any data for even these standard work void days. Benchmarking is critical to the ongoing assessment and analysis of Value for Money and the Magnify panel were very disappointed to find that this was not possible for the void times of major works on properties.

Steve White had already acknowledged at our May meeting that Tuntum's revised Local Offer Service Standards covering Greater Nottingham, North Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Leicestershire had no Local Offers relating to the Void process. Additionally, Magnify were informed in their discussions with Julie Martin and Salim Yasin (Maintenance Officer) that currently there are no timeframes in place for the completion of major works on individual properties. Noticeably, Tuntum's Re-Let Form (Appendix 6) shows a Priority Status of *up to 6 months* for major works to be completed.

Consequently, it would seem that the reason major works for the period in question have taken 31 to 111 days (nearly 16 weeks) to complete is likely due to targets dates not being set and the fact that there are no incentives for improvement or penalties for any contractor delays. Because there are no targets set from the very beginning of the major works process to full completion this would seem to leave the way open for several days or weeks of inactivity on some properties, as tenants have frequently observed to the detriment of Tuntum. Magnify feel that what is needed is the installation of additional software that would give staff an increased degree of project management. This would enable improved organisation and communication, allow project progress to be monitored and potential delays in work execution to be anticipated and corrected. Major works void times would then be reduced providing tenants with improved outcomes as homes could be made available to them sooner.

It had rapidly become clear to the Magnify panel that the difference between tenant poor perception of reality and Tuntum's claimed performance was due to the fact that major works were not taken into consideration. The only performance data published for Tuntum's is that not involving major works (that is not including damp proofing, roof repairs, re-wiring, asbestos work, heating replacement, refurbishment of kitchens and bathrooms and other items as recorded on Magnify's spreadsheet v.6.3a – pages 6 & 7 above). It can be seen from this spreadsheet that kitchen replacement is often written against major work times of 42 – 45 days, but Julie Martin advised the panel that a kitchen replacement in a void property (often brought forward as the property is vacant) should only take 7 - 10 days. That a lack of cohesive organisation and scheduling exists for major work voids is unfortunately obvious despite the best efforts of staff.

It should be said that Julie Martin (Head of Assets Management), Salim Yasin (Maintenance Officer) and Denise Watt (Housing Officer) kindly met with Magnify between April and July 2016. We found all these meetings to be very productive and these staff members contributions to the meetings and the detailed documentation and photographs they provided to help us in our review was invaluable. However, in conducting this review Magnify encountered numerous problems in obtaining accurate and detailed information that surely should have been available from Tuntum's computer systems with no difficulty at all. The staff involved did their very best, but it seems the void management planning systems are not fit for purpose. Julie Martin informed the panel that currently the Housing Management team uses a whiteboard to keep track of voids and liaise with the Maintenance Department. Magnify consider this to be a very outdated and inefficient method considering we are in a digital age. Julie agreed that an appropriate electronic monitoring system for the management of void properties would definitely improve inter-departmental activities in managing the voids process from start to finish.

We were given to understand that Tuntum's current SDM Housing Management System has a voids management tool that would cost approximately £900 to implement and, amongst other very useful resources, would provide a diary system and running records. This would seem to be needed on an urgent basis.

Salim Yasin outlined his experiences to the panel of undertaking and managing frontline maintenance and gave an overview of various efficiency measures he has been implementing, bearing in mind that Tuntum have a lot of older properties scattered throughout the East Midlands that are all different regarding doors, windows, kitchens, etc. When asked how he thought that major work time could be reduced he also recognised the

need for a void module to be added to the SDM system so that everyone concerned at Tuntum could see on a day-to-day basis how maintenance events were progressing and make re-let plans accordingly. From Salim's efficiency perspective the provision to him of a handheld pad to link with the SDM system direct from site (or a nearby wifi zone) in order to view specifics and record information would be invaluable. The same applies to a mobile phone that has a WhatsApp capability in order to upload photographs. He believes that in this way a number of matters relating to voids could then be actioned immediately instead of waiting for him to return to the office which as a frontline worker may not be for a day or so. The Magnify panel can see definite benefits to Tuntum if these points were actioned.

Magnify's first meeting in this review was with Denise Watt who very competently explained to us the problems experienced by her and other Housing Officers in relation to voids generally and the re-letting of properties. Additionally, she took us to view two void properties – one just made available for re-let after some minimal maintenance work and the other requiring work to be carried out. As an eye opener for the panel, Denise also supplied to us photographs of a property that had been left full of rubbish and in a disgusting condition that needed a lot of work doing to it.

Staff said the fact that there was not a target time for major repairs and no effective void path was troublesome, particularly as they had seen it work well elsewhere in social housing. They were concerned that the Maintenance and Housing departments are not working back-to-back and would like the SDM system to be upgraded to accommodate a smooth transition and cut void time. Staff members would like to see process mapping taking place to obviate the unnecessary documentation that currently exists.

To get a further reality check the panel had wanted to know what refusal reasons were given by prospective tenants who turned down a property offer. Accordingly it had emailed to Jassmin another spreadsheet (v.6.1a) with details previously provided by Tuntum concerning 40 void properties and showing the number of offers that had been extended regarding each property. By our meeting in April the panel had received this back as physical copies with the refusal reasons provided by prospective tenants (where available) handwritten on it. These properties were standard voids without major works that had a timescale of between 31 to 78 days during the period under review, namely 23.03.14 - 07.02.16. We were informed that detailed recording of refusal reasons is not always completed due to various circumstances and this is unfortunate as it could perhaps inform and influence future letting processes.

As mentioned above, reasons for refusal of property offers are not currently recorded in the system in a way that could offer a possible pattern of refusals for all or specific properties. Magnify consider that there should be a history log for refusal of properties to help identify patterns of what could be discouraging prospective tenants. The panel also believes that more property information should be available to prospective tenants in the form of floor plans, room measurements, property features and photographs together with details of local amenities and facilities such as schools and transport. The panel realises that Homelink may have limitations as to what may be posted and suggests that every property advertised on Homelink could also be shown on Tuntum's website in order that more complete information can be available to prospective bidders. Advice about accessing Tuntum's website could hopefully be included in the Homelink advertisement.

The completed spreadsheet regarding refusal reasons is shown on the following four pages.

Property Code	Void Start Date	Tenancy Start Date	Total Void Days	Area	Postcode	CBL	Bedrooms	Type	No. Offers	Reasons for Refusals & Other Relevant Notes	Hard To Let Y/N	Housing Officer
BLYTH002	09-03-14	26-05-14	78	Mapperley	NG3 5LW	N	2	House	6	① TOO SMALL ② NEEDED A BUNGALOW ③ TOO FAR FROM SUPPORT NETWORK ④ ACCEPTED A NOT PROP. NOT GIVEN.	Y	SK
CITY046	15-11-15	01-02-16	78	St Anns	NG3 4FN	Y	2	Bungalow	3		N	PR
HIBIS003	16-02-14	28-04-14	71	St Anns	NG3 4EL	Y	2	Flat	5	① NEED A WET ROOM ② UNABLE TO KEEP A SATELLITE DISH.	Y	CM
BURNS004/3	09-11-14	19-01-15	71	Arboretum	NG7 4DT	Y	0	bedsit	5	① TOO SMALL NO BEDROOM ② NOT A FLAT ③ THE AREA	Y	PR
HELS00A/02	26-07-15	05-10-15	71	Strelley	NG8 6QL	Y	1	Flat	35	① UNABLE TO ACCEPT PUMP - DUE TO RISKS ② TOO FAR AWAY FROM SUPPORT NETWORK. ③ UNDESIRABLE AREA. ④ HOUSES ALREADY ⑤ NEED GRASS ⑥ FLOOR ⑦ DISLIKE THE AREA.	Y	DW
GUIN000/E	26-11-15	01-02-16	67	Arboretum	NG1 4GS	Y	1	Flat	3		Y	PR
EMP009	06-07-15	07-09-15	63	Bulwell	NG6 8HW	Y	4	House	4		Y	CM
HMPS043	16-11-14	05-01-15	50	St Anns	NG3 3AH	N	3	House	1	① UNABLE TO SECURE REFERENCE.	Y	DW
NCHA022A	14-12-14	02-02-15	50	Long Eaton	NG10 2BG	Y	2	House	3	1 APPLICANT BOLD IN ERROR	N	CM
HIBIS001	11-10-15	30-11-15	50	St anns	NG3 4EL	Y	2	Flat	5	1 RENT TOO HIGH. 1 REFERENCE NOT GOOD	Y	DW

Magnify Spreadsheet V.6.1a - 11.04.16

Property Code	Void Start Date	Tenancy Start Date	Total Void Days	Area	Postcode	CBL	Bedrooms	Type	No. Offers	Reasons for Refusals & Other Relevant Notes	Hard To Let Y/N	Housing Officer
BRID014	12-07-15	07-09-15	57	St Anns	NG3 1DW	Y	2	House	5	(OFFERED) ANOTHER PROPERTY.	Y	SK
FOUND004A	02-03-15	20-04-15	49	Leicester	LE4 2PA	Y	3	House	3	(1) BEDROOM TOO SMALL NO DINING ROOM	N	DW
BARW0020	25-09-14	10-11-14	46	Barwell	LE9 8NL	Y	1	Flat	3	(1) PROP TOO SMALL	N	SK
REHA018	26-02-15	13-04-15	46	Sneinton	NG2 4LP	Y	2	House	5	(1) WAITED TOO LONG.	Y	SK
MHTS014A	13-04-14	09-06-14	57	Radford	NG7 5ND	Y	2	House	1	(1) —	N	CM
HELS00A/01	06-04-14	19-05-14	43	Strelley	NG8 6LQ	Y	1	Flat	3	(1) DOES NOT WANT THE AREA.	N	CM
CITY059	20-07-14	01-09-14	43	St Anns	NG3 4FH	Y	2	House	1	—	N	CM
NBRI034K	03-08-14	15-09-14	43	Wollaton	NG8 2TT	Y	1	Flat	5	(1) UNDER ANOTHER OFFER - CARE LEAVER	Y	CM
NCHA063	17-08-14	29-09-14	43	Sneinton	NG2 4HX	Y	2	House	1	(1) —	N	CM
MOUNT011	31-08-14	13-10-14	43	New Basford	NG7 7HA	N	2	House	2	—	N	SK

Magnify Spreadsheet V.6.1a - 11.04.16

Property Code	Void Start Date	Tenancy Start Date	Total Void Days	Area	Postcode	CBL	Bedrooms	Type	No. Offers	Reasons for Refusals & Other Relevant Notes	Hard To Let Y/N	Housing Officer
NBRI102	30-11-14	12-01-15	43	Wollaton	NG8 2TT	Y	1	Flat	3	—	N	CM
BALA002	21-12-14	02-02-15	43	Bestwood	NG5 9DB	Y	2	Bungalow	3	① WASN'T A COUNCIL PROPERTY ② NO CUPB. ROOM NO SHOWER IN THE BATHROOM, STAIRS TOO LARGE.	N	PR
WESL000/01	27-09-15	09-11-15	43	Sherwood	NG5 2JR	Y	2	Flat	1	—	N	PR
MHTS029/A	27-04-15	15-06-15	49	New Basford	NG7 6JA	Y	1	Flat	5	① NO ACCESS TO PUBLIC FUNDS ② TOO SMALL	Y	DW
NCHAOOB/01	28-12-14	09-02-15	43	Sherwood Rise	NG7 6JE	Y	1	Flat	5	① PROPERTY IS TOO FAR FROM WORK ② DOES NOT AREA + CANNOT AFFORD.	Y	SK
EMID050A	13-04-14	19-05-14	36	Derby	DE23 6UG	Y	2	House	2	—	N	CM
NCHA011A	13-04-14	19-05-14	36	Meadows	NG2 2FQ	Y	2	House	2	① ALREADY HOUSED.	N	CM
SUTT0106	15-06-14	21-07-14	36	Lenton	NG7 2DU	Y	2	House	2	① PREGNANT + DUE IN AUGUST - NEED 3 BED ROOMS	N	CM
HIBIS024	15-06-14	21-07-14	36	St Anns	NG3 4EL	N	2	Flat	1	—	Y	SK
HOMX126	17-08-14	22-09-14	36	Bestwood Villa	NG6 8YX	Y	2	House	2	① TOO FAR FROM CURRENT PROP.	N	CM

Property Code	Void Start Date	Tenancy Start Date	Total Void Days	Area	Postcode	CBL	Bedrooms	Type	No. Offers	Reasons for Refusals & Other Relevant Notes	Hard To Let Y/N	Housing Officer
HIBIS012	19-10-14	24-11-14	36	St Anns	NG3 4EL	N	2	Flat	3	② SOME OF THE ROOMS TOO SMALL	Y	DW
DECO011	21-12-14	26-01-15	36	Radford	NG7 3HH	Y	2	House	1	—	N	SK
HIGH168	28-12-14	02-02-15	36	New Basford	NG7 7AP	Y	2	Bungalow	1	—	N	PR
MHTS002	26-04-15	01-06-15	36	Radford	NG7 3HU	Y	1	Flat	3	① HAD A BABY SO CIRCUMSTANCES CHANGED. MULTI OFFER	N	SK
LEIC012	03-05-15	08-06-15	36	Hyson Green	NG7 5AS	Y	4	House	2	① NOISEY NEIGHBORS ② SIZE OF GARDEN TOO SMALL	N	DW
GUIN000/D	12-07-15	17-08-15	36	Arboretum	NG1 4GS	Y	1	Flat	2	① DID NOT LIKE THE PROP. ② PROPERTY CONDITION	N	PR
PINFO002	02-06-15	13-07-15	41	Hucknall	NG15 7AB	Y	2	Flat	1	① PREGNANT - DUE SOON	N	SK
HINK011B	08-04-15	11-05-15	33	Hinckley	LE10 1BD	Y	1	Flat	1	② BY PASSED - BEDROOM TEMP UNSTABILITY	N	DW
BARW002A	25-09-14	27-10-14	32	Barwell	LE9 8GP	Y	1	Flat	5	① UNABLE TO AFFORD RENT ② TOO SMALL	Y	CM
EMID026	27-02-15	30-03-15	31	Derby	DE23 8RT	Y	3	House	1	—	N	DW

5.0 Conclusion

From Magnify's investigations during this review we are able to highlight the following:

- We identified major works voids as being problematic and resulting in homes being unavailable to let to waiting tenants for longer than necessary.
- It is a common experience for tenants to see a property remaining empty sometimes for several months when there is no obvious reason for this to be happening. At the same time Tuntum Housing's Key Performance Data states that average void times are much shorter than this, currently well under 1 month. This creates a disparity between customer perception and actuality.
- The difference between tenant poor perception of reality and Tuntum's claimed performance is due to the fact that major works are not taken into consideration when publishing performance data regarding voids.
- Long void times are wasting a valuable asset and losing income, frustrating potential tenants and leading to a loss of customer confidence in performance figures produced by Tuntum.
- Tuntum has no Local Offer Service Standards relating to the void process.
- There is no proper setting of re-let targets for major works properties. Because there are no targets set from the very beginning of the major works process to full completion this would seem to leave the way open for several days or weeks of inactivity on some properties, as tenants have frequently observed to the detriment of Tuntum.
- The panel found that a quick calculation covering the 28 Tuntum properties with a major works time of between 31 – 111 days in the period 23.03.14 - 07.02.16 provided a figure of 1,594 days which is just under 228 weeks. At an average rent loss of say £90 per week this equates to £20,520 and any reduction in the timescale that major works take to complete is likely to save Tuntum a considerable amount of money.
- In conducting this review Magnify encountered numerous problems in obtaining accurate and detailed information that surely should have been available from Tuntum's computer systems with no difficulty at all. Staff involved did their very best, but it seems the void management planning systems are not fit for purpose.
- Staff members are using out-dated and inefficient manual methods to keep track of void processes, project cohesion and inter-departmental activities are badly impacted as a result.
- Reasons for refusal of property offers are not currently recorded in the system in a way that could offer a possible pattern of refusals for all or specific properties.
- Staff report that there is unnecessary documentation in the re-letting process.

6.0 Recommendations

From Magnify's investigations during this review we would like to recommend that Tuntum consider implementing the following:

- Provide information in the Tenants' Annual Report concerning re-let targets for both standard works and major works. This is to dispel the disparity between customer perception of published statistics which only refer to standard voids and the actuality of the major void properties that tenants see empty for long periods.
- When publishing the statistics regarding 'Empty properties (voids)' in the Tenant's Annual Report target figures are also provided as the number of properties empty in the quarter. A percentage figure means very little to tenants as they generally do not know how many properties Tuntum operates.
- Write a Local Offer Service Standard regarding voids to give tenants confidence in Tuntum's efforts to reduce re-let times and make properties available sooner.
- Put timeframes in place for the completion of major works on individual properties and set penalties for contractor delays (where possible).
- Install a voids management module on the SDM Housing Management System to improve inter-departmental activities in managing the voids process from start to finish. We understand it would cost £900 to implement and, amongst other very useful resources, would provide a diary system and running records. Tuntum staff could then see on a day-to-day basis how maintenance events were progressing and make re-let plans accordingly. The installation of additional software would give staff an increased degree of project management. It would enable improved organisation and communication, allow project progress to be monitored and potential delays in work execution to be anticipated and corrected. Void times would then be reduced providing tenants with improved outcomes as homes could be made available to them sooner.
- Provide the Maintenance Officer, Salim Yasin, with a handheld pad to link with the SDM system direct from site (or a nearby wifi zone) to enable him to view specifics and record information. Additionally, the provision of a mobile phone to him that has a WhatsApp capability in order to upload photographs to the office or contractors. A large number of matters relating to void works could then be actioned immediately instead of waiting for him to return to the office.
- Create a history log for refusal of properties to help identify patterns of what could be discouraging prospective tenants. Make more property information available to prospective tenants in the form of floor plans, room measurements, property features and photographs together with details of local amenities and facilities such as schools and transport. Every property advertised on Homelink could also be shown on Tuntum's website in order that more complete information can be available to prospective bidders. Advice about accessing Tuntum's website could hopefully be included in the Homelink advertisement.
- Process mapping should take place to obviate any unnecessary documentation that currently exists in the re-letting process.



Appendices

**Appendix 1 – Extract from Tuntum Annual Accounts – Financial Statements
Year Ended 31st March 2016**

Appendix 2 – Original Spreadsheet Information from Tuntum – Page 1 of 5

Appendix 3 – List of Addresses Relating to Refusal Reasons on Spreadsheet v.6.1a

Appendix 4 – Tenants Annual Report from Engage Newsletter - Summer 2016

Appendix 5 – Extract from Efficiency East Midlands Report – Page 9

Appendix 6 – Tuntum Re-Let Form

Appendix 1

Extract from Tuntum Annual Accounts – Financial Statements Year Ended 31st March 2016

TUNTUM HOUSING ASSOCIATION LIMITED

STRATEGIC REPORT

Investment in Assets – Table

Item	2014/15		2015/16		Efficiency Saving
	No.	Average Unit Cost	No.	Average Unit Cost	
Kitchens	66	£2,950	51	£3,520	2015/16 - Kitchen surveys and supply arranged directly by the contractor. Additional electrical works included. Savings on procurement by using EEM. All walls receive a skim coat of plaster.
Bathrooms	31	£1,944	19	£2,410	2015/16 - Materials ordered directly by the contractor. Additional electrical works included. Savings on procurement by using EEM.
Windows & Doors	51	£2,589	43	£2,954	Increase in average price in 2015/16 due to the majority of properties having all windows and doors replaced (not partial replacement), along with many also having French doors. Procurement savings through EEM. Increased tenant choice on door styles, color and furniture. Lock specification improved to increase security and tenants home insurance costs. Adjustable door hinges used to enable ease of adjusting - Increased window hinge specification for ease of cleaning for tenants.
Boiler Heating Systems	23	£1,840	38	£1771	Boilers upgraded to swap old back boilers and g rated appliances for modern appliances. Through EEM negotiated a supply of boilers and working with contractor, at no cost to the Association. Have established a social fund and contribute £5 per boiler fitted.

Appendix 2

Voids Data for Magnify

Property Code	Tenancy Start Date	Area	Postcode	Local Authority	CBL Letting?	No. Of Bedrooms	Type of Unit	No. Of Offers	Void Date	Major Repairs Completion Date	HARD TO LET? Y/N	Reason for Vacancy	Housing Officer	Time prperty was void for (in days)	Properties voids following major repairs (Days)	
P&RERE020	07-04-14	Long Eaton	NG10 1DB	Erewash	Y	2	House	1	23-03-14		N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	15		
HEL5015	07-04-14	Strelley	NG8 6QJ	NCC	Y	2	House	1	23-03-14		N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	15		
HOMX050	14-04-14	Strelley	NG8 6LA	NCC	Y	3	House	4	16-02-14	01-04-14	Y	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	57	44	
HIBIS003	28-04-14	St Anns	NG3 4EL	NCC	Y	2	Flat	5	16-02-14		Y	Eviction	CM	71		
CITY038	05-05-14	St Anns	NG3 4FN	NCC	Y	2	Bungalow	1	27-04-14		N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	8		
P&R009	12-05-14	Strelley	NG8 6JU	NCC	Y	4	House	1	23-02-14	08-05-14	N	Internal Transfere	CM	78	74	
EMP059	12-05-14	Ilkeston	DE7 8GQ	Erewash	Y	2	House	1	05-05-14		N	First Let - newly purchased by Tuntum	CM	7		
NCHA011A	19-05-14	Meadows	NG2 2FQ	NCC	Y	2	House	2	13-04-14		N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	36		
EMID050A	19-05-14	Derby	DE23 6UG	DCC	Y	2	House	2	13-04-14		N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	36		
EMP021	19-05-14	Sawley	NG10 3DL	Erewash	Y	2	House	2	19-05-14		N	First Let - newly purchased by Tuntum	CM	0		
HEL500A/01	19-05-14	Strelley	NG8 6LQ	NCC	Y	1	Flat	3	06-04-14		N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	43		
SNEI415	26-05-14	Sneinton	NG2 3GB	NCC	N	2	House	1	25-05-14		N	Mutual Exchange	CM	1		
HOMX055	26-05-14	Bestwood Village	NG6 8YX	Gedling	N	2	House	1	25-05-14		N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	1		
BLYTH002	26-05-14	Mapperley	NG3 5LW	NCC	N	2	House	6	09-03-14		Y	Tenant Died (no succession)	SK	78		
EMP010	26-05-14	Ilkeston	DE7 5PJ	Erewash	Y	2	House	3	19-05-14		N	First Let - newly purchased by Tuntum	CM	7		
HINK021A	09-06-14	Hinckley	LE10 1BD	Hinckley BC	Y	1	Flat	2	18-05-14		N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	22		
MHTS18	09-06-14	Hyson Green	NG7 5AG	NCC	Y	2	House	8	11-05-14	18-05-14	Y	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	29	7	
MHTS004A	09-06-14	Sneinton	NG3 3AR	NCC	Y	2	House	1	18-05-14		N	Eviction	CM	22		
MHTS014A	09-06-14	Radford	NG7 5ND	NCC	Y	2	House	1	13-04-14	27-04-14	N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	57	14	
ETHE08D	09-06-14	Westbridgford	NG2 5LT	Rushcliffe BC	N	2	House	1	18-05-14		N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	22		
HEL500A/07	16-06-14	Strelley	NG8 6QL	NCC	N	1	Flat	1	15-06-14		N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	1		
P&RLEI018	23-06-14	Leicester	LE5 0ET	LCC	N	2	House	1	22-06-14		N	Mutual Exchange	SK	1		
HOMT0014	23-06-14	Leicester	LE5 0FN	LCC	N	3	House	1	22-06-14		N	Mutual Exchange	SK	1		
EXSA019	23-06-14	Top Valley	NG5 9HL	NCC	Y	2	House	1	06-04-14	30-05-14	N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	78	54	
LODG015A	30-06-14	Old Basford	NG6 0NX	NCC	Y	3	House	2	15-06-14		N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	SK	15		
EMP002	30-06-14	Sandiacre	NG10 5EA	Erewash	Y	2	House	2	20-06-14		N	First Let - newly purchased by Tuntum	CM	10		
BURNS004/1	07-07-14	Forest Fields	NG7 4DT	NCC	Y	1	Flat	3	08-06-14		N	Internal Transfere	CM	29		
CIND004	14-07-14	Builwell	NG6 8QT	NCC	N	2	House	1	13-07-14		N	Mutual Exchange	CM	1		
COLV002	21-07-14	Arboretum	NG1 4HU	NCC	N	3	House	1	29-06-14		N	Internal Transfere	SK	22		
HIBIS024	21-07-14	St Anns	NG3 4EL	NCC	N	2	House	1	15-06-14		Y	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	SK	36		
SUTT0106	21-07-14	Lenton	NG7 2DU	NCC	Y	2	House	2	15-06-14		N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	36		
HOMX008C	21-07-14	Strelley	NG8 6JN	NCC	Y	3	House	2	06-07-14		N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	15		
LONG013	28-07-14	New Basford	NG7 7AP	NCC	N	2	House	1	27-07-14		N	Mutual Exchange	CM	1		
NCHA00C/03	04-08-14	Sherwood	NG7 6JE	NCC	Y	1	Flat	1	06-07-14	13-07-14	N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	SK	29	7	
SNEI417	04-08-14	Sneinton	NG2 3GB	NCC	Y	2	House	1	29-06-14	06-07-14	N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	36	7	
COLLY022	04-08-14	Meadows	NG2 2ET	NCC	Y	2	House	3	29-06-14	06-07-14	N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	SK	36	7	
BALA002	11-08-14	Bestwood	NG5 9DB	NCC	Y	2	Bungalow	6	13-07-14		Y	Tenant Died (no succession)	CM	29		
MRS009	13-08-14	Clifton	NG11 9LU	NCC	N	1	House	1	12-08-14		N	Mortgage Rescue Scheme Letting	CM	1		
HOMX130	18-08-14	Bestwood Village	NG6 8YX	Gedling	Y	1	House	1	27-07-14		N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	SK	22		
QAKFO037	24-08-14	Broxtowe	NG8 6BJ	NCC	N	2	House	1	24-08-14		N	Mutual Exchange	CM	0		
DECO099	25-08-14	Radford	NG7 3JX	NCC	N	2	Flat	1	24-08-14		N	Mutual Exchange	SK	1		
HYSO012	25-08-14	Hyson Green	NG7 6EY	NCC	N	2	House	1	24-08-14		N	Mutual Exchange	SK	1		
HINK029	18-08-14	Hinckley	LE10 1DQ	Hinckley BC	N	4	House	1	17-08-14		N	Mutual Exchange	SK	1		
HIBIS015	18-08-14	St Anns	NG3 4EL	NCC	N	2	Flat	1	27-07-14		N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	22		
HINK025A	25-08-14	Hinckley	LE10 1BD	Hinckley BC	N	2	House	1	24-08-14		N	Mutual Exchange	CM	1		
MHTS002B	01-09-14	Hyson Green	NG7 5EE	NCC	N	2	House	1	31-08-14		N	Mutual Exchange	CM	1		
CITY059	01-09-14	St Anns	NG3 4FH	NCC	Y	2	House	1	20-07-14		N	Internal Transfere	CM	43		
CITY051	01-09-14	St Anns	NG3 4FH	NCC	Y	2	House	2	03-08-14		N	Eviction	CM	29		
REHN011	08-09-14	Broxtowe	NG8 6JE	NCC	Y	4	House	1	10-08-14	17-08-14	N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	29	7	
NBRI012	08-09-14	Wollaton	NG8 2TT	NCC	Y	1	Flat	1	31-08-14		N	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	8		
HOMX005A	08-09-14	Arnold	NG5 8AA	Gedling	Y	2	House	3	27-07-14	29-08-14	N	Tenant moved to other social housing provider	CM	43	33	
NBRI034K	15-09-14	Wollaton	NG8 2TT	NCC	Y	1	Flat	5	03-08-14		Y	Tenant moved to private sector or other accomodation	CM	43		

Appendix 3

List of Addresses Relating to Refusal Reasons on Spreadsheet v.6.1a

- 7 Palin Street ①
- 11 mount heighrs ②
- 16 Bardolph St ③
- 27 frederick St ④
- 9 wesley Road ⑤
- 16 melrose st ⑥
- 6 Collison st ⑤
- 21 Bridlington Sr ③
- 9 Newark Avenue ⑤
- 37 Trappard Rd ⑥
- 23 melrose st ④
- 140 Beechdale Rd. ②
- 39 Stoneywell Rd ③
- 48 Player St ④

Damp

page one.

- 19 Ederm Gardens ⑬
- 4 Gresley Drive ⑩
- 9 maud St ⑭
- 19 frederick st ⑮
- 50 Helston Drive. ⑰
- 43 Shelton St ⑱
- 220A Ginderhill Rd ⑲
- 1 Rugby Terrace. ⑳
- 54 Third Avenue. ㉑
- 166 minver Crescent ㉒
- 10 Gayhurst Rd ㉓
- 5 Hawbeck Road. ㉔
- 9 Silverhill close. ㉕
- flat C, 14 Burn St. ㉖

page Two

Tenants' Annual Report 2015/16: **how we performed**

Managing current rent arrears

Target: below 3%

Quarter end	2015/16	2014/15
June	3.7%	2.3%
September	3.5%	2.5%
December	3.6%	2.5%
March	3.6%	2.6%
Average	3.6%	2.5%

Complaints managed within agreed timescales

Target: 90%

Quarter end	2015/16		2014/15	
	GENERAL	GENERAL		
June	92%		72%	
September	100%		100%	
December	100%		100%	
March	88%		40%	
Average	95%		78%	

Empty properties (voids)

Target: below 1%

Quarter end	2015/16	2014/15
June	0.7%	1%
September	0.7%	1%
December	0.8%	1%
March	0.8%	0.9%
Average	0.8%	1%

Tenant satisfaction with our services

Target: 85% overall / 85% repairs

Quarter end	2015/16			2014/15		
	Overall	Repair service	Listens to tenants	Overall	Repair service	Listens to tenants
June	84%	81%	N/A	80%	84%	80%
September	84%	81%	76%	75%	81%	74%
December	86%	75%	75%	83%	84%	82%
March	83%	67%	85%	84%	85%	84%
Average	84%	76%	79%	81%	84%	80%

Repairs And Maintenance Performance 2015/16

Expenditure:

	Responsive repairs	Planned Maintenance	Total expenditure	Ratio R:P
2015/16	1,054,048	652,920	1,706,968	62% : 38%
2014/15	1,094,842	636,912	1,731,754	63% : 37%

Planned works programme

April 2015 to March 2016:

Element	Number	£
Kitchen replacements	48	168,000
Bathroom replacements	28	72,800
Roof renewal	6	37,800
Windows & Doors	47	142,410
Electrical wiring	4	10,000
Replacement Boilers	70	112,000
Full Heating installation upgrades	13	52,000
Energy efficiency improvements	5	12,500
External Walls Overhaul/replacement		17,400
MAINTENANCE IMPROVEMENT		624,910



Appendix 5

Company No. 1	Company No. 2	Company No. 3	Company No. 4	Company No. 5	Company No. 6	Company No. 7	Tuntum	Company No. 9	Median Score
---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	--------	---------------	--------------

Percentage of day to day (responsive) completed right at time of first visit, meeting appointment with one consecutive visit	99.69%	92.15%	Data Not Available	Data Not Available	84.00%	89.81%	Data Not Available	Data Not Available	99.27%	92.15%
	1 out of 5	3 out of 5			5 out of 5	4 out of 5			2 out of 5	
Emergency jobs as a percentage of all day to day responsive jobs completed	14.36%	34.18%	4.98%	23.00%	16.00%	20.26%	2.21%	8.22%	20.02%	16.00%
	4 out of 9	9 out of 9	2 out of 9	8 out of 9	5 out of 9	7 out of 9	1 out of 9	3 out of 9	6 out of 9	
Average time to complete void works	25.00 Days	36.80 Days	11.02 Days	Data Not Available	7.80 Days	13.58 Days	15.56 Days	Data Not Available	27.90 Days	15.56
	5 out of 7	7 out of 7	2 out of 7		1 out of 7	3 out of 7	4 out of 7		6 out of 7	
DMS/DLO Sickness	8.00 Days	18.76 Days	10.59 Days	Data Not Available	26.40 Days	8.69 Days	6.50 Days	0.00 Days	3.00 Days	8.69
	4 out of 8	7 out of 8	6 out of 8		8 out of 8	5 out of 8	3 out of 8	1 out of 8	2 out of 8	
Average SAP rating	69.20	65.00	72.47	Data Not Available	Data Not Available	68.80	73.02	Data Not Available	67.12	69.00
	3 out of 6	6 out of 6	2 out of 6			4 out of 6	1 out of 6		5 out of 6	



Appendix 6

Tuntum Housing Association - Re-let form

**TUNTUM HOUSING ASSOCIATION
RE-LET FORM**

A Re-let Is Required For The Following Property:		
Address:		
Date void:		
FOR HOUSING MANAGEMENT USE ONLY:		
Date notification of termination received:		
Date of pre-inspection:	Signed:	
Date keys returned:	No. of keys:	
Prospective tenant: Yes/No		
Date keys to maintenance		
Signed (Technical Officer)		
FOR MAINTENANCE USE ONLY:		
Date of void inspection:	Signed:	
Priority Status: A = 10 Days B = 28 Days C = Major Works (up to 6 Months)		
Works order number:		
Contractor name(s):		
Post inspection date	Signed:	(Technical Officer)
	Signed	(Housing Officer)
Comments/ Non standard items:		