

Homes in Somerset (HiS) Board Meeting

The primary purpose of the board meeting is to provide oversight and strategic guidance to the business, to address important matters, to assess emerging risks and trends, and make decisions.

APPROVED Minutes of the Non-Confidential Board Meeting held in the Sedgemoor Room at Bridgwater House on Tuesday 31 March 2026 at 12.32pm

Board Members:	Cllr Federica Smith-Roberts Cllr Kathryn Pearce Cllr Pauline Ham Craig Green Marie Hide Oliver Keates Paul Hackett Paul Stephenson (Chair)	Federica Kathy Pauline H Craig Marie Olly Paul H Paul S
In Attendance:	Alice Pearce, Governance Manager (minutes) Ben Lane, Director of Finance & Performance Claire Tough, Director of Communities & Customer Service Naomi Macey, Director of Asset Management, Safety and Development Pauline Kelly, Executive Assistant (Admin support) Peter Hatch, Chief Executive	Alice Ben Claire Naomi Pauline K Peter
Guests:	Chris Hall, Executive Director Community, Place & Economy, Somerset Council Julia Paling, Head of People & Communications Hennah Ashfaq, Account Director - Governance & Housing, OneAdvanced (via Teams) Michael Hooper, STAC member Michael Murray, Solutions Consultant, OneAdvanced (via Teams) Rob Griffiths, CEO, Housemark (via Teams) Sarah Hosken-Jones, Account Manager, Housemark (via Teams) Wendy Lewis, Housing Specialist, Somerset Council	Chris Julia Hennah Michael H Michael M Rob Sarah HJ Wendy
NO.	ITEM	
1.	Welcome Guest	
	Paul S welcomed everyone to the meeting, including Chris, Wendy and Rob and Sarah HJ from Housemark.	
	Apologies	
	Apologies were received from Sarah O’Neill and Cllr Lance Duddridge.	
2.	Presentation Slot Strategy Theme: Customer Driven (Inspire Customers & Colleagues) Topic: Housemark Tailored Feedback 2024/25	

Sarah HJ presented the current operating environment, HiS costs and performance, tenant satisfaction and some key trends (presentation attached to Board Portal)

She explained that Housemark had set up a bespoke peer group of Local Authorities and ALMOs in England (not London) up to 7,500 properties to compare us to. Sarah HJ set out what Housing providers looked like that were “still behind”, “catching up” or “leading the way”, and set out the sector-wide changes including the following:

Management costs

- Overhead costs per unit had increased by 20 percent, much of which comes from consultancy fees and business transformation cost along with costs owing to preparing for regulation.
- A 5% increase in average cost per employee and a 2% increase in frontline housing management costs.
- Increase in ASB headcount, and reduction in development and community investment headcount.

Maintenance

- 17% increase in response repairs costs, average cost now £180.
- Labour and material availability challenges.
- DLOs out-performing contractors.
- Increases Voids expenditure being capitalised.
- 16% increase in planned maintenance, the ratio is moving to proactive planned maintenance.
- Increases in costs per employee.

Overall picture at Homes in Somerset

The presentation set out details of the situation for HiS. In short:

- tenant perception was favourable, particularly in relation to speed of repairs.
- We had lower than average complaints. Depending on circumstances and because this could be considered negative or positive, however escalation rates were low, responses were in-target and perception was good.
- Voids backlog was being worked through. When these historic, more complicated relets were completed the average relet time would increase for a while, but this was to be expected.
- Work in Progress (WIP) repairs was low. HiS had a quick completion rate and volumes were in line with the rest of the sector. Our emergency completions rate could be improved.
- Spend on lettings was in line with peers.
- Average call waiting time was low.

Sarah then set out in more detail how HiS was performing, details can be seen in the presentation. The following areas were discussed:

- Both headline and management costs per property were better than the sector. The sector figures include larger Housing providers, where consultancy and business transformation costs were being included in the costs. We were in-line with our peers.
- Our customer experience costs were slightly higher than peers, but similar to others in the sector. We are lean on people costs. Maintenance management was in line with peers. Building survey costs had increased which was to be expected.
- Maintenance costs per property (responsive repairs, voids and building safety) were in-line with peers.
- Under maintenance costs per property there was a section labelled "other". HiS had not recorded any costs under this section. Sarah HJ explained these were often revenue costs and she would find out from the person who submitted the details if our figure was correct. It could be that this spend could have been included in another category.
- "Vacant but available" property data includes void properties where organisations were working through the backlog from the pandemic. The data shows that properties "vacant and available to let" were increasing. This could be caused by faster void turnarounds or less properties being let and removed from the data set. The data shows that this is caused by both. There was a spike of properties coming back online in June and July, which correlates with the spike in re-let times in June. This was to be expected when we start to let long term voids. Naomi set out that the change in July in the voids available to let was when the team refocused and bought together internal projects to address the issues within the void process. In addition, we let La Ciotat House, after the issues with bedbugs and some Extra Care properties.
- The average re-let time within the sector was 40-45 days which was still a couple of weeks longer than pre-covid. We can expect this to continue to come down within sector and HiS.
- ARK Consultancy Ltd had started worked with us on making improvements to the voids process.
- In May 2026 5-year EICR testing will come into force. HiS percentage dipped in July/September. It could be there was a change in process or methods of recording.
- Repair speed was good against sector and peers, which was reflected in tenant perception.
- Emergencies repairs completed against target were slightly lower than our peer group and sector, it was increasing, but still 7 or 8 percent difference. It was possible HiS could have higher targets than others.
- HiS average repairs per property was higher compared to peers and the sector.
- Proportion of properties that do not meet DHS was lower than peers and sector.
- Average time to answer calls was very low, 68 seconds compared to 156 and 109 seconds (peer and sector respectively). Sarah HJ noted that there had been a high level of voluntary staff turnover. If this was from

	<p>call centre staff, we would be likely to see it in the call times, but we do not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proportion of emergency repairs was lower in HiS than peers and sector. - Work in Progress (WIP) was also low. High levels of WIP would suggest bottle necks in the process. - Complaints had been rising across the sector since April 2024 and there was a discrepancy between the number of complaints tenants felt they had made and the number that landlords record. HiS was low against peers and sector. Satisfaction was better than peers, but this was only a very smallest positive. In April 2025 HiS introduced a revised complaints policy so it would be interesting to see any changes in future rates. - Stage 2 complaints were really low, which was very good. Plus, Complaints responded to in time was higher than the sector and peers. - Similar to complaints, tenants think they have raised more ASB cases than providers think they have. Often this results in low level cases being miss managed, in turn resulting in lower satisfaction. - HiS had a low number of ASB reports. Our satisfaction result for ASB, was the only one where we were not better than peers. This could be an area for improvement. - It was noted in surveys that satisfaction varies a lot depending on collection method, size of organisation, geography, tenure type and tenant age. HiS conducted all of our surveys by phone. <p>Paul S. thanked Housemark for the vast array of information presented in an understandable way. It's important for us to turn this information into a story. Olly asked our result to be communicated to staff and tenants. Peter would share the headlines with the organisation in due courses. The full report will be reviewed and shared with the communication team and colleagues.</p>
	<p>Rob and Sarah HJ left the meeting at 13.35</p>
	<p>ACTION Sarah (HouseMark) to investigate if the "other" category in <i>Maintenance costs per property</i> was correct. The results should be communicated back to Board.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Declarations of Interest</p>
	<p>The declarations listed in the pack were noted. Pauline highlighted that she was a Liberal Democrat, not Labour.</p> <p>All council members declared an interest in item 11c due to them being council members.</p>
	<p>ACTION Pauline to update the Declarations of Interest document to reflect that Pauline is a Liberal Democrat, not Labour.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2026</p>

	<p>Members agreed that the minutes recorded were a true record of the meeting.</p> <p>It was explained for Sarah, prior to the meeting, that HIPPO was “Help Information Policy Procedure Other Stuff”, our governance repository and internal intranet for colleagues.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED and APPROVED the minutes.
5.	Matters Arising from meeting held on the 27 January 2026
	<p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED the matters arising.
6.	Chair’s Update
	<p>No questions were raised.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
7.	Chief Executive’s Update
	<p>No questions were raised.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
8.	Chair of Audit & Risk Update
	<p>Marie updated the Board that she and Ben would meet with the Chairs at the April Board Innovation Day (BID) to discuss the implications of the war in the Middle East.</p> <p>Olly discussed the human side of cyber security and recommended an online training session followed up with mock phishing emails. Ben reassured him that HiS (with SC) do similar already.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
9.	Chair of Sedgemoor Tenants’ Assurance Committee (STAC) Update
	<p>In response to a Paul S question prior to the meeting, Claire explained that TPAS had commenced their work supporting the Customer Committee and an initial report would be available for May Board. They will look at best practice from HiS & SC models of engagement and use this to build the new Customer Assurance Committee. They would support us to recruit a new Chair. There is an open invite to Board at the virtual meeting on the 7 May which TPAS will be observing as part of the STAC review.</p> <p>In response to a Paul S enquiry prior to the meeting, about the joint SC/HiS Domestic Abuse scrutiny session, Claire explained it had been very successful. The draft report was being reviewed. It included 14 key recommendations, 12 had been adopted and two were not agreed to as they</p>

	<p>required to additional resource and information that was already covered in other ways. Some examples were shared with the Board.</p> <p>Claire set out for Paul S (question prior to the meeting) the plan for policy reviews. There were 40 polices scheduled for alignment, it was not envisaged STAC would review them all but have oversight of the same T1 (strategic/compliance related) policies that come to Board. Tenant consultation and review would be undertaken by the Tenants Policy Group.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
10.	Chair of Development Committee Update
	<p>Naomi responded to a Paul S question, prior to the meeting, around aligning the joint workshop for future supply options with partnership working. She explained the joint workshop was to explore future housing supply options in the context of the new Development Strategy. The intention was for the session to focus on strategic choices around delivery models, risk, capacity and partnership approaches, rather than individual schemes. The Private Sector Partnership report referenced was being developed to inform those discussions and was expected to form an integral input to the workshop, helping frame the options available and the potential role of private sector partners alongside council-led delivery.</p>
	<p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
11.	Governance Framework Review
	<p>11a. No comments were raised on the new Management Agreement.</p> <p>11b. The reviewed Articles of Association were considered. The Board discussed in depth the proposals enabling them to appoint an additional tenant or independent Board member <i>or</i> co-optee, who could be appointed, if required, for their skills during the transition period.</p> <p>Marie raised that this could result in there still only being 2 tenant members, 3 councillors and the rest being independent. She felt the move did not protect the tenant voice and support the Board being tenant lead. Peter highlighted that the extra place (if appointed) would be open to either a tenant or an independent and would come down to the skills needed. It provides flexibility when it comes to replacing Marie (whose tenure ends in March 2027). When we recruit to replace her, if we find two skilled tenants then the Board could appoint them both. She would be involved in this process. In addition, the outcomes of the work with STAC and the customer base may result in the need for flexibility. The change gives more options for tenants rather than less. In the next three years this flexibility will be important.</p> <p>Paul S reassured Marie that we were a collaborative Board and would remain that way. This provided balance by debate. Marie reiterated that this move would not protect us being tenant lead in the future, however</p>

Paul felt the change provided the opportunity to have balance. In addition, the culture work being undertaken with colleagues and with Board at the BID will set out what sort of business we want to be, that we are not a purely commercial business but a business that hears the customer’s voice. We need to make sure the right processes were in place, to get the right skills including members who wish the organisation to continue being a success. Paul and Marie would be part of that process. Marie raised that tenants often have the skills we need but may not have this set out clearly in a CV.

Assuming the result of the Option Appraisal (OA) goes as expected, Wendy raised that next year we will need to consider reflecting the wider geography of Somerset. Wendy, Federica and Chris will consider this when discussing Councillor nominations. When we recruit Marie’s replacement we will be advertising to all of the new 10,000 tenant body. We had started succession planning for Marie and Paul H’s replacements, plus the new tenant committee of the Board. TPAS’s work will report initial findings at the end of April, ready for the May Board. We would advertise for Marie and Paul H’s replacements, the new tenant committee, including the Chair, at the beginning of June. All of this should bolster the tenant voice on the Board.

Following Board approval, the Management Agreement and Articles would be recommended for council approval.

11c Councillor Board Member Nominations. Alice set out the reasons for the proposals, there were no comments raised.

RESOLVED

- The Board **APPROVED** the refreshed Management Agreement subject to approval by Somerset Council (SC).
- The Board **APPROVED** delegated authority to ET to agree non-material amendments with SC should these arise following discussions at Council.
- The Board **APPROVED** to delegate authority to ET to agree the schedules with SC.
- The Board **APPROVED** the refreshed Articles of Association and recommend them for approval to Somerset Council.
- Following approval by SC, the Board agreed to **ADOPT** the refreshed Articles of Association.
- The Board **SUPPORTED** the recommendation to SC that Pauline Ham and Kathy Pearce be the nominated Cllr Board members for reappointment to the Homes in Somerset Board at the September 2026 AGM.
- The Board **REQUESTED** that SC nominated a third Cllr Board member for appointment to the Homes in Somerset Board at the September 2026 AGM, who has some of the skills listed in the

	report.
12.	<p>Final Budget 2026/27 – Revenue, Capital & Reserves</p> <p>Ben presented the Revenue and Capital budgets for 2026-27, including the Management Fee and Reserves position. Small deficits had been worked through since the January board meeting and Ben was now presenting a balanced budget for approval. Our Articles of Association require the Board to approve the annual Management Fee, which is contained in this report.</p> <p>The reasons for the repurposing of some reserves were set out in the paper. The analysis of the reserve position demonstrates what year end would look like if the reserves requested are utilised. The request is in line with policy. In July this year Ben would consider what reserves were like sector-wide for a 10K model, bearing in mind the Council’s own HRA reserve levels.</p> <p>The Exec Team would consider the resource implications of the uncertainties caused by the Middle East war and report back to the May Board.</p> <p>In response to Sarah’s question prior to the meeting asking if we were obliged to use Clean Surrounds Caretaking and Cleaning Service, Claire explained that we have an existing Service Level Agreement (SLA) with the council, and services and staff were well received generally. We undertook a scrutiny of the services with tenants in 2019 and it provided good value for money at the time although further work was planned to gain like-for-like service comparisons. Services were value for money and very flexible. Services provided to tenants were generally higher than those provided to wider council contracts. We aim to review the service post transfer.</p> <p>Ben responded to several questions from Paul S prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the final approval for a single delivery model awaits final customer consultation and assuming go-live remains the 1 September, we should not have direct financial implications. If the go-live date was delayed the savings/efficiencies that need to be delivered will come under pressure as the window to achieve them within will be smaller. Likewise, any ‘transition costs’ budgeted may increase as the transition period increases. • The Management Agreement inflation uplift was sound in the context of the economic climate pre ‘Middle East conflict’. We will no doubt experience increased inflation costs in the coming months that will create pressures on our budgets. Some will be direct costs i.e. energy (though we are in contracts that will protect us for a while) and others will be indirect costs such as increased R&M expenditure. We will be looking to assess the likely best case/worst case scenarios over the next couple of weeks to identify likely budget pressure in 26/27. • The £100k from reserves to support the recruitment of Heads of Service includes the cost of external support in the recruitment process. • The Business Intelligence (BI) SLA was tried and tested by the In-House team. They receive a high level of service that has produced strong

	<p>results. On reflection, appointing a BI role directly creates a single post reliance whereas the SLA with SC provides a larger team giving us flexibility and resilience. The SLA document itself will be reviewed to ensure it is '10k ready'. This will include ensuring there was sufficient flexibility and control built in. SC have appointed a Policy Manager who had been working across both delivery models, producing good results for both. This appointment negated the need to appoint our own.</p> <p>ACTION That Ben and the Exec Team consider the resource implications of the uncertainties caused by the Middle East war and report back to the May Board as part of the Risk update.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board APPROVED the Revenue Budget and the Management Agreement Fee for 2026/27. • The Board APPROVED the Capital Budget for 2026/27. • The Board APPROVED new requests from reserves amounting to £97k and APPROVED the carry forward of unutilised reserve allocations amounting to £255k from 2025/26 to 2026/27.
	<p>The meeting paused at 14:14 and reconvene at 14:25</p>
13.	<p>Demonstration of new Board Portal</p>
	<p>Michael Murray and Henna Ashfaq, OneAdvanced joined the meeting at 14:25 via Teams. Michael demonstrated the Decision Time software for the Board which is intended to streamline board processes and provide a better service to board and committee members. The following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how the system will cope with short or longer breaks in internet access • downloading of Board packs for use when there is no internet access • how it can support Chair's with writing meeting summary reports • commenting on reports, in private, to share and for report preparation <p>The software will be implemented for May Board, followed by Committees, Exec Team meetings and Leadership team. Training will be provided to members in advance of May board.</p> <p><i>Post Meeting Note: Due to resourcing pressures, we have deferred migration to Decision Time until July Board.</i></p> <p>Michael and Henna left the meeting at 14:52</p>
14.	<p>Risk Register - February 2026</p>

	<p>In response to questions from Sarah and Paul S prior to the meeting around the war in the Middle East, Ben explained the Exec Team discussed the impact of the war on our corporate risk 'Global Events' at March ET and again on 30 March. The ARC were not due to meet again until 9 June, however, Ben would discuss with Marie whether a separate one-off ARC meeting was required. They would consider cost implications and consider service level provision, similar to that during Covid.</p> <p>Naomi responded to Sarah's questions, prior to the meeting, that we had 75 homes with oil heating and SC had six. We have had an active programme to remove oil systems from all homes but have experienced extremely high levels of refusals. We were continuing to work with the relevant residents and will be able to mobilise replacements relatively quickly should any change their minds. In the meantime, SC is currently supporting residents struggling with heating oil costs through the Household Support Fund, delivered in partnership with Citizens Advice Somerset. There was no landlord-specific criterion, our frontline teams were signposting residents to this support. In addition, households using oil or LPG may be eligible for national government schemes, which the Council promote and signpost.</p> <p>Ben explained that fees for customers' Service Charges for communal energy were set for 26/27. The 27/28 proposal would be presented to the Board in November and will reflect the impact of any increased energy costs. Options for mitigating the potential increased cost impact on customers would be presented at the same time (e.g. creation of a Hardship Fund).</p> <p>Paul enquired if the Council was looking at the impacts of fuel costs too, what a fuel shortage might look like and where would we prioritise services. Chris explained this was being looked into. Marie asked if a hybrid fleet would support council delivery. Chris responded that work had started, the infrastructure for electric vehicles wasn't great. It was particularly difficult and significantly more expensive for the larger vehicles. Hydrogen vehicles might be an option in the future, but there was almost no infrastructure, but may be the only way forward.</p> <p>Naomi updated Paul S that the reported concerns about the developer Vistry would not directly impact us, as we had no existing contractual relationship with them.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED this summary report.
15.	Review of Safeguarding Effectiveness (Annual)
	<p>Prior to the meeting, Paul S asked if we could consider the impacts of child poverty on safeguarding. It had recently been reported that nationally there are 3.4 million children in poverty, with 1 million classified as destitute. He asked if we had local data to evidence this horrendous statistic? Claire outlined that HiS did not currently hold tenancy related</p>

data on child poverty save for that shared with and by other agencies. The Somerset Intelligence Partnership (census and other) data holds very rich information that we use to inform our approach. The report states 14,300 children in Somerset were living in extremely low-income households and the former Sedgemoor area had some of the highest child-poverty concentrations in the county; Free School Meal rates in former Sedgemoor are above the Somerset average. During the meeting, Paul S discussed wanting to keep child poverty and safeguarding on the table. He had raised this with the NFA (National Federation of ALMOs) Board as a topic for their awayday. As a company covering 10,000 homes HiS should understand the risk and level of deprivation.

Marie highlighted it was the people who were just over the benefits levels, that were often the poorest. It would be a good starting point to understand what that means and how it affects us. Pauline H added alongside this that the end of free school lunches vouchers, and the replacement system was a concern. It's important for us to understand the range of issues and impacts for our customers.

Claire agreed with Paul S prior to the meeting, that the new Strategy being presented to November Board can be showcased at October BID. We would focus on our corporate responsibility with case study examples.

In response to questions from Paul S prior to the meeting, Claire gave the following responses:

- There were multiple issues emerging especially where safeguarding was linked to housing issues. Damp and mould, fire safety and electrical hazards were increasingly recognised as contributors to neglect, respiratory illness and mental distress. Under Awaab's Law and the strengthened consumer regulation regime, failures to address hazards promptly were treated as safeguarding failures. In addition, vulnerability, existing or deteriorating mental health, criminal exploitation, cuckooing and cost of living pressures were all considered contributory factors to safeguarding the poor and vulnerable that were not as prevalent or connected previously.
- Within the new Corporate Strategy, we had committed to use research and data to support our decision making. The use of AI and data will become increasingly important in our approach to predict through risk and review to focus service delivery. Support to assess those most at risk and harm will enable us to target our resource and identify the most vulnerable and sustain tenancies.
- We cross-reference other data sources such as health, social care police, education as much as we can although resource is limited. Homelessness data and our work with partners in health and social care on specific cases informed our approach however this was not always a strategic approach, and we do need to improve in this area.

RESOLVED

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED this summary report.
16.	<p>Sustainability By Design Update</p> <p>Paul S commented that the fact that over 76% of HIS homes now have an Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) Rating of C and above was a huge achievement.</p> <p>Prior to the meeting Paul S asked about the 198 homes with out-of-date EPC's and asked if we had concerns about how long some had been out of date. Naomi explained that we were keen to get the outstanding EPC's completed, so that we had accurate data to inform the path to EPC C by 2030, and the wider journey to net zero. For the 198 properties, renewal had been delayed due to no access. Access was managed in-line with our established access procedures, including repeat attempts, engagement with residents, and prioritisation when access was achieved. Where EPCs cannot be refreshed immediately, we continue to rely on wider asset and energy data to inform our understanding of the stock. EPCs were also renewed at void, during planned works, or when access is otherwise available.</p> <p>Kathy talked about her visit to Dunwear House, which had funding for greening. The wider Board would be offered an opportunity to visit before the May Board.</p> <p>It was highlighted that James Nagle (Retrofit Project Coordinator) and Rik Saunders (Property Services, Investment & Sustainability Manager) had been invited to a thinktank committee at Parliament. They were the only Social Housing members and had received a quarterly invite to help shape sustainability policy for the country. James and Rik promoted our decarbonisation fund. Lord Porter (leader of South Holland District Council) expressed interest in working with us. Paul S enquired if Lord Porter would like to visit Dunwear House.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTE the update on Sustainability by Design
17.	<p>People Plan 2024-2026 Update</p> <p>Julia joined the meeting 15.11</p> <p>Paul S expressed his feeling that the report showed excellent progress and achievements.</p> <p>Julia outlined the update. She highlighted that she didn't believe the sickness and turnover rates were anything to be concerned about. There had been a number of fixed term contracts ending. If these were removed from the data the rates were approximately mid-range. Sarah had raised, prior to the meeting, that elsewhere she had seen a correlation between the introduction of the Bradford Score and an increase in leavers. She enquired if this could happen here. Laura Wickens had responded that on reviewing the list of</p>

	<p>leavers, only one of them was hitting a red in the Bradford Factor Score and would have been subject to potential action.</p> <p>In response to Sarah’s question prior to the meeting, Laura explained that we do conduct exit interviews to understand reasons for leaving, they were conducted by a member of the People Team and responses were tracked. Any issues were highlighted to the Head of People & Communications for next step discussion.</p> <p>Paul S had enquired, prior to the meeting, if there were any clear trends for colleagues reasons for leaving and what was the current sector average. Laura had set out that there were 17 leavers to date, this included five fixed term contracts ending, eight resignations (no specific themes). The average number of leavers on the CIPD website was 21%. However, we were in the highest quartile against Housemark data.</p> <p>Julia updated the Board, that the Culture survey has been issued to colleagues. At the BID we will look at Culture with the consultants “Pinpointing Potential”.</p> <p>This year we will run one Connect Session in June to launch the Corporate Strategy for HiS colleagues. In December there would be an in-person Connect Session with all colleagues. Julia was looking for a location, and it will be designed to mirror what we usually do. Board would be invited.</p> <p>Julia left the meeting 15:18</p>
	<p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board NOTED the contents of this report. • The Board CONSIDERED and SUPPORTED the recommendation to defer the Investors In People (IIP) assessment until 2027.
18.	<p>Key Performance Indicators – February 2026</p>
	<p>It was noted that many of the discussions here cross-reference to today’s presentation from Housemark.</p> <p>Paul S reminded members that recent inspections had highlighted the use of data, tenants voice, stock surveys. As Chair of the NFA he was recently interviewed by a journalist and discussed three recent inspection outcomes. Paul had explained the governance within an ALMO, the focus on housing it brings and how the Board can concentrate and is responsible for housing.</p> <p>Marie, highlighted that we need to be good at telling our story, using evidence such as Housemark data, and triangulating it. Claire added that we needed to ensure we can evidence what was happening and why and what had changed. Compliance, and the big 6 were obviously important, alongside knowing our stock, customer influence and engagement, complaints and</p>

	<p>being a listening and learning organisation. We know from HQN that we are traditional in our tenant influence structures, so we need to consider how to do things differently. We need to ensure the website information was accurate. The results for the Council’s mock inspection will be with us on Friday 22 April. They will provide the information in a presentation which we intend to share with board in May</p> <p>Paul S enquired, prior to the meeting, if there was a reason why re-lets for supported housing were so high in August 25. Claire explained 4 independent living scheme (ILS) homes were allocated in August. One home accounted for 199 days due to needing an isolator switch (fitted by the National Grid and incurs significant days) and was a traditionally hard to let property; one village property required 115 days to relet, it was let to the 30th applicant on the shortlist of 36 due to multiple refusals; a third home was also difficult to let (79 days) due to being 2nd floor in a mixed general need and ILS block. There were issues with reporting snagging issues, annual leave and change-over of resources in the team with a contracted member of staff leaving all impacted. Allocations were now being reported and managed more closely, and the inclusion of a dedicated allocations team was achieving improved performance.</p> <p>Paul S. similarly asked why general needs re-lets were unusually high in January 2026. Claire explained that of the 18 homes let in January we experienced significant delays with six homes. We have continued to manage the bedbug issues in La Ciotat with three homes accounting for 414 days. Two Westfield Close properties were major voids following the roof issue from Dec 2024 (711 days). Another property in Fairfax Road was a major void following a Closure Order & major works requirements (227 days).</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board NOTED the KPIs as at the end of February 2026
19a.	Compliance Summary and Dashboard – February 2026
	<p>Paul S highlighted that compliance was critical to regulation and maintaining it will be key for the on-going strategy.</p> <p>Members noted that there had been a reduction in compliance in EICRs Naomi explained that we were working with Liberty to make improvements. Performance had dropped when a long-standing manager had left. We also had a new contract in place with MD Group.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board NOTED the contents of the report.
19b.	Joint HiS/SC Compliance Summary Report – February 2026
	<p>No comments were made.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To NOTE the contents of the report

20.	Stock Condition Survey Programme Update (10K)
	Prior to the meeting Paul S. asked, in relation to agenda items 19 and 20 when will the data system be fully aligned. Naomi explained that it would be aligned by 31 August 2026.
	RESOLVED <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED the update on progress of our Stock Condition Survey Project.
21.	Management Accounts – February 2026
	No comments were raised
	RESOLVED <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board NOTED management accounts for the first eleven months of 25/26 (Apr 25 – Feb 26).
22.	AOB (to be notified in advance)
	There was no other business notified.

The non-confidential meeting finished at 15.25

Confirmed as a true record of the meeting

Signed: 

Name (Chair): Paul Stephenson

Date: 26 May 2026