

Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development Report

Kier North Tyneside Joint Venture – Future Priorities

6 July 2015



North Tyneside Council

Contents

Reason for the Study.....	3
Method and Remit.....	3
Approach.....	4
Kier North Tyneside Limited.....	4
Value for Money.....	4
Workstreams.....	4
Current Arrangements.....	5
Killingworth Site.....	6
Performance.....	7
Evidenced opinion.....	7
Business Growth.....	7
Schools.....	9
Letting process.....	11
Right 1 st Time.....	11
Best Price First Time.....	12
Partnership Working.....	12
Sub - Contractors.....	13
Supply Chain.....	13
Staff.....	13
Enhance Customer Service.....	14
Governance.....	14
Rebranding.....	15
Conclusion.....	15
Summary of Recommendations.....	16
Background Information.....	17
Acknowledgements.....	17

Reason for the Study

In 2014, Councillor John Harrison - Cabinet Member for Housing and Transport attended Overview & Scrutiny Committee and delivered a presentation on his portfolio responsibility. At the meeting he asked if the Committee would consider carrying out studies into the future of the Kier North Tyneside Joint Venture (JVCo) partnership.

At its meeting in July 2014, the Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee considered and agreed its work programme to carry out a study into the Performance Priorities for the second half of the JVCo was included.

Method and Remit

The Overview, Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee agreed that establishing a Kier North Tyneside Joint Venture sub-group would be the most appropriate means of undertaking this piece of work.

It was decided to encourage cross party/committee involvement into this important piece of work and invitations were extended to the Chair/Deputy Chair of the Housing sub-committee and all other non Executive Members of the Council to be part of the sub-group.

The following members volunteered to serve on the group:

Councillor Sandra Graham
Councillor Jim Allan
Councillor Steve Cox
Councillor Linda Darke
Councillor Peter Earley
Councillor Paul Mason
Councillor John O'Shea
Parent Governor Representative – Justine Little

The Sub-group met on 6 occasions to complete its work.

At its first meeting the Sub-group agreed the scope for the study.

In entering the sixth year of an initial 10 year arrangement there was a need to look at past performance and the future priorities of the JVCo. This would then provide Cabinet with an evidenced opinion on areas to business planning improvement and performance priorities.

It was hoped that the study would provide guidance and opinion to what priorities were needed to be achieved by the JVCo and how it will look in 4 years in order for there to be a seamless transition into whatever direction it would then take.

Approach

At its first meeting the sub group received a presentation, 'Reflections on Kier Partnership', delivered by Council officers, which provided information and understanding to the reasons why the partnership had been established, how it had been received and its evolution to the performance it currently provided.

It was clear from the outset that the sub-group needed to receive information from all interested parties. It therefore requested that the Cabinet Member responsible for Housing and Transport and Kier Management to attend meetings so it could receive their views and future aspirations for the partnership.

It also decided the most appropriate method to receive the views from other interested parties was to hold a Tenants focus group and receive views through electronic surveys from Council Staff, Kier Staff, Schools, Council Members and the Business Forum.

All responses and views were then collated to establish key themes and priorities for future consideration.

Kier North Tyneside Limited

Kier North Tyneside Limited is a Joint Venture Company between the Kier Group and North Tyneside Council. The new company commenced trading in September 2009 with circa 500 staff transferring under TUPE arrangements from North Tyneside Council to the new organisation.

Kier North Tyneside is a limited company, owned 80% by the Kier Group and 20% by the Council.

The task of transferring to the new organisation and a tight mobilisation period created some issues with service delivery and as a consequence this affected customer confidence, which is still having some effect to customer perceptions.

Value for Money

The overarching objective of the service is the achievement of 'value for money', which is translated as meaning the provision of a high quality service at the lowest possible cost, underpinned by a strong customer focus and achievement of 'year on year' continuous improvement in performance.

Workstreams

The key objective is to provide an effective and efficient responsive repairs and planned maintenance service for all North Tyneside owned and managed properties including capital investment works.

The JVCo also has a key role in North Tyneside Council's emergency planning requirements acting as a Category 2 Responder supporting North Tyneside Council.

The core work streams of the JVCo are:-

Work stream 1 – the Repairs and Maintenance Service responsible for the delivery of all housing related responsive works, gas servicing, void property and planned maintenance activities.

Work stream 2 - housing capital investments works and major works.

Work stream 2A – aids and adaptations based upon occupational therapists recommendations and funded by the Authority's capital budgets or grant funded by third party bodies in relation to non-Authority dwellings.

Work stream 3 - other Authority Capital Funded projects whether allocated to Partnership through the 'New Project Approval process' or other agreement as the case may be. This service includes non-housing construction works for the various Council services and has a "design and build" capability.

Work stream 4 - reactive repairs, preventative planned maintenance emergency works, or minor capital works to Authority owned and/or operated non-housing building portfolio.

Work stream 4A - reactive repairs, preventative planned maintenance emergency works, or minor capital works to schools as instructed by the Authority or otherwise agreed between Kier North Tyneside Limited and individual schools through formal service level agreements.

Work stream 5 - works or services to third parties undertaken by Kier North Tyneside Limited.

Work streams 6, 7 and 8 - design and other partnering services provided by Kier North Tyneside Limited to North Tyneside Council.

Current Arrangements

The Council has several methods of driving performance with the main mechanisms being:

1. Work stream specific KPI's these can reduce the standard profit from 2.5% to Nil or increase it to 3.75% for exceptional performance. The Council have currently insisted that these be set at rates as close to upper quartile levels as possible.
2. Cost caps based on the prices tendered in the procurement process which were designed to maximise value for money combining price with quality – these are applied at two levels
 - a. The actual cost of service delivery effectively penalising inefficient working;
 - b. Total indirect overhead preventing cost over runs
3. Disallowing costs – where the costs claimed are not appropriate in relation to the work undertaken.

Profits or losses generated by JVCo are held in the company, profits being used to support the working capital of the company and to provide it with a retained earnings fund.

There are payments made to the Council by the JVCo as pay back payments, management fees and for the use of the Killingworth depot as well as a management overhead paid to the Kier Group.

Without these payments the overhead costs would be lower, which would translate into lower prices that would deliver more work or reduce budgets.

In order to reduce overhead costs it is understood that the JVCo needs to grow its business and improve turnover.

Killingworth Site

A significant proportion of the overhead costs relate to the Killingworth site.

The offices and depot at Killingworth is currently under lease from North Tyneside Council. While meeting with Kier Management the sub-group heard that the Killingworth site was a expensive facility and some areas were not suitable for use. The site was considered to be to large a facility, with some health & safety concerns to the working surroundings within the site.

The JVCo are required to meet the full cost of the Killingworth Site totalling circa £1m and it was indicated that accommodation costs for the current operation of this size would be in the order of £500k.

Progress for the JVCo to move to a more suitable site would make it more profitable. It would also be a boost to staff morale. It was stated that there were a number of suitable locations in North Tyneside that could accommodate the JVCo.

The sub-group heard the Council was undergoing an accommodation review of all its buildings and investigating the various options for the site. It also needs to be understood that if the option to move the JVCo to an alternative site were exercised this, would have financial implications for the Council as it receives an income for the site from the JVCo.

It was thought that duplication could also be removed & reduced if both partners were co-located allowing a truly integrated structure which would promote improved service delivery and be less confusing to our tenants and customers.

This is obvious a concern and the sub group would encourage greater dialogue between the Council and JVCo to find a amicable solution that would see the JVCo move forward to concentrate on building the business and providing improved services.

It was suggested ways should be investigated to reduce overheads across the partnership and how payments could be recovered differently, with a suggestions of possible accommodation rent free periods, improved co-location or joint management teams.

Recommendation 1: That investigation is progressed to see what if any alternative/ sustainable and suitable proposals could be put in place with regards to the use of the Killingworth site to aid both the Council and JVCo.

Performance

In May 2013, the new Cabinet Member for Housing challenged the JVCo to consider how it could further improve the service to customers, how much more the JVCo and its parent company Kier Group could do to support and add value to the residents of North Tyneside, and in particular how we could assist further in helping the Council meet its strategic plans.

To gain a clear understanding the sub-group requested and received a range of performance reports that provided information upon how the partnership had performed to date.

The group was aware that the latest performance information relating to housing repairs and housing investment work delivered through JVCo, was regularly presented to the Housing Sub-committee for scrutiny and it was viewed as positive that the latest KPI's relating to the performance of housing repairs were all either on target or improving.

It was also made aware that KPI targets are agreed annually to ensure continuous improvement in line with benchmarking data.

Another measure of performance looked at was customer satisfaction where there had been an increase in compliments and letters of thanks from satisfied tenants and less stage 2 complaints as a result of better customer service.

A significant benefit for customers was the reduced level of follow on works due to the success of multi-skilling the workforce, which will only improve the service and reduce costs.

Evidenced opinion

It was clearly apparent from all sectors that the prime concerns related to:

Business Growth

The mixture of projects being delivered by JVCo in 2015/16 is dominated by Housing with a £1m increase in Housing Planned Maintenance spend and a number of affordable homes projects planned for 2015/16.

The largest is a development of 41 units in Wallsend town centre which will be supported by Kier Living.

Elsewhere the most significant capital project will be at Swan Hunters where the JVCo will carry out refurbishment works as part of a larger regeneration being led by Kier Property and there will be almost £3m spent on a range of education projects.

Work stream 5 –An increase in works or services to third parties undertaken by the JVCo was considered, by the group, to be one of the main areas for improvement in the performance of the JVCo over the next four years.

It was in this area that it was considered more focus should be applied to improve business growth, with the JVCo making more effort to grow their business by seeking to win more work in neighbouring authorities.

Although an argument was made by representatives of the JVCo that a focus on contracts carrying out minor works would have a detrimental effect on the JVCo's operational resources and there was a greater appetite to work on bigger projects the group thought the minor repairs/maintenance work to private properties could be beneficial and profitable.

It was understood that there are 15,000 council properties that could require small fixture/fittings work that could be bid for, at an estimate of £500k and therefore it was believed the JVCo should have the appetite to bid for smaller works.

There are a range of additional works the JVCo could potentially seek to perform for the privately owned homes in North Tyneside, which all have the need for some form of repair, maintenance or improvement, examples included:

- When undertaking housing investment works such as new roofs, fencing, boilers, etc they could offer opportunities for private owners in that locality.
- The offer of gas servicing to private owners and leasehold properties
- Tenants are particularly keen to look at low cost decoration and gardening services.
- All type of activity should be offered to House Associations/Private Landlords/Estate Agents.

There was a greater opportunity to gain further works as the government has decided to extend the Right to Buy scheme and many residents could benefit as works would be completed to a high standard by a reputable organisation such as the JVCo.

Recommendation 2: that consideration is given to offering a wide range of minor works/ services by extending the current offer to private sector clients.

There were some concerns highlighted with regards to debt recovery of works that would need to be recharged.

It therefore necessary to explore the implementation of a system for upfront payments for rechargeable repairs to avoid the need to recover these costs after work has been completed.

Recommendation 3: that consideration be given to the introduction of efficient payments processes that would avoid delay in receiving payments.

Schools

There are 77 schools in North Tyneside that come under:

Work stream 4A - reactive repairs, preventative planned maintenance emergency works, or minor capital works to schools as instructed by the Authority or otherwise agreed between Kier North Tyneside Limited and individual schools through formal service level agreements.

The trend of funding is that North Tyneside Council receives £3.4m to carry out works directly with the JVCo.

Programming of works and pricing was an area of concern for the sub-group.

An example was given of some work which required completion at short notice and the school being told that JVCo could not arrange for completion of the work in the timeframe required and on this occasion the work was lost and given to an alternative contractor.

Schools expressed concerns that there is often a drawn out negotiation for the best price for proposed works. By providing best price first time would save resources and time. There needs to be confidence that the customer is getting the best available deal at the first time of asking.

Further school building funding was now being managed by central government through the Education Funding Agency, which procures works of a value of circa £30m for schools.

There was a significant reduction of 80% in the number of school repairs from 2500 in 2009 to 500 in 2015. The reasons for the reductions were thought to be a combination of reduced school budgets and that schools now appoint Business Managers who look for the most competitive repairs quotes for their schools and go directly to contractors and are not using the JVCo. It was suggested that this was a direct result of the service schools had received in the past.

It was accepted that performance on the summer works programme had improved, with the majority of works completed in school holidays, however there needed to be a clear understanding by schools that some work needed to take place in term time.

The group heard from JVCo management that looking to source work from individual schools could be labour intensive and costly in terms of time and resources needed to provide estimates. It was thought that the JVCo would not necessarily see a profit.

During meetings the sub group heard differing opinions as to the barriers to working in schools these being;

- a) Health & Safety of carrying out work in schools during term time (Ensuring staff had Disclosure & Barring/the necessary space to carry out works away from students etc).

However, a counter view was that when work was being undertaken in schools, arrangements are made to ensure the area where works are being carried out

would be cleared and staff member would accompany any external work personnel.

It was therefore thought this should not be a determining factor.

- b) The receipt of payments for completed works was a risk.

It believed this should not be an issue providing there was an efficient invoicing system in place. It was understood that each school has a Financial Support Officer whose responsibility would be to ensure all payments are made.

- c) It was noted that the JVCo had written off some debt it was unable to collect for works carried from schools.

This again should not be an issue providing there was an efficient invoicing system in place.

It was suggested that it had become common practice that upon receiving estimates schools would use these as a benchmark, then modify their requirement down and go to sub-contractors to gain a lower price.

Schools had concerns around additional charges on invoices for "administration", particularly for subcontracted jobs, this meant that schools are more inclined to go to contractors direct to avoid an additional charge. They thought that greater transparency around administration charges would be beneficial.

It was also noted all sectors that schools are now encouraged procuring collectively to drive down costs.

It was suggested that the offering maintenance contracts to schools that work collectively could provide economies of scale with framework Service Level Agreement (SLA) contracts. With a further suggestion that there was a the need for a schedule of prices for standard tasks/job

Some positive comments from schools were that the JVCo are being used when work needed to be completed in a short period of time or in an emergency. This suggests that schools do have some confidence that the JVCo are providing services to the standard required however there is a stumbling block with how it approaches projects over a longer period.

Issues around reliable communication with customers were raised with issues around the number calls needed to get JVCo representatives to respond to schools concerns. A further example was provided where there had been an occasion when the JVCo had provided a competitive price, however, due to the time taken to respond the school decided to offer the work elsewhere.

There were also concerns with the time to set a site up for major works and the perception was that too much unnecessary equipment is sometimes placed on site and the costs were then passed on to the customer. It was considered that an itinerary and explanation for the use of equipment to be used on site and therefore charged to the project should be made available.

With regards to the provision of design works, the group heard that there were times when proposed schemes with the associated budget had been provided only for the design to be priced at up to 20% over the available budget.

A further concern for schools was the need to improve consistency across differing aspects of contract delivery, particularly where work has been sub-contracted. With an example provided with regards to significantly below acceptable standards compared to the overall quality & effectiveness of preceding construction programmed works.

Recommendation 4: that establishing a customer charter providing a named contact that customers could call would be beneficial as a clear communication process would be established to deal with customer concerns and requirements.

Letting process

Each month, the total number of properties re-let is recorded. For each property, the start date and end date is analysed to identify the amount of time spent empty. The amount of time is measured in calendar days. The performance data indicated the average (YTD) period taken to complete the letting process was rated at a Red level (over 29 days at March 2015).

Recommendation 5: That further efforts be made to reduce the time taken for completing the lettings process to a more acceptable level i.e. under 25 days. It was thought that better programme planning and developing a multi skilled workforce would help in achieve this goal.

Recommendation 6: That the JVCo investigate smarter working approach to enable and encourage housing staff to identify potential back to back lets. This may require investigation if some financial incentive would enable agreed works to be carried out once the new tenant has moved in or before the old one departed.

Right 1st Time

One of the main themes that ran throughout of the study was the view that if all activities carried out by the JVCo were completed right first time this would show that the correct procedures were in place, with the right staff with the right skills carrying out each job correctly.

Right first time in relation to housing responsive repairs is defined using 4 combined factors

1. Appointment Created
2. Appointment met
3. Job completed on time
4. No quality defects reported

The performance indicator for right 1st time is monitored on a monthly basis to enable any issues to be flagged, however due to variances on reporting it is not completely up to date and accurate until the year end has closed.

It was however noted that although circa 75-80% of jobs are completed first time, this still leaves 20-25% jobs that need more than one visit to be completed.

Recommendation 7: This is an area that should be investigated to discover the reasons why jobs cannot be completed first time and put procedures in place to reduce the amount of delays as much as possible.

This also applies to larger projects where there needs to be a clear programme/job management brief of the works to be carried out, including as much information as possible on required scope of works / critical dates for delivery/ priority of the works/ possible budgetary constraints/ any other known constraints (e.g. planning issues).

This then needs to be translated accurately into the design and estimate, with relevant stakeholders involved. When on site constant communication/instruction is required to achieve the desired outcome.

This will increase productivity, lead to improved customer satisfaction, reduce the number of complaints and reduce the average cost of repairs across the service.

Best Price First Time

Improvement in the estimating and pricing process was suggested as the current process can be both lengthy and result in 'inflated' prices being quoted. The process can be inflexible and can cause operational issues due to the time taken to return prices for projects.

The assessment of risk and cost of preliminaries are often excessive and following the submission of costs there is often a period of further negotiation required between parties to get the cost down to an 'acceptable' level. This only adds to delays to the procurement process and additional staffing time in agreeing the final price.

If prices were submitted on the basis of 'Best Price First Time', it would help to alleviate frustrations and protracted discussions after submissions. This often leads to customer distrust. Again a schedule of rates could be established to give clarity to the customer.

Partnership Working

The Council has a number of other partners that deliver its services in addition to the JVCo.

When major regeneration projects (such as Swans) are planned the Council is best placed to facilitate closer working with all its partners on project delivery. Where the JVCo could be involved in the delivery of some of the works, it was highlighted that the Council would see a 20% benefit on top of any other benefit it will have in place through other partnerships.

This was an area that all the partners should focus on, working smarter with each other, investigating the processes that all partners had in common would promote closer working relationship and reduce the amount silo working and therefore potential savings and reduction in inefficiencies could be made through restructuring and having a joined up approach and removing any duplication of activity.

It is crucial for the JVCo to be a true partnership that a strong framework of agreement is in place to encourage closer partnership working and ensuring the correct behaviours are demonstrated to achieve the same aims and objectives.

Sub - Contractors

The extended use of sub-contractors to undertake work could have an impact on customer confidence.

The group received information that some tenants have felt that some sub-contractors don't respect customers or properties when carrying out works. There is a need to ensure that all our customers experience the best customer service whether this is delivered by JVCo employees or sub-contractors.

The sub-group also heard that there had been an increase of capital works being sub-contracted out which it was believed should wherever possible be done by using the in house work force.

Supply Chain

The group understood the JVCo continues to ensure that external goods and services are procured effectively using transparent procedures, with a continuing focus on 'local' supply and assurances that all decisions are made in the best interests of customers.

These services have been positively impacted upon by Kier Group national procurement initiatives designed to use the Kier buying power to manage a better deal for all contracts.

However, there were concerns about the amount of local suppliers used. The perception of those canvassed was that there were the issues with the quality of fixtures and fittings, procured from outside the region.

It was suggested that a standardised fixtures and fittings catalogue be used so that these can be sourced from the local area when required.

Staff

During its existence the JVCo it had seen its workforce reduced from 504 in 2009 to 400 in 2015.

It was encouraging that an extensive training programme to aid the development of the workforce and ensure their multi-skilling had been provided and would continue. This up-skilling of staff would see the completion of a greater number of jobs with reduced visits, resulting in resource savings.

Satisfaction levels for staff are on par with the rest of the Kier Group

An area where it was thought that morale could be boosted was the improvement of the working environment, with the facilities at the Killingworth site being a factor.

Value for Money also comes in the form of the social value created across the whole business in terms of apprentices, work placements and the Working Roots programme.

The Working Roots scheme is full time training programme for disadvantaged young people for trainees aged 16-18 living in North Tyneside. The scheme has been recognised nationally as an excellent example of what can be achieved when working in a true partnership. This scheme was an area that it was thought could be expanded to provide more learning and work opportunities to disadvantaged teenagers in the borough.

Enhance Customer Service

The customer experience starts and finishes by involving residents in developing and scrutinising services, which will increase customer satisfaction, resulting in continuous improvement and therefore creating value for money for the end user.

Customers were included on Tenant ride outs, which allowed tenants to view how the JVCo deals with repairs etc. Also when works are being carried out in a particular area all residents who would be affected by the works (not necessarily having work done on their property) are invited to meetings.

Customers should be at the heart of everything the JVCo does and although improvements have been noticeable, further strides should be made to make improvements.

The delivery of services in the future for customers is a key area of focus. In today's digital age there should be more focus on improving systems to enable customers to report faults and book appointments online at anytime of the day and night.

Opportunities to send pictures of faults/repairs and avoid pre-inspections should be explored to improve the service to customers and reduce costs. Many organisations offer live chat options to report and discuss repair issues without the need to incur travel cost and non-productive time; this also should be explored.

Customers should have the facility to raise queries/concerns with Service Managers directly rather than being sign posted immediately towards registering a corporate complaint.

Recommendation 8: that there should be a greater focus to ensure better online services are available to customers to allow them to report faults and create better appointment management etc

Governance

It was thought that the Operational Partnership Board had been forward thinking in how to deliver services better and more efficiently (examples were guttering replacements and scaffolding).

However the impression given of the Strategic Partnering Board was that it was too focused on operating activities and it was considered that there should be more emphasis on strategic vision and an ambition to broaden the customer base.

Recommendation 9: That greater focus was needed from the Strategic Partnering Board on creating a clear Strategic Vision as to how it would deliver and grow the business.

Rebranding

There was some discussion that the JVCo's reputation and the public's perception of it had suffered through its performance at the outset of the partnership. The JVCo was a partnership between Kier and North Tyneside Council, however it was noted that all fleet vehicles, site signage bore little evidence of this and the lack of reference to Kier North Tyneside on operatives clothing did not help.

The need to rebrand the partnership to ensure both partners were identified was considered.

Recommendation 10: the most appropriate time to consider a rebranding exercise may be addressed when consideration is being made to how the JVCo will look like post 2019.

Conclusion

After receiving the views and opinions from stakeholders, it emerged that there were clear areas for improvement and development.

These related to the reduction of overheads, taking advantage of the opportunities already available to grow the business and sourcing new business opportunities from organisations in and outside the borough.

By enhancing accessibility through IT innovations such as enabling customers to report faults, make appointments etc and ensuring that its staff continue to be multi-skilled the reputation of the JVCo would be enhanced and therefore improve the programming of repairs and maintenance and aid the ambition to complete all jobs right 1st time.

The JVCo should have the ambition to be a top rated service provider that delivers start to finish capital projects with the ability to offer /deliver a full range of maintenance solutions to all customers within the borough and beyond.

Being able to deliver a range of ambitious products/services for an extended range of customers, will enhance the reputation of the JVCo to deliver excellent services at good value for money and reduce cost.

Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation 1: That investigation is progressed to see what if any alternative/ sustainable and suitable proposals could be put in place with regards to the use of the Killingworth site to aid both the Council and JVCo.

Recommendation 2: that consideration is given to offering a wide range of minor works/ services by extending the current offer to private sector clients.

Recommendation 3: that consideration be given to the introduction of efficient payments processes that would avoid delay in receiving payments.

Recommendation 4: that establishing a customer charter providing a named contact that customers could call would be beneficial as a clear communication process would be established to deal with customer concerns and requirements.

Recommendation 5: That further efforts be made to reduce the time taken for completing the lettings process to a more acceptable level i.e. under 25 days. It was thought that better programme planning and developing a multi skilled workforce would help in achieve this goal.

Recommendation 6: That the JVCo investigate smarter working approach to enable and encourage housing staff to identify potential back to back lets. This may require investigation if some financial incentive would enable agreed works to be carried out once the new tenant has moved in or before the old one departed.

Recommendation 7: This is an area that should be investigated to discover the reasons why jobs cannot be completed first time and put procedures in place to reduce the amount of delays as much as possible.

Recommendation 8: that there should be a greater focus to ensure better online services are available to customers to allow them to report faults and create better appointment management etc

Recommendation 9: That greater focus was needed from the Strategic Partnering Board on creating a clear Strategic Vision as to how it would deliver and grow the business.

Recommendation 10: the most appropriate time to consider a rebranding exercise may be addressed when consideration is being made to how the JVCo will look like post 2019.

Background Information

Cabinet 20 April 2009 Report– Chris Procurement – Selection of “Preferred Bidder” to form Joint Venture Partnership with the Council

Overview & Scrutiny Report - Study in to the Joint Venture Agreement – March 2012

Joint Venture Partnership Kier North Tyneside 3 year Anniversary review

Report to Overview & Scrutiny of the Joint Venture Company Kier North Tyneside Limited February 2014

Governance Framework for the Partnership between North Tyneside Council & Kier North Tyneside

Housing Sub Committee 26 January 2015 Kier North Tyneside Performance Update

Kier North Tyneside’s Business Plan 2013-2016.

Kier North Tyneside Ltd 2014 Business Plan update

Kier North Tyneside Ltd Business Plan update2015-16

Kier North Tyneside – Company Board minutes - 6 November 2014 & 20 January 2015

Strategic Partnering Board minutes – Kier North Tyneside - 6 November 2014 & 20 January 2015

Kier North Tyneside Focus Group – Survey feedback

Stakeholder - Survey feedback

KNT Workstream – Performance reports

KNT Human Resource Dashboard

Meeting Notes of the Kier North Tyneside Sub-group

Presentations received

Reflections on Kier Partnership

Kier North Tyneside

Stakeholder Feedback

Acknowledgements

David Foster - Property Services Manager,

Iain Betham - Senior Manager - Education Capital and Fair Access

Mike Furze – Kier Regional Director

James Walder – Kier Financial Controller

Charles Rayner – Kier Senior Operations Manager

Those surveyed were:

- Tenants – focus group workshop, Council Members, Business Forum, Schools, North Tyneside Officers, Kier NT Officers