

## **Summary**

### **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 The RSP have carried out a review of the management and delivery of scaffolding services between August 2015 and April 2016. The review was designed to reality-check the changes following an internal review and establish whether concerns raised in 2014 through the leaseholder review had been addressed.

### **2 Key findings**

- 2.1 Dedicated scaffolding inspection team
- 2.2 Reduced number of official complaints regarding scaffolding but not taking into account informal complaints made to the Call Centre, Rydon or Griffin
- 2.3 Introduction of standard letters, which is excellent, but refinement and consistency of information to be provided.
- 2.4 Ensure that all residents residing in the building are provided with the same information
- 2.5 Maximise the use of Safetrak by ensuring that user/s are properly trained and competent, validate scaffold sites between contractor invoice and database, do a random audit to check information is correct, limit manual updating and consider developing interface to allow data transfer to repairs system. Ensure report writing and use of the system is not restricted to one employee.
- 2.6 No access to site inspection reports, risk assessments, scaffold design and installation instructions so these were not able to be validated
- 2.7 Interviews restricted to Partners and Rydon management and no access to contract specifications or interview with scaffolding contractor.
- 2.8 Despite the introduction of new working procedures complaints by residents indicate that operating procedures are not consistent and service failures continue with regards to installation times, scaffolding blocking access, damage to buildings and gardens, lack of locks on scaffolding, scaffolding having to be re-erected, paying compensation due to service failure but no central list of payments, writing to a deceased resident, not indicating on headed paper that Rydon are working on behalf of 'Partners', performance indicators not allowing for monitoring of performance and customer feedback related to scaffolding
- 2.9 Commitment to consider using alternative surveying techniques but were not notified or offered the opportunity to participate in the Council's review and piloting.

### **3 Key Recommendations**

- 3.1 Safetrak, the new database to record and monitor scaffolding services, is not working effectively due to a lack of understanding of the capabilities of the system, missing data regarding scaffolding sites and

## Summary

- the need for further training to increase the skills and knowledge of the user/s
- 3.2 Communication with secure and leasehold tenants related to scaffolding services has improved but standard letters need to be reviewed to provide clear information related to, insurance notification, contact names, timescales for start, and role of scaffolding inspectors
  - 3.3 The quality of scaffolding used is high but there needs to be consistent signage, safety gates properly installed, tags located where they are not able to be tampered with, risk assessments readily available for each site, and photographic evidence before, after installation and following removal of scaffolding.
  - 3.4 Performance indicators and feedback satisfaction cards need to be reviewed. Consider having scaffolding identified as a separate item on the feedback card, look at introducing performance indicators related to monitor the time that scaffolding is in place – date installed, date work commenced, date work completed, date scaffolding removed percentage of time that scaffolding is actually in use. There should be monitoring of the number of times that scaffolding is installed at individual properties.
  - 3.5 Provide the same level of information and service standard for scaffolding used for cyclical and major works. Information - letters and standard of signage for cyclical repairs consistently higher.
  - 3.6 Complaints information should be made available in the scaffolding information pack as residents unclear about what is an official complaint and complaints logged to be able to identify activity such as scaffolding to facilitate monitoring feedback and learning outcomes.
  - 3.7 If the initial survey, that is carried out before scaffolding is erected, is seen not just as a prerequisite for the issuing of section 20 notices but by using traditional and innovative surveying techniques thorough surveys of the buildings are made, inside and out, then building work accompanied by a check survey, could start the moment that the scaffolding has been declared safe and the total duration during which scaffolding blights the lives of tenants to be shortened.

## 4 Conclusion

- 4.1 Scaffolding services have improved and there is a commitment to continue improving.
- 4.2 New procedures are still not fully embedded and there is issues regards accountability that needs to be addressed.
- 4.3 Scaffolding is an important part of the responsive repairs and cyclical/major works.
- 4.4 Leaseholders were the most dissatisfied regarding scaffolding and the associated works and this can be addressed through improved

Confidential Resident Scrutiny Report – Management and Delivery of  
Scaffolding Services

**Summary**

surveying, communication, better pricing and ensuring that final bills are accurate and supported with pictorial records.

## **Summary**

### **5 Methodology**

- 5.1 The RSP *had limited access* to documentation so relied on site visits, mystery shopping, interviews, focus group and case studies.