# Minutes



## **Housing Assurance Board**

Minutes of the meeting held on 29th May at 6pm via Microsoft Teams.

### ATTENDEES

**BM-** Board Member

Tanaiya Daniel (Chair) Anne Dean (Vice -Chair) Marie Smith (BM), Victor Haven (BM), Linda Chamberlain (BM), Kudzai Muganhiri (BM), Jayati Bhattacharjee (BM),Cllr Jay Hayes ( Executive Member for Housing), Sharon Guest (Interim Director for Housing), Paul Spencer (Head of Tenant Experience), Matthew Woods (Building Safety Manager) Amanda Outram (Tenant Involvement Project Manager), Louise Painter (Business Performance Analyst), Paul Kerridge (Business Performance Analyst), Andy Shone (Business Improvement & Performance Manager), Lisa Dawkins (Head of Involvement), Cherrelle Daniel (Tenant Involvement Project Manager)

### APOLOGIES

Geraldine Chesta (BM)

#### ABSENT

Jessica Moyo (BM), Bereket Amaha (BM)

Item No.	Item Detail	Actions	Action Completion Date
1	Welcome & Introductions		
2	Attendance and Apologies for Absence		
	Attendance and apologies as noted above.		
3	Declaration of interest – None		

4	Previous Minutes and Actions	
	The Chair approved the minutes as a correct record for the meeting held on 27 <sup>th</sup> March.	
	<ul> <li>The Improvement Plan has now been circulated to all Board members.</li> <li>A meeting was successfully held with Cllr Jay Hayes, Executive Member for Housing, who addressed a range of questions from the Board. The Board expressed appreciation for his time and input.</li> <li>A WhatsApp group has been established for Board members to enhance communication and engagement on Board-related matters. Early feedback indicates it is functioning effectively.</li> <li>An update on the Tenant Conference has also been shared with all Board members and will be discussed in more detail later in the meeting.</li> </ul>	
5	Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSMs) Yearly Report 24-25, Paul Spencer, Head of Customer Experience	
	Paul Spencer provided a high-level update on the 2024/25 Tenant Satisfaction Measures, comparing them with 2023/24 results. A summary has been published, showing directional changes in satisfaction levels.	
	<ul> <li>Key points included:</li> <li>Overall Progress: While there are still areas for improvement, 2024/25 reflects positive momentum in several areas, indicating that the service improvement journey is well underway.</li> <li>Complaints Handling: Satisfaction with complaints handling rose by 7% year-on-year to 34%, the largest increase across all TSMs. This places the service close to the upper quartile nationally for similar local authorities.</li> <li>Repairs: Despite ongoing perception challenges, transactional data shows significant improvement. Formal complaints about repairs have decreased, and compliance with complaint handling standards has improved quarter-on-quarter.</li> </ul>	
	Next Steps: The 2025/26 TSM survey cycle will begin next week, marking the start of Quarter 1 data collection.	
	An update was provided on the upcoming 2025/26 Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSM) survey, recently finalised in partnership with Acuity. The survey will include the 12 mandatory regulatory questions, alongside additional sentiment-based questions designed to gather deeper insights into tenant perceptions—particularly around services such as repairs and communal area maintenance.	

Key points:		
<ul> <li>Real-Time Data Access: A live dashboard will provide real-time survey results to senior managers, who are expected to monitor and act on feedback promptly.</li> <li>Follow-Up Engagement: Where tenants consent, staff will follow up on individual comments to better understand concerns and feed them into service improvements.</li> <li>New Role: An Equitable Outcomes Manager will support departments in analysing feedback across demographic groups to ensure compliance with the Equality Act and consumer standards, particularly around transparency, influence, and accountability.</li> </ul>		
<b>Survey Sample Size</b> : The board queried the sample size. The survey will continue to reach 2,200 tenants, meeting the regulator's minimum requirement and achieving a 95% confidence level. This ensures the results are statistically representative of the wider tenant population.		
<b>Glossary of Terms</b> : The board requested a glossary of abbreviations and acronyms to be provided with future reports.	PS/TP	31.7
<b>Incomplete Surveys:</b> The board queried the 117 surveys that were incomplete. It was advised that this represented a small proportion of the total and was a result of tenants unavailable or not willing to participate.		
<b>Open comments left by Tenants:</b> The board raised concerns regarding a tenant comment in the TSM survey referencing the absence of proper fire escapes and safety features in a multi- storey building. Paul Spencer confirmed that such feedback is captured via the live dashboard accessible to senior staff and will be reviewed and addressed accordingly.		
<b>Security concerns:</b> A incident was highlighted where a tradesperson attempted to prop open a communal door for convenience. Paul Spencer agreed to escalate the issue to the Head of Responsive Repairs and ensure a clear communication is issued to all trade staff reinforcing security protocols.	PS	31.7
<b>Concerns regarding the low complaints handling figure</b> (34%): The board queried what would be considered an acceptable benchmark. Paul Spencer acknowledged the current performance and indicated that a review is underway to determine aspirational targets. He suggested that a year-end result of 45% for 2025/26 would be a positive step forward, given the perceptual nature of the feedback. Paul emphasised the importance of a sustainable improvement plan but difficult to put a target on it with it being perception.		

	Sharon Guest supported the need for realistic and evidence- based targets, suggesting a long-term goal of 70–80% satisfaction. Sharon emphasised the importance of implementing clear, actionable steps to improve tenant experience across services, including complaints and repairs, rather than focusing solely on headline figures. Written responses to any outstanding questions will be provided to the board in due course.	
6	Resident Engagement in Building Safety Strategy – REIBS	
	The Chair commended the consultation as very robust showing an extended period of consultation, evidencing all the steps taken to consult with tenants.	
	Matthew Woods introduced himself as the Principal Accountable Person, he emphasised that all safety concerns ultimately fall under his remit and that he serves as the main point of contact for the Building Safety Regulator of Social Housing.	
	<b>High-Rise Property Overview</b> The organisation manages approximately 25,000 properties, including 13 high-rise buildings. There are around 1,800 flats within these high-rises, which are visited annually as part of the safety inspection programme.	
	The team conducts flat inspections by knocking on doors and inviting residents to participate. These inspections are a legislative requirement and provide an opportunity for direct engagement with tenants.	
	If access is granted, the team checks: <ul> <li>Fire doors</li> <li>Sprinkler systems</li> <li>Smoke detectors</li> <li>Window restrictors</li> </ul>	
	Additional concerns such as hoarding or safeguarding issues are also identified and reported to the relevant teams (e.g., repairs, safeguarding).	
	Currently, the team gains access to approximately 50% of flats annually. While this may seem low, it is relatively high compared to other organisations. Limited access is largely due to residents being unavailable during standard working hours (9:00 AM – 5:00 PM). The team is exploring ways to improve access moving forward.	
	Resident Engagement and Feedback	

	1	
Following inspections, follow-up surveys with residents and done to gather feedback on building safety. This data contributed to the development of the Resident Engagement in Building Safety strategy.	e	
In 2024, 95% of surveyed residents reported feeling safe their homes.	in	
<b>Communication and Outreach</b> To ensure residents are informed and engaged:		
<ul> <li>letters were sent to all residents regarding inspecti and the REIBS initiative. Posters were displayed in buildings.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Information was shared via social media and displastic screens in communal areas.</li> <li>A drop-in session is held in each location approximation approximation</li></ul>		
one month after inspections, involving various servareas.	vice	
<ul> <li>A building safety fact sheet was created and transl into 11 languages spoken in the high-rise commun</li> </ul>	nities.	
Despite these efforts, engaging residents remains a challe when individuals choose not to participate.	enge	
The Board received an update on the process for securing Building Assessment Certificates (BACs) as required by th Building Safety Regulator since 2023. Feedback from the Regulator has been received in the form of detailed querie particularly around resident engagement. This has informed the development of the REIBS.	es,	
Fire Service Engagement and Feedback		
The Board expressed concerns regarding the limited feed received from the Nottingham Fire and Rescue Service (Nand other Nuerodivergent groups, DESN.		
Cllr Jay Hayes suggested leveraging existing connections the Fire Authority and its committee to explore senior-leve engagement opportunities and a direct liaison. The Board reassured that fire safety remains a top priority, and it was agreed that further action would be taken to enhance engagement with the fire service. The Chair of the Nuerodivergent group was also given an opportunity to feedback.	el JH/MW was	27.11
<b>Resident Engagement Strategy and Delivery Plan</b> Matthew Woods confirmed that the resident engagement strategy is being translated into 11 languages to ensure accessibility. He also highlighted the existence of a delive plan, which involves multiple teams taking ownership of specific actions and providing evidence of delivery. Feedb		

from this process will be reported to the Building Safety Management Group and, where appropriate, to the Housing Assurance Board (HAB).		
The Board was broadly supportive of the strategy, recognising it as a working document, <b>the strategy was approved by a majority vote.</b>		
Housing Services Balance Scorecard – KPIs. Presented by Sharon Guest		
The Board received an update on void property management. It was acknowledged that while there is positive progress in some areas, the number of lettable voids remains a concern. Additional resources and contractors have been brought in to carry out works, and early signs of improved turnover are emerging.		
<ul> <li>Two key challenges were identified:</li> <li>The volume and complexity of works required on void properties.</li> <li>The shift towards allocating homes through a homelessness reduction plan, which, while targeting those in greatest need, involves a longer process than the previous HomeLink system.</li> </ul>		
A weekly plan is now in place to streamline the transition from completed works to tenancy allocation. A project is also being overseen to improve coordination between Housing Solutions and Housing Options to reduce delays. On estate management, it was noted that tenant satisfaction with communal areas remains an area for improvement, as previously discussed. Other performance indicators were not highlighted due to time constraints, but members were invited to raise any specific queries.		
Housing Application Process and Communication The Board discussed concerns regarding communication related to housing applications. It was confirmed that all relevant information for housing applications should be submitted through the appropriate route. Due to current prioritisation of homeless households, some housing routes may appear unavailable on the website and this is being reviewed to ensure clarity for applicants in relation to current housing priorities.	CS	31.7
Housing Allocations and Temporary Accommodation The Board discussed the current prioritisation of homeless households for housing allocations. It was confirmed that, due to the scale of homelessness and associated costs, most allocations are now made through Housing Solutions rather than the open HomeLink system. This has limited access for		
	<ul> <li>majority vote.</li> <li>Housing Services Balance Scorecard – KPIs. Presented by Sharon Guest,</li> <li>The Board received an update on void property management. It was acknowledged that while there is positive progress in some areas, the number of lettable voids remains a concern. Additional resources and contractors have been brought in to carry out works, and early signs of improved turnover are emerging.</li> <li>Two key challenges were identified:         <ul> <li>The volume and complexity of works required on void properties.</li> <li>The shift towards allocating homes through a homelessness reduction plan, which, while targeting those in greatest need, involves a longer process than the previous HomeLink system.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A weekly plan is now in place to streamline the transition from completed works to tenancy allocation. A project is also being overseen to improve coordination between Housing Solutions and Housing Options to reduce delays.</li> <li>On estate management, it was noted that tenant satisfaction with communal areas remains an area for improvement, as previously discussed. Other performance indicators were not highlighted due to time constraints, but members were invited to raise any specific queries.</li> <li>Housing Application Process and Communication related to housing applications. It was confirmed that all relevant information for housing applications should be submitted through the appropriate route. Due to current prioritisation of homeless households, some housing routes may appear unavailable on the website and this is being reviewed to ensure clarity for applicants in relation to current housing priorities.</li> <li>Housing Allocations and Temporary Accommodation The Board discussed the current prioritisation of homeless households for housing allocations. It was confirmed that, due to the scale of homeless households. It was confirmed that, due to the scale of homeless and associated costs, mo</li></ul>	<ul> <li>majority vote.</li> <li>Housing Services Balance Scorecard – KPIs. Presented by Sharon Guest,</li> <li>The Board received an update on void property management. It was acknowledged that while there is positive progress in some areas, the number of lettable voids remains a concern. Additional resources and contractors have been brought in to carry out works, and early signs of improved turnover are emerging.</li> <li>Two key challenges were identified:         <ul> <li>The volume and complexity of works required on void properties.</li> <li>The shift towards allocating homes through a homelessness reduction plan, which, while targeting those in greatest need, involves a longer process than the previous HomeLink system.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A weekly plan is now in place to streamline the transition from completed works to tenancy allocation. A project is also being overseen to improve coordination between Housing Solutions and Housing Options to reduce delays.</li> <li>On estate management, it was noted that tenant satisfaction with communal areas remains an area for improvement, as previously discussed. Other performance indicators were not highlighted due to time constraints, but members were invited to raise any specific queries.</li> <li>Housing Application Process and Communication related to housing applications. It was confirmed that all relevant information for housing applications should be submitted through the appropriate route. Due to current prioritisation of homeless households, some housing routes may appear unavailable on the website and this is being reviewed to ensure clarity for applicants in relation to current housing priorities.</li> <li>Housing Allocations and Temporary Accommodation The Board discussed the current prioritisation of homeless households for housing allocations. It was confirmed that, due to the scale of homelessness and associated costs, most allocations are now made through Housing Solutions rather</li></ul>

	general applicants, though some properties remain available via HomeLink through registered providers.		
	Concerns were raised by the board about the impact on those unable to access housing through traditional routes. It was acknowledged that this shift may feel exclusionary, but is necessary to meet statutory duties and reduce reliance on costly temporary accommodation, such as hotels and B&Bs.		
	Cllr Jay Hayes explained that the decision to suspend general access to the waiting list was driven by financial pressures and legal obligations. The Council had been spending approximately £8 million annually on temporary accommodation, which affected wider services such as waste management and libraries. The strategy now focuses on reducing long-term stays in temporary accommodation and prioritising vulnerable groups, including those with complex needs and care leavers.		
	The Council is working closely with housing partners to increase nomination rights and access to new build properties. A review of temporary accommodation needs and the housing waiting list is underway, with a view to potentially reopening the list later in the year, depending on capacity and demand.		
	The board would like further information on the proposed improvements to the housing allocation process and communication strategy.	CS/LM	31.7
8	An Overview of a Deep Dive Scrutiny Review, Louise Painter & Paul Kerridge		
	The Board was informed of the new review commissioned to assess the quality, value for money, and tenant satisfaction of the grounds maintenance service. The review is in response to performance data and tenant feedback indicating areas for improvement.		
	A new Tenant Scrutiny Group (TSG) has been established to lead this work, with over 20 expressions of interest received and six tenants selected to participate. The group will work alongside officers to identify strengths and weaknesses in the service, with a balanced approach that also highlights areas of good practice.		
	<ul> <li>Analysis of performance data and complaints.</li> <li>Staff and management interviews (conducted separately to ensure openness).</li> <li>SWOT analysis sessions with tenants and staff.</li> <li>Benchmarking against other services.</li> <li>Development of a tenant-led report with findings and</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>service, with a balanced approach that also highlights areas of good practice.</li> <li>The review process will include: <ul> <li>Analysis of performance data and complaints.</li> <li>Staff and management interviews (conducted separately to ensure openness).</li> <li>SWOT analysis sessions with tenants and staff.</li> <li>Benchmarking against other services.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

	Board, with a nominated tenant delivering the findings. An action plan will be created based on the recommendations, with progress monitored quarterly. Previous scrutiny reviews have resulted in numerous actionable recommendations across various service areas, demonstrating the value of tenant-led insight. Past reports can be shared with Board members upon request.	LP/PK	31.7
9	<ul> <li>AOB</li> <li>Andy Shone provided an update on changes to TSM targets and performance benchmarking. The focus is on two key perception-based measures: overall tenant satisfaction and satisfaction with how antisocial behaviour (ASB) is handled.</li> <li>Overall Satisfaction: Current performance stands at 59–61% over the past two years, against a previously aspirational target of 85%. This target is now considered unrealistic. A revised target of 64% has been proposed for 2025/26, with a stretch target of 68% by 2026/27, aligning with national benchmarking data from the Regulator of Social Housing.</li> <li>ASB Satisfaction: Current performance is 64%, exceeding the national upper quartile benchmark of 60–61%. However, the existing target of 70% is also being revised. A new target of 66% is proposed for both 2025/26 and 2026/27. The service is working with Housemark to ensure appropriate peer group benchmarking and is using national regulator data in the interim. These revised targets aim to provide a more realistic and meaningful framework for performance improvement.</li> <li>Proposal: Board Member Participation in Staff Conference A proposal was put forward for Board members to attend the upcoming staff conference on 8th July.</li> <li>The board members were also asked to confirm their attendance at the Tenant Conference on 17<sup>th</sup> July by 13<sup>th</sup> June.</li> </ul>		
10	Meeting concluded at 20:06PM.		