

Complaints Scrutiny Session

Venue: Microsoft Teams

Date: 27th April 2026 **Time:** 16.00 – 18.00

Present: Georgina Parkinson – Chair, Director of Housing (GP), Kirsty McGivney – Property Director (KM), Julie Pearce-Martin (part) – Board Member (JP-M), Ashley Horsey – Board Member (JP-M), Sarah Pank – Resident (SP), Kayleigh Green – Resident (KG), Sarah McEvansoneya – Resident (SM), Zoanne Martin – Resident (ZM), Michael O Ejeomo – PA to Housing Director (MOE – Minute Taker).

Apologies:		
	Agenda Items	Action
1	Welcome and Apologies Introductions were made all round and no apologies were received.	
2	Minutes from the Last Meeting The minutes of the last meeting were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.	
3	Actions Arising See the action tracker for updates.	
4	Ombudsman report on Repairs and Maintenance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of how Hastoe manages its repairs contractors? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contractor Communication Issues: Participants described confusion over which contractor was responsible for repairs, with SM and ZM sharing experiences of unclear instructions and contradictory information about appointments and required works. KM thinks the issue may be linked to the cancellation of the appointments made by one of their contractors who has now been replaced by another contractor. However, she acknowledged the communication gaps and committed to following up to improve clarity for residents. ○ Oversight and Contractor Changes: KM explained that the organisation had identified patterns of over-reporting failures by a contractor, leading to a change in contractor for electrical safety checks. The process for switching contractors was not clearly communicated to residents, which contributed to confusion. ○ Task and Finish Processes: KG inquired about the existence of a task and finish group to track completion and follow-up of repairs. KM clarified that contractors have self-authorisation limits and that all findings are recorded and validated, but acknowledged that communication about these processes with residents needs improvement. 	

Complaints Scrutiny Session

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Legal and Safety Check Procedures: SP described difficulties in communicating about the timing of safety checks and receiving legal notices despite being within compliance. GP and KM explained the legal obligations for safety checks and offered to verify certificate dates upon request, emphasising the need for better internal communication and record-keeping. ○ Trust and Financial Oversight: AH raised concerns about whether increased oversight and financial controls might add unnecessary complexity for residents. KM responded that while controls are necessary, the organisation is monitoring repair completion times and collecting resident feedback to balance oversight with service quality. KM added that some satisfaction surveys now go out to residents to gather feedback about the repairs completed and these data are discussed at their contractor meetings. KG inquired whether Hastoe's contractors and subcontractors undergo proper vetting to ensure they are compliant and carry out their jobs to standard. KM explained that all relevant compliant checks are normally done based on collateral warranty to ensure the contractors take responsibility for the subcontractors they use. ● Other ways you think we should provide resident feedback to contractors ○ Feedback Mechanisms: GP described current feedback mechanisms, including regular meetings with contractors, satisfaction surveys, and the use of complaints data. KG suggested more visible reporting of actions taken in response to feedback, such as a 'you said, we did' section in newsletters or on the website. GP and KM to review and enhance the visibility and accessibility of the "You Said, We Did" section and contractor performance updates on the website and in communications, ensuring residents are aware of actions taken in response to feedback. ○ Communication Preferences: KG and others highlighted the need for multiple communication channels, such as text messages and letters, to ensure residents are informed about changes and actions taken. GP acknowledged that reliance on the portal is insufficient for all residents and agreed to consider alternative methods. ● Which contractor performance measures matter most to you? ○ Quality Assurance and Auditing: SM questioned how the organisation assures repair quality beyond resident reports. KM explained that post-inspections were previously conducted but have been scaled back, and that compliance is now checked through certifications for safety-related work. KG proposed annual quality assurance audits based on complaint patterns, which KM agreed could be beneficial. KM to review and consider implementing targeted annual or periodic quality assurance audits based on complaints and service failure data, focusing on contractors or work types with recurring issues. KM also added that gas and lift servicing are independently checked from time to time to verify that a repair has been done correctly. 	<p>GP/KM</p> <p>KM</p>
--	--	------------------------

Complaints Scrutiny Session

	<p>In addition, the data for complaint and service failure processes are in place on our system to help identify those contractors underperforming.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Miscommunication about Repairs: SP and ZM highlighted the need to provide tenants and contractors with an up-to-date list of work orders or repairs to be completed because in most cases, contractors don't end up carrying out the jobs requested by residents. KM explained that individual jobs are raised on the system with different SOR codes which may not always be compatible with the devices used by the contractors and as a result limits the level of information they have access to. She, however, promised to look into the issue. ● Would you like to see more information about contractors not performing to be published about this? ○ Transparency and Publication of Data: AH and others discussed the potential for publishing contractor performance data, including satisfaction survey results and complaint trends, to increase transparency. KM confirmed that such data is shared with contractors and considered publishing more detailed breakdowns for residents. ● What's your experience of operative behaviour, appointments kept and attended on time, information about changes to appointments, information about progress of repairs requests and standard of work completed? ○ Planned Works and Routine Maintenance: SM thinks Hastoe's focus should be on how to improve communication around routine maintenance rather than contractor's visits. GP acknowledged the need for clearer communication around planned works schedule and routine maintenance. ○ Appointment Scheduling Challenges: KG and others reported difficulties in arranging repair appointments that fit their schedules, noting limited flexibility and the need to escalate complaints to secure suitable times. KM agreed to review appointment flexibility, including the possibility of evening and weekend slots. ● Resident's perception on whether contractor's appointments are kept on time and missed appointments ○ Missed Appointments and Accountability: KG appreciated the inclusion of fines for missed appointments in the contractor code of conduct, suggesting this would improve accountability. KM confirmed that financial penalties are now possible for contractors who miss appointments. 	<p>KM</p>
--	--	------------------

Complaints Scrutiny Session

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications around repairs and rearrangement of appointments for repairs ○ Access for Safety Checks: GP raised the issue of residents not providing access for mandatory safety checks and asked for suggestions to improve compliance. SP and others emphasized honest communication and flexibility in appointment times over incentives, with agreement that access should be a tenancy expectation. • Report on the standard of works completed No comments were provided. • Does our Contractor Code of Conduct contain what you would expect it to? ○ Code of Conduct Content: KG found the code of conduct generally adequate but suggested it could be more explicit about expectations, especially regarding appointment times and visible ID badges. KM explained that the code supplements the contract and welcomed further feedback. ○ Resident Access to Code: KG noted that tenants do not receive the full contract and suggested making the code of conduct publicly available. KM agreed to consider publishing it on the website so residents know what to expect from contractors. • What reasonable adjustments do you think we should provide for residents living with disabilities or long-term health conditions? ○ Reasonable Adjustments Suggestions: SM suggested prioritizing repairs that could impact health, providing temporary measures, allowing third-party access, scheduling longer appointments, and offering accessible information in various formats and languages. GP confirmed that some of these practices are already in place and welcomed further suggestions. GP and KM to review and, where appropriate, implement suggestions for reasonable adjustments for residents with disabilities or long-term health conditions, such as escalated repairs, temporary measures, flexible access arrangements, and accessible information formats. ○ Data Protection Practices: GP and KM explained the shift towards recording only the necessary service adjustments rather than detailed medical information, to minimize sensitive data held and shared with contractors. KG and SM discussed the balance between GDPR requirements and practical service delivery. 	<p style="text-align: center;">KM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">GP/KM</p>
--	---	--

Complaints Scrutiny Session

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recording of Resident’s vulnerabilities and Health Conditions: KG and others agreed that disclosure of information about people’s vulnerabilities and health conditions should be on a ‘need to know’ basis. SP reported that she had previously provided some information about her health condition and didn’t think it was well protected. GP agreed to look into this issue. ● Do you think our responsive repairs contractors trial periods on a small number of properties and listening to resident feedback before entering a longer-term contract is the right approach? Are there other ways you think we should engage with residents in procurement and onboarding of new contractors? ○ Trial Periods and Feedback: KM explained that new contractors are trialed on a small number of properties, with resident feedback collected before entering into long-term agreements. The trial period is flexible, and performance monitoring continues throughout the contract. ○ Contract Termination and Performance: KM assured the group that contracts include break clauses, allowing the organisation to end agreements with underperforming contractors, and emphasised the importance of ongoing resident feedback in contractor evaluation. ● Can you suggest ways of communicating exacerbating issues such as damp and mould issues more effectively with residents? ○ Education and Communication Strategies: SM and others suggested that education about property care should be factual, clear, and non-patronizing, with visual aids or leaflets explaining the pros and cons of actions like ventilating rooms. KM agreed to review the content of letters sent to residents. ○ Handling of Damp, Mould, and Structural Issues: ZM reported receiving repeated letters about condensation when the actual issue was a leak from above, finding the communication patronizing. GP and KM agreed that structural issues must be addressed first and committed to reviewing communication to ensure it is accurate and not dismissive. 	KM
5	AOB	
	GP asked the residents about what topics they would like on future meeting agenda and a discussion on communication, rents and service charges were suggested. GP to add this to the agenda for future meetings.	GP