ISLINGTON

Housing & Adult Social Services
7 Newington Barrow Way, London, N7 7EP

Report of: **Service Director, Housing Needs and Strategy**

Meeting of	Date	Agenda Item	Ward(s)
Housing Scrutiny Committee	26th January 2016	B4	All

Delete as appropriate	~~Exempt~~	Non-exempt

SUBJECT: 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey Results – Housing Services

1. Synopsis

1.1 This report sets out the background the customer satisfaction survey carried out during the summer of 2015 and highlights the key areas of feedback from residents.

1.2 This report outlines the action Housing Services will take to address the feedback and respond to residents' service priorities.

1.3 The full survey results are available on the council's website.

2. Recommendation

2.1 That the content of the report be noted.

3 Background

3.1 How we engage with residents

3.1.1 The two-yearly customer satisfaction survey is part of a wider programme of feedback opportunities that are used to improve and design our housing services.

3.1.2 In addition to this survey, targeted surveys and more focused customer feedback exercises are carried out through discussion groups, service reviews, on-line, paper and telephone surveys covering all aspects of housing services. In the past year, customer feedback has been gathered on learning from complaints, satisfaction with major works, responsive repairs, Right to Buy services and homeowner and housing management services. The two-yearly survey is the opportunity to hear from a larger number of residents on what they think about key aspects of our service. It provides a health-check and benchmark on how we are doing.

3.1.3 The council procured KWEST Research, an independent organisation, to carry out the satisfaction survey. Six tailored surveys were carried out by Kwest and these surveys were sent out to a random sample of residents selected from the following groups:

- Tenants whose homes are managed directly by the council
- Tenants whose homes are managed by Partners for Improvement in Islington (Partners)
- Tenants whose homes are managed by a resident-led organisations (TMO)
- Homeowners whose homes are managed directly by the council
- Homeowners whose homes are managed by Partners for Improvement in Islington (Partners)
- Homeowners whose homes are managed by a resident-led organisation (TMO)

3.1.4 The six surveys are tailored to the groups identified above. Wording of some questions has changed across the years to ensure that feedback reflects resident priorities and the changing services that the council provides. Therefore, it is not always possible to compare trends in satisfaction over time in every instance.

Table 1 **– Number of residents surveyed**

Resident Group	**Residents surveyed**	**Surveys completed**	**Response rate 2015 (%)**
Tenants	8022	1717	21%
Homeowners	8304	1629	20%

3.2 Benchmarking

3.2.1 To allow results to be placed in a meaningful context, findings for Islington's residents were combined and a comparison was undertaken using data published by HouseMark, one of the main benchmarking organisations for the social housing sector. Results are compared using data bands known as quartiles. Upper quartile (average of top 25%), median quartile (average of middle 50%) and lower quartile (average of bottom 25%).

3.2.2 Table 2 (below) shows that the combined results for Islington's tenant groups lay in the median quartile for most of the core feedback measures, with the exception of satisfaction with neighbourhoods, where satisfaction levels are above average. The combined results for Council, Partners and TMO homeowners lie in either the median or lower quartiles on these measures. However, it should be noted that the HouseMark figures for homeowners (table 3, overleaf) are national benchmarks and it is widely recognised that satisfaction levels in London are generally lower than average.

Table 2 **– Comparison against HouseMark data for general needs tenant surveys in London**

Description	Upper Quartile	Median Quartile	Lower quartile	Number of landlords in sample	Combined Islington tenants' result	Islington tenants' quartile position
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the overall service provided by their social housing provider	80%	76%	74%	20	74%	Lower quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the quality of their home	79%	75%	73%	18	76%	Median Quartile

Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live	81%	78%	74%	20	81%	Upper quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the way their social housing provider deals with repairs and maintenance	76%	70%	64%	20	70%	Median quartile

***Table 3* – Comparison against HouseMark data for homeowners surveys nationally**

Description	Upper Quartile	Median quartile	Lower quartile	Number of landlords in sample	Combined Islington homeowners' result	Islington homeowners' quartile position
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the overall service provided by their social housing provider	72%	62%	48%	22	43%	Lower quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live	80%	75%	69%	18	75%	Median quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied that their service charge provides value for money	52%	41%	30%	18	30%	Lower quartile
Percentage of respondents very or fairly satisfied with the way their social housing provider deals with communal repairs and maintenance	61%	46%	34%	19	32%	Lower quartile

3.3 Key survey results

3.3.1 The findings on key housing services reveal that overall satisfaction for tenants is going up (table 4) and overall satisfaction with homeowner services remains the same as in 2013 (table 5).

Table 4 **- Tenant satisfaction with key housing services**

Area of Service	Satisfaction 2011	Satisfaction 2013	Satisfaction 2015
Overall Satisfaction	72%	72%	74%
Repairs & Maintenance	66%	68%	70%
General condition of home	71%	73%	76%
Rent as Value for Money	72%	70%	74%

Table 5 **- Homeowner satisfaction with key housing services**

Area of Service	Satisfaction 2011	Satisfaction 2013	Satisfaction 2015
Overall Satisfaction	40%	44%	43%
Neighbourhood as a place to live	70%	76%	75%
Value for Money of Service Charge	31%	28%	30%

3.3.2 Repairs and maintenance is recognised as being a key driver of satisfaction and remains the consistent top priority for both tenants and homeowners. Tenants identified the overall quality of their homes and being kept informed as their second and third most important priorities. Homeowners place a much higher priority on value of money for service charge than having their views taken into account.

Table 6 **- Service priorities - tenants**

2013	%	**2015**	%
Repairs and Maintenance	65%	Repairs and Maintenance	73%
Keeping tenants informed	42%	Overall quality of home	48%
Overall quality of home	41%	Keeping tenants informed	45%

***Table 7* - Service priorities - homeowners**

2013	%	2015	%
Repairs and Maintenance	57%	Repairs and Maintenance	65%
Value for Money of Service Charge	53%	Value for Money of Service Charge	60%
Taking homeowners' views into account/ Dealing with anti-social behaviour	37%	Taking homeowners' views into account	41%

3.3.3 Tenants were asked to identify three services that they felt most need to be improved. Similar to the top priorities identified, the majority of tenants selected repairs and maintenance and overall quality of homes as the services they would most like improved. However, the percentage of tenants who feel that services need to improve in all three of these areas has decreased considerably since 2013 (table 8).

3.3.4 Similarly, homeowners were also asked to identify three services that they felt most need to be improved. The highest proportion of homeowners chose value for money of service charge and repairs and maintenance as the services they would most like to see improved. Since 2013, a growing percentage of homeowners seem to think that services in all three areas need improvement (table 9).

***Table 8* - Areas most in need of improvement for tenants**

Areas most in need on of improvement in 2013	%	Areas most in need of improvement in 2015	%
Taking residents' views into account	78%	Repairs and Maintenance	51%
Repairs and Maintenance	73%	Overall quality of home	47%
Overall quality of home	76%	Keeping tenants informed	40%

***Table 9* - Areas most in need of improvement for homeowners**

Areas most in need of improvement in 2013	%	Areas most in need of improvement in 2015	%
Value for Money of Service Charge	65%	Value for Money of Service Charge	73%
Repairs and Maintenance	42%	Repairs and Maintenance	48%
Taking homeowners' views into account	41%	Taking homeowners' views into account	45%

3.3.5 The council recognises that there are low satisfaction ratings on value for money of service charge and that it is the highest priority for homeowners, and an area identified by them as needing improvement. This means that this is very likely to be a key factor in low satisfaction rates.

3.3.6 In order to gain a better understanding of neighbourhood problems, tenants and homeowners were asked to prioritise problems in their local area. The following tables show the main issues identified.

Table 10 **- Problems are in the area - Tenants**

Neighbourhood problem	Tenants
Litter and rubbish in the street	56%
Dogs	48%
Drug dealing	37%

Table 11 **- Problems are in the area - homeowners**

Neighbourhood problem	Homeowners
Litter and rubbish in the street	75%
Dogs	57%
Noise from outside property	50%

3.4 What the survey tells also us

- The percentage of both tenants and homeowners satisfied with the overall service provided falls into the lower quartile when compared to other social landlords in London for tenants and nationally for homeowners.
- Repairs and maintenance is the most important service for both tenants and homeowners. Tenants are more satisfied than homeowners with the service provided by their landlord.
- Both tenants and homeowners are generally satisfied with their neighbourhoods as a place to live.
- Both tenants and homeowners view litter and rubbish in the streets and dogs as the top two problems in the area. It should be noted that it is not clear from the survey whether residents are referring to issues on their immediate estates or the wider area where they live.
- Less than 50% of tenants and homeowners are satisfied with the opportunities to take part in management and decision making.
- There is no significant difference in the data bands (gaps between quartiles) in the key areas of service for tenants. As there is no readily available comparative information on specific areas of service with other landlords; further investigation and benchmarking may be required to work out how Islington satisfaction levels compare to other landlords.
- Homeowners' satisfaction is low and has not improved in line with tenant satisfaction. This may be because homeownership overall in London is expensive, and residents have high expectations of the services their landlord can deliver and how much they are happy to pay for this.

3.5 What are we doing with the survey results?

3.5.1 The full KWEST report has been distributed to all divisional management teams in Housing for their consideration and action.

3.5.2 A summary action plan is attached as Appendix 1 to this report. This picks out the resident priorities and key areas of feedback from this report.

3.5.3 In the past year, three resident reference groups (housing management, leasehold management and repairs) have been set up to give on-going feedback on housing services and suggest improvements to working practices. The results of the survey will be fed back to these groups at their next meetings and this will be an opportunity for residents to have real input into how the survey results are used to progress service improvements.

3.5.4 The day to day resident engagement work listed in section 3.1.2 of this report will be used to gather further resident satisfaction information and compliment feedback provided by the KWEST survey.

4. Resident profile

4.11 The following is a summary breakdown of our resident profile. Understanding the make-up of residents assists the council in tailoring its services and ensuring everyone is treated fairly. Knowing what residents we are hearing from allows us to identify where there are gaps and the need to address these by targeting other feedback opportunities at particular groups or making opportunities more accessible.

4.1.2 Analysis of customer satisfaction identified a link between the age of the resident and satisfaction with services. For example, in terms of overall satisfaction with housing services; 82% of tenants aged 65 and over were satisfied compared to 71% of those aged 25-44. For homeowners 58% of those aged 65 and over were satisfied compared to 50% of those aged 25-44.

***Table 12* - Tenants' profile**

Age	Over 65 years	36%	45-64 years	42%	Under 44 years	23%		
Gender	Male	41%	Female	58.5%	Trans	0.5%		
Religion	Christian	65%	Muslim	13%	No Religion	13%	Other	9%
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	80%	LGBT	6%	Prefer not to say	15%		
Ethnicity A	White	74%	Black/Mixed Heritage/Asian	26%				
Ethnicity B	British	61%	Other	38%				
Long term illness, disability or impairment	Yes	49%	No	51%				

Table 13 **- Homeowners' profile**

Age	Over 65 years	19%	45-64 years	38%	Under 44 years	43%		
Gender	Male	48%	Female	51.8%	Trans	0.2%		
Religion	Christian	49%	Muslim	4%	No Religion	29%	Other	18%
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	78%	LGBT	8%	Prefer not to say	14%		
Ethnicity A	White	84%	Black/Mixed Heritage/Asian	16%				
Ethnicity B	British	67%	Other	33%				
Long term illness, disability or impairment	Yes	15%	No	85%				

4. Implications

4.1 Financial implications

There are no specific financial implications for this report.

4.2 Legal implications

There are no specific legal implications for this report.

4.3 Environmental Implications

There are no specific environmental implications for this report.

4.4 Resident Impact Assessment

The council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations, between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it (section 149 Equality Act 2010). The council has a duty to have due regard to the need to remove or minimise disadvantages, take steps to meet needs, in particular steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities, and encourage people to participate in public life. The council must have due regard to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

No resident impact assessment was carried out as part of the customer satisfaction survey. Impact assessments will be carried out as appropriate, in relation to any actions carried out as a result of the survey.

Background papers: None.

Appendices: Appendix 1 – Resident Satisfaction Survey Summary Action Plan

Final Report Clearance:

		18 January 2016
Signed by	……………………………………………………….	…………………..
	Maxine Holdsworth, Service Director – Housing Needs and Strategy	Date
		18 January 2016
Received by	……………………………………………………….	………………….
	Head of Democratic Services	Date

Report author: Wendy Gajadhar, Resident Engagement Officer
Tel: 020 7527 4141
E-mail: Wendy.Gajadhar@islington.gov.uk