



## **Appendix 9**

# **Resident Impact Assessment of the Group Structure Review**

### **Key themes**

- I. Changes following the Group Structure Review
- II. Consultation with residents
- III. How residents' views impacted upon the proposals
- IV. What is the impact of the GSR on residents

#### **I. Changes following the Group Structure Review**

1. Customer Service Provision
2. Resident Involvement resources
3. Board composition and Governance Structure
4. Income Recovery
5. Local office visiting arrangements
6. Re-defined Neighbourhood Manager Role
  - Areas that are not changed

##### **1) Customer Service Provision**

There are currently four customer service centres that are becoming two Regional Customer Service Centres. These two new Customer Service Centres will operate longer hours and on Saturday mornings.

##### **2) Resident involvement resources**

The new structure will lead to the creation of new Resident Involvement posts that are expected to increase resident involvement. The increased resident involvement capacity will enable Catalyst Housing to specifically target hard to reach groups for their involvement in service delivery. The creation of a new Board Support Officer will ensure that the Local Boards can operate with reduced bureaucracy and function more efficiently for residents.

##### **3) Board/ Governance**

#### **More Resident Board Members**

Changes to the governance structure will lead to more resident Board Members. Existing board structures, containing residents, were involved in the proposals and have agreed. Local Boards will have a greater capacity for performance monitoring and will be better able to tailor services to all residents.

## **Local Board recruitment**

Residents were given the option of election or selection for residents to become Board Members. Residents have decided that their preference is a selection process of a pool of volunteers that meet the criteria.

### **4) Income Recovery**

There are significant changes to the existing benefit system, and a more specialist focus is needed in this area. Income Management will be centralised and the role will be taken away from the Neighbourhood Manager (NM). The new Income Recovery Team will be able to identify problems early and provide better support for our residents to pay rent. The improved rent recovery will lead to a reduction in non-collected rent that can be used to benefit all customers.

### **5) Local Office visiting arrangements**

Our local offices are changing from a 9-5 drop-in service to an appointment based system.

### **6) Re-defined Neighbourhood Managers Role**

This will encourage NMs to be responsible for all residents on their estates. The larger patches would normally create increased difficulties, but by reducing the amount of administration duties then this will mean NMs are on site more and can more easily communicate with residents.

#### **- Areas that are not changed**

Maintenance arrangements, Business Development and Marketing, and Business Systems Department.

## **II. Consultation with Residents**

Prior to commencement, we sought the views of the TSA, the Group Residents' Federation and the Board Steering Group.

### **Method Statement-**

In January 2010 the Board took the decision to restructure the company. Residents were consulted and involved in the process in May/June 2010 to develop optional approaches to restructuring the company. The Board selected the current proposal in July 2010.

Residents were formally consulted over the period 13/12/10 to 31/01/11 via-

- An Entire Resident Population Survey. The survey consisted of formal, individually addressed letters to each tenant and leaseholder. Contents included Question and Answer sheet, leaflet, response sheet and prepaid envelopes.
- Meeting with existing resident groups.
- Posting materials to our website.
- Set up a consultation e-mail mailbox for replies.
- Put up posters and comments boxes in offices.
- Held 15 consultation events with residents (including those in sheltered accommodation etc) in local and accessible locations. Residents informed through an individual letter approximately two weeks before and a door knocking exercise of neighbourhood properties commencing two to three days prior to the events. All events were held in Disability

Discrimination Act (DDA) 1995 compliant locations. All events were held on non-religiously sensitive days and locations where possible.

Translations and other formats were produced on request.

Fifteen events were held and in total, 196 residents attended. A total of 620 residents responded to this consultation approach. For more specific details on the responses please refer to Appendix A.

### **III. How residents' view impacted upon the proposals**

We developed our proposals between May and June 2010 with our residents. Our residents identified that they wanted such as longer opening times, specific Neighbourhood Managers to areas, and the Customer Service Centre to achieve 80% right first time contact were identified.

The method that we used to consult has enabled our residents show whether they support or do not support our proposals. Appendix A shows that there is wide-spread support throughout the Group for all the changes that we want to make.

Residents were given the choice between electing or selecting Local Board Members. They have chosen selection, so we will honour their decision and use this method.

### **IV. What is the impact of the GSR on residents?**

#### **Gender +**

There is no indication of any specific impact on residents with these Protected Characteristics from the restructure. All residents are expected to receive the benefits of the changes regardless of Protected Characteristics. Overall there will be a positive impact.

#### **Age +**

There is no indication of any specific impact on residents with these Protected Characteristics from the restructure. All residents are expected to receive the benefits of the changes regardless of Protected Characteristics. Overall there will be a positive impact.

#### **Race +**

There is no indication of any specific impact on residents with these Protected Characteristics from the restructure. All residents are expected to receive the benefits of the changes regardless of Protected Characteristics. Overall there will be a positive impact.

#### **Sexual Orientation +**

There is no indication of any specific impact on residents with these Protected Characteristics from the restructure. All residents are expected to receive the benefits of the changes regardless of Protected Characteristics. Overall there will be a positive impact.

#### **Disability +**

All consultation events were held in DDA compliant locations. Plain English communication was used where possible. A legal letter needed to be sent to all residents and was not in Plain English. To ensure that our residents could understand the letter we also sent a brochure in Plain English explaining the letter and the proposals. All residents are expected to receive the benefits of the changes regardless of the Protected Characteristics. Overall there will be a positive impact.

#### **Religion or belief +**

There is no indication of any specific impact on residents with these Protected Characteristics from the restructure. All residents are expected to receive the benefits of the changes regardless of Protected Characteristics. Overall there will be a positive impact.

#### **Gender Reassignment +**

There is no indication of any specific impact on residents with these Protected Characteristics from the restructure. All residents are expected to receive the benefits of the changes regardless of Protected Characteristics. Overall there will be a positive impact.

#### **Pregnancy and Maternity Leave +**

There is no indication of any specific impact on residents with these Protected Characteristics from the restructure. All residents are expected to receive the benefits of the changes regardless of Protected Characteristics. Overall there will be a positive impact.

#### **Marriage and civil partnerships +**

There is no indication of any specific impact on residents with these Protected Characteristics from the restructure. All residents are expected to receive the benefits of the changes regardless of Protected Characteristics. Overall there will be a positive impact.

## Appendix A - Resident consultation: summary of responses

More than 620 residents took part in the resident consultation regarding our restructure, which ran from 15 December 2010 – 31 January 2011. Overall, 83% of those who fed in their views are in favour of our restructure proposals. More specifically:

- 82% are in favour of establishing local boards
- 46% feel that local board members should be elected from a pool of volunteers who meet the criteria (32% preferred selection through interviews)
- 70% are in favour of establishing a single customer services department
- 84% are in favour of rolling out the neighbourhood management system to all areas, and providing greater admin support for neighbourhood managers
- 93% are in favour of the customer services department being open for longer and aiming to deal with 80% of queries immediately

Below is the summary of responses to each proposal, for each member company.

**Our proposal:** Local boards will make decisions about local service delivery. Up to half the places on these boards will reserved for residents.

***Resident response:***

- CCHA London: 83% in favour
- CCHA South East: 84% in favour
- FCH: 80% in favour
- KHT: 76% in favour

**Key issues:** Resident board members should reflect a broad spectrum of residents and must have the right skills for the role

**Our proposal:** Local residents will elect their local board members from a pool of volunteers who meet the selection criteria for board member roles.

***Resident response:***

- CCHA London: 44% in favour (34% prefer selection by interview)
- CCHA South East: 50% in favour (30% prefer selection by interview)
- FCH: 45% in favour (28% prefer selection by interview)
- KHT: 49% in favour (27% prefer selection by interview)

**Key issues:** Very little support for full, open election. Opinion is divided between a purely selective process (as for non-resident Board members) and a mixed approach where residents will elect resident board members from a pool of candidates who meet the selection criteria. More residents favour the mixed approach.

**Our proposal:** A single customer services department will be responsible for all housing services and customer services

**Resident response:**

- CCHA London: 67% in favour
- CCHA South East: 65% in favour
- FCH: 75% in favour
- KHT: 58% in favour

**Key issues:** Residents broadly support this – but only as long as the department has enough trained staff to provide the service they need. Some concern that the service could become less personal. In general residents are less concerned with structure than with quality of service.

**Our proposal:** A designated neighbourhood manager will be responsible for all our residents and homes in a specific area.

**Resident response:**

- CCHA London: 83% in favour
- CCHA South East: 92% in favour
- FCH: 77% in favour
- KHT: 85% in favour

**Key issues:** It is important that there are enough NMs and that patch sizes are manageable, so that NMs are able to spend more time out and about in the communities they serve. It is important to know who your NM is, and for there is a deputy/alternate contact to provide cover in a NM's absence.

**Our proposal:** We will improve on how we deal with your queries on the telephone so we are able to answer 80% of your questions straightaway. We will also be open for longer, including early mornings, evenings and weekends.

**Resident response:**

- CCHA London: 93% in favour
- CCHA South East: 93% in favour
- FCH: 93% in favour
- KHT: 93% in favour

**Key issues:** Very strong support for longer opening hours and for queries being resolved quickly without being passed around. Some current frustration when residents are not able to reach someone who can help them, and when we don't take action/follow up.

**Overall proposal: We will join our housing associations together + make the four changes above.**

**Resident response:**

CCHA London: 86% in favour  
CCHA South East: 73% in favour  
FCH: 77% in favour  
KHT: 86% in favour

**Key issues:** Residents are broadly supportive of what we are proposing, as long as the changes will lead to tangible service improvements