

Saxon Weald Task and Finish Group Report

The ASB Journey

Jacqui Garman, Resident Chair of the Task and Finish Group

April 2026

Presented to Customer Experience Committee on 12 May 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Scope of the ASB Task and Finish Group.....	2
3. Methodology: How We Scrutinised the Service	2
3.1 Evidence Gathering & Data Review	2
3.2 Stakeholder Engagement.....	3
3.3 The Collaborative Workshop Model.....	3
3.4 Quick Reference: Areas of Focus.....	3
3.5 Dedicated Meetings	3
3.5.1 Meeting 1: Beginning the journey of ASB	4
3.5.2 Meeting 2: Saxon Weald Website and Portal - The Digital "Front Door" and Website Usability	5
3.5.3 Meeting 3: Communication - Tone and Victim Validation	7
3.5.4 Meeting 4: Case Studies - Investigation Barriers & Case Management...	11
3.5.5 Meeting 5: Managing Expectations and the Ombudsman's Five Pillars & Compliance.....	13
3.5.6 Meeting 6: Staff Surveys the Mirror Effect & the Final RoadMap	14
4. Chair's Closing Summary: From Scrutiny to Partnership.....	17

1. Introduction

In February 2026, a task and finish group was established, comprising 10 residents: Natalie Cox, Diana Lolo, Jill Phillips, Carol Rawlings, Adam Curtis, Ruby Sheriff, Philip Vidal, Obert Mnube, Adrian Pace, and myself, Jacqui Garman, serving as Resident Chair.

I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to all group members for their valuable contributions, commitment, and input, which have been instrumental in producing this report. We conducted seven hybrid meetings at Saxon Weald House, facilitated by Saxon Weald staff, Kay Simpson (Customer Engagement Manager) and Jeremy Oliver Jones (Customer Experience Manager), with Laura Anderson (Housing Operations Manager) joining as the Subject Matter Expert (SME).

2. Scope of the ASB Task and Finish Group

The Saxon Weald Task and Finish Group was established to address antisocial behaviour (ASB) following its identification as a primary area of resident dissatisfaction in the Tenant Satisfaction Measures and a top priority in Vision One consultations. Recognising that resident concerns often centre on communication and transparency rather than just final outcomes, our primary aim was to improve the resident experience by examining how expectations are managed and how clearly the ASB process is explained.

The scope of our work focused on the day-to-day handling of ASB—from initial reporting and case assessment to investigation and closure—with a specific emphasis on evaluating the clarity and accessibility of all resident-facing communications, including website guidance, letters, and templates. By analysing anonymised case studies and Housing Ombudsman expectations, we sought to identify ways to better articulate the legal and practical limits of landlord action and the necessity of evidence, ensuring that the process feels fair, consistent, and easy to understand from a resident's perspective.

3. Methodology: How We Scrutinised the Service

To ensure a comprehensive and balanced review, the Task and Finish Group (TFG) employed a multi-layered research approach over six meetings. Our process was defined by active collaboration rather than passive observation.

3.1 Evidence Gathering & Data Review

The group interrogated a wide range of internal and external evidence, including:

- Case File Audits: Reviewing anonymised ASB cases to track the "real-life" journey from report to closure.
- Communication Analysis: A deep-dive audit of Saxon Weald's letter templates, website navigation, and digital advice tools.

Saxon Weald Task and Finish Group ASB Report

- **Regulatory Alignment:** Benchmarking Saxon Weald's current performance against the Housing Ombudsman's "Five Pillars" and the new Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSMs).

3.2 Stakeholder Engagement

We didn't work in a vacuum. Our findings were shaped by direct dialogue with:

- **Frontline Staff:** We conducted surveys with the Customer Support Team and Housing Managers to identify "pain points" in their daily workflows.
- **Subject Matter Expert:** Regular "check-ins" with the Housing Operations Manager to test the feasibility of our emerging ideas.
- **Independent Research:** The Chair conducted external market research into modern ASB tools, such as rapid-deployment 24-hour CCTV solutions.

3.3 The Collaborative Workshop Model

Unlike traditional formal committees, our meetings were designed as interactive workshops. Every recommendation in this report was born out of:

- **Round-Table Debate:** Moving away from "sit and listen" presentations to active problem-solving sessions.
- **Role-Reversal:** Putting ourselves in the shoes of both the frustrated resident and the overstretched Housing Manager to find "win-win" solutions.

3.4 Quick Reference: Areas of Focus

To provide a clear overview of our investigation, the group focused on:

- **Operational Practice:** How cases are assessed, prioritised, and recorded.
- **Communication Standards:** Reviewing the "plain language" and accessibility of templates and guidance.
- **Expectation Management:** Explaining the shared responsibilities between residents, the landlord, and partner agencies.
- **Lessons Learned:** Reviewing both successful and unsuccessful case outcomes to improve future practice.

3.5 Dedicated Meetings

To ensure a comprehensive review, our work was conducted over six dedicated meetings, each focusing on a specific aspect of the ASB service:

Meeting 1: Beginning the Journey – An overview of how ASB is handled in practice, from the initial report and assessment to how cases are prioritised and investigated.

Meeting 2: Saxon Weald Website and Portal – A review of digital accessibility and the clarity of information provided to residents online.

Meeting 3: Communication – An audit of the letters, emails, and templates used to keep residents informed throughout a case.

Meeting 4: Case Studies – A deep dive into anonymised examples of both positive and negative resident experiences to identify lessons for the future.

Meeting 5: Managing Expectations and the Ombudsman – Evaluating how we explain legal limits and shared responsibilities, alongside a review of Housing Ombudsmen expectations.

Meeting 6: Staff Survey Results – Hearing directly from the staff involved in ASB and customer services to understand the internal challenges of delivery.

Our goal throughout this process was to identify both "quick wins" and long-term changes that will make the ASB process feel fairer and more transparent for every resident.

3.5.1 Meeting 1: Beginning the journey of ASB

In the inaugural session of the Task and Finish Group, the group employed a Scenario-Based Testing methodology to evaluate the "front door" of the ASB service. Members were tasked with a pre-reading exercise involving two contrasting scenarios: Case 1 (High-Risk ASB) involving verbal abuse and loitering, and Case 2 (Non-ASB Lifestyle Clash) regarding noise from children playing in a communal garden.

The group analysed these cases through three specific lenses:

- Accessibility of access channels (how a resident initiates contact);
- Service Level Agreement appropriateness (the validity of current response times);
- Outcome expectations (the viability of the landlord's intervention).

This methodology allowed the group to identify "friction points" in the resident journey, particularly the barriers faced by neurodiverse or disabled tenants, and provided the evidence base for our recommendations regarding a unified recording system and intent-based triage.

The group's initial review of the reporting process identified a significant "data gap" regarding lifestyle clashes and non-ASB incidents. Currently, these reports are handled through general customer records, but the group strongly recommends they be recorded in a dedicated area to ensure a clear audit trail should behaviours escalate into formal ASB at a later date. It was also agreed that the online reporting portal should have a question added asking if this is a repeat incident.

Furthermore, the group—with the unanimous support of the SME—identified that the current reliance on two separate internal reporting systems is a primary cause of triage delays and administrative friction. To improve accessibility, particularly for neurodiverse residents who face higher barriers to reporting, the group advocates for a "Single System" approach. This should focus on the intent and impact of the

Saxon Weald Task and Finish Group ASB Report

behaviour (e.g., deliberate noise vs. general lifestyle) rather than rigid categorisation, ensuring that the resident's lived experience is prioritised over administrative convenience. Considering this, the group proposed implementing a universal ASB logging template to ensure comprehensive and consistent documentation of each case

3.5.1.1 Meeting 1 Recommendations

Ref	Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
R1.1	Unify Reporting Systems: Move from the current dual-system infrastructure to a single, unified recording method for all ASB.	Unanimously supported by the group and SME to reduce triage errors and administrative delays.	Critical
R1.2	Universal Reporting Template: Design and implement a standardised template for logging all ASB/Nuisance reports across all departments.	To ensure consistency in data collection, ensuring no key points are missed regardless of how the report is made.	High
R1.3	Dedicated Nuisance Logging: Create a dedicated area for "Non-ASB" or lifestyle reports within the system.	To ensure an audit trail exists if minor incidents escalate into a pattern of ASB over time.	High
R1.4	Intent-Based Triage: Update reporting forms to focus on the intent of the behaviour and the impact on the victim.	Allows for more nuanced handling of cases (e.g., targeted noise) that may currently fall through the cracks.	High
R1.5	Online Form Enhancements: Add two specific prompts to the web form: 1) "Is this a repeat incident?" and 2) "Emergency? Call 999."	Improves immediate risk assessment and identifies escalating patterns of behaviour earlier.	Quick Win

3.5.2 Meeting 2: Saxon Weald Website and Portal - The Digital "Front Door" and Website Usability

The group conducted a live evaluation of Saxon Weald's website, assessing its effectiveness as the primary portal for reporting ASB. While the current online form

Saxon Weald Task and Finish Group ASB Report

was praised for its simplicity and its focus on "how the incident made you feel", several significant barriers were identified.

Members noted that the requirement to log into a "My Saxon Weald" account acts as a deterrent for residents in crisis or those who do not have established digital accounts.

During the meeting, the group examined other housing association websites to compare them with Saxon Weald and gather ideas for enhancing their own site. It became clear that opinions were divided; some members favoured interactive tools, while others preferred visual aids or simple, easy-to-read documents. Because the group represents a segment of tenants, it would be beneficial for the website to consider these diverse needs by offering multiple communication options.

It was observed that other housing associations offered a 'Dear Neighbour' card, which allows residents to contact their neighbours anonymously before reporting ASB. These could either be requested by the tenant or downloaded directly from the website. The group responded positively to this feature and felt that Saxon Weald should implement and promote it as well.

A recurring theme was the need for "Easy Read" content and visual aids, such as short videos or animations, to explain complex concepts like "lifestyle clashes". The group found that the current text-heavy policy documents are alienating and should be separated from the reporting journey. There was a strong preference for an "interactive" feel that allows residents to self-triage their issues—clearly distinguishing between criminal ASB and tenancy management issues—before they reach the reporting form. Some group members preferred a simple report-now option, leading to recommendation 1 for a dual approach.

3.5.2.1 Meeting 2 Recommendations

Ref	Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
R2.1	The "Dual-Path" Homepage Design: Create two distinct, high-visibility buttons on the ASB landing page: 1. "Report ASB Now" and 2. "About ASB/Information."	Directly addresses the group's concern by separating the urgent reporting action from the educational/policy content.	Critical
R2.2	Bypass Login for Reporting: Allow residents to report ASB via the "Report Now" path without requiring a "My Saxon Weald" login.	Removes a major technical barrier for residents in crisis or those without digital accounts.	Critical

Ref	Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
R2.3	Interactive Self-Triage Toolkit (The "About" Path): Under the "About ASB" path, provide a toolkit to help residents identify if their issue is ASB or a lifestyle clash.	Manages resident expectations and reduces "incorrect" reports before they are submitted.	Medium
R2.4	Implement "Easy Read" Guides: Use the "About ASB" section to host "Easy Read" versions of policies using visual aids and simple language.	Improves accessibility for neurodiverse residents and for those where English is not their first language.	Critical
R2.5	"Explain it in Video" Content: Feature a short video in the "About" section explaining the process and "What Happens Next."	Humanises the process and provides clarity for those who struggle with large blocks of text.	Medium
R2.6	Downloadable "Dear Neighbour" Cards: Ensure these cards are a primary "Self-Help" download within the "About ASB" section.	Empowers residents to resolve minor issues independently where appropriate.	Quick Win

3.5.3 Meeting 3: Communication - Tone and Victim Validation

The group conducted a "deep-dive" audit of 12 core correspondence documents, focusing specifically on initial acknowledgment letters and dispute closure notices. The overarching finding was a significant deficiency in empathy and a tone that many members described as "patronising" and "dismissive".

In the initial acknowledgment of a complaint, the group found the tone to be overly bureaucratic. The requirement for 14-day diary sheets was presented as a barrier ("no further action will be taken") rather than a supportive tool. Furthermore, the "Neighbour Dispute" closure letter was criticised for creating a "false equivalence" of guilt, implying that the victim and the respondent were equally at fault by requesting both parties "not to confront" each other. The group felt strongly that the

current language fails to validate the resident's experience and misses critical opportunities to promote supportive services like Mediation and Conflict Coaching.

The "Empathy Gap" and Communication Logic

Upon a detailed scrutiny of 12 core documents—ranging from FAQ sheets to formal dispute correspondence—the group identified a consistent 'Empathy Gap' that fundamentally undermines the resident experience. While the group found that Saxon Weald is highly effective at writing clear, firm, and purposeful 'Breach of Tenancy' letters to those breaking the rules, this same standard is not applied to those seeking help. Instead, correspondence for victims was found to be legalistic, deterrent, and at times, patronising. The group unanimously agreed on creating a quality checklist to serve as guidance for any staff member responsible for ASB correspondence.

The following recommendations seek to bridge this gap by 'flipping' the current script: moving away from a tone that emphasises why the landlord cannot act, toward a supportive framework that validates the resident's experience, simplifies the evidence-gathering process, and ensures no resident is left in a 'support vacuum' without clear signposting to mediation or external partners.

In certain correspondence, it was suggested that tenants should approach their neighbours prior to contacting Saxon Weald. The group agreed that this determination ought to be made by the Housing Manager after discussing the matter with the tenant, particularly considering safety concerns.

3.5.3.1 Meeting 3 Recommendations

Ref		Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
R3.1		Tone of Voice Review: Rewrite all ASB templates to remove patronising language (e.g., "we cannot expect everyone to get on") and replace with empathetic, validating terminology.	To ensure residents feel heard and supported rather than blamed for reporting a nuisance.	Critical
R3.2		"The Mediation First" Protocol: Explicitly offer Mediation and the "Conflict Coach" service in every dispute letter	Maximises the use of existing support tools and provides a constructive path forward for "Non-ASB" cases.	High

Saxon Weald Task and Finish Group ASB Report

Ref		Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
		where no clear conclusion is reached.		
R3.3		Retrospective Diary Entries: Update the 14-day diary sheet instructions to clarify that residents can include recent past events to establish a pattern immediately.	Prevents the feeling that the "clock starts at zero" when a resident has already been suffering for weeks.	Critical
R3.4		Remove "Speak to Neighbour" Requirement	For safety reasons, this advice should only be given verbally by a Housing Manager after a risk assessment.	Critical
R3.5		Digital Return Options: Explicitly state that diary sheets and evidence can be returned via email/photo, alongside the prepaid envelope option.	Modernises the process and reduces the effort required for the resident to submit evidence.	Quick Win
R3.6		Terminology Update: Replace the term "Perpetrator" in general correspondence with more neutral language like "Other Party" until a breach of tenancy is proven.	To avoid escalating tensions and maintain a professional, objective tone in early-stage disputes.	Critical
R3.7		The "Empathy Flip" Strategy: Rewrite the ASB FAQ to focus on support and	To stop the "deterrent" effect where residents feel discouraged from	Critical

Saxon Weald Task and Finish Group ASB Report

Ref		Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
		encouragement. Instead of "We can't act without X," use "To help us build the strongest case for you, we need X."	reporting legitimate concerns.	
R3.8		Staff Correspondence Checklist: Implement a mandatory three-point "Quality & Empathy" tick-list for all staff before sending ASB letters: 1. Is it empathetic? 2. Is the problem clearly defined? 3. Is it tailored to the individual?	Ensures a human-centric approach is maintained even in high-volume caseloads.	High
R3.9		Multi-Agency Signposting: When a case is closed because it isn't a "breach of tenancy," the letter must include links to the police, social services, or local support groups.	Ensures the resident isn't left in a "support vacuum" just because the landlord's legal powers have reached their limit.	High
R3.10		Anonymous Reporting Encouragement: Rephrase anonymity clauses to be supportive. Acknowledge the fear of retaliation and explain how Saxon Weald wants to know about issues even if	Encourages "intelligence gathering" even when a witness isn't ready for court, allowing for earlier intervention.	Medium

Ref		Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
		the reporter stays anonymous.		
R3.11		Inclusive Evidence Options: Explicitly offer alternatives to written diary sheets (e.g., voice notes, photos, or phone check-ins) for residents who cannot use traditional forms.	Ensures the service is compliant with the Equality Act and accessible to those with varying needs.	Critical

3.5.4 Meeting 4: Case Studies - Investigation Barriers & Case Management

The group redirected its attention to the "living" phase of an ASB case, specifically the period spanning from the initial report to final resolution. Through analysis of various case studies—including suspected drug activity and ongoing noise disturbances—the group identified a "support vacuum," highlighting instances where residents experience isolation during prolonged cases.

A central theme of the meeting involved the creation of a comprehensive "ASB Information Pack." The group recommended distributing this pack early in the process to effectively manage expectations. It would clarify the legal thresholds required for actions such as eviction or injunctions and outline how a resident's lack of response can result in case closure due to insufficient evidence. Additionally, the discussion encompassed the significance of Multi-Agency Signposting, emphasising collaboration with Environmental Health for statutory noise concerns and "Age Concern" for older residents who may require advocacy to navigate procedural complexities.

Further, the group expanded its review beyond document audits to assess the 'life cycle' of high-level ASB cases. By examining detailed scenarios involving persistent noise, unauthorised structures (including hot tubs and gazebos), and suspected criminal activity, the group identified key 'friction points' that often impede investigations. The findings concentrate on strategies Saxon Weald can employ to overcome accused tenants' stalling tactics and leverage advanced technology to collect evidence securely.

The "Access Loophole": The group identified a recurring issue where alleged respondents avoid property inspections. Currently, there is no firm limit on how many times a respondent can claim to be "out" or "busy" before the landlord takes a

harder line. This creates a "stalling loop" that can last months, while the victim remains in distress.

The Evidence "Technological Gap" & Rapid Deployment: In cases of suspected drug dealing or high-level harassment, residents are often too terrified to keep written diary sheets or act as witnesses. During the meeting, it was initially suggested that installing CCTV is a slow and difficult process. However, independent research presented by the Chair revealed that temporary or mobile CCTV units can be deployed much more easily and often within 24 hours. Unlike permanent fixtures, these rapid-deployment units provide immediate intelligence and a visible deterrent, bypassing long-term infrastructure hurdles.

The "Lifestyle vs. Statutory" Confusion: The group discussed the difficulty of proving noise nuisance to a legal standard. The group found that while Saxon Weald investigates "Breach of Tenancy", they often lack the technical equipment to measure statutory noise. A formal, mandatory partnership with Environmental Health is required to ensure cases are backed by scientific data rather than just subjective accounts.

3.5.4.1 Meeting 4 Recommendations

Ref	Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
R4.1	Advocacy Partnerships - partnering with agencies like Age Concern.	To help vulnerable or older residents navigate the formal process.	High
R4.2	"Three-Attempt" Access Rule - setting a firm limit on property access attempts for investigations.	To prevent respondents from stalling the process.	Critical
R4.3	Environmental Health Referral – standardising the link to EH for statutory noise monitoring.	To ensure objective, technical evidence is gathered.	Medium
R4.4	CCTV – reviewing the feasibility of temporary mobile surveillance (more accessible to landlords) in high- level criminal cases	Facilitate evidence gathering where residents are too intimidated to act as witnesses.	High

3.5.5 Meeting 5: Managing Expectations and the Ombudsman's Five Pillars & Compliance

The group reviewed the Housing Ombudsman's expectations for ASB management, focusing on the "Five Pillars": Proactive Communication, Accountability, Empathy, Documentation, and Timely Resolution.

In this session, the group looked at how they could support Saxon Weald in meeting the Housing Ombudsman's "Five Pillars". They did not look at this as a "compliance test" but as a way to build a more transparent, stress-free relationship between residents and staff. The group found that by sharpening communication, Saxon Weald could protect the wellbeing of both the people reporting ASB and the managers handling the cases.

Breaking the Silence (Working Together)

The group discussed how stressful "no news" can be for a resident but also recognised that Housing Managers are often working hard behind the scenes with the police or maintenance. To bridge this gap, the group proposed creating a "check-in" culture. By agreeing on a simple update schedule (even if it's just a quick "no news yet" text), Saxon Weald can stop the resident from feeling ignored and stop the Manager from getting "chasing" calls. It's about mutual respect for each other's time.

Seeing the Whole Person (Universal Risk Assessment)

Every resident is different, and some need a little more support than others. The group wants to ensure that Housing Managers have the tools to spot those needs on Day 1. A simple, universal check at the start of a case ensures that if a tenant has a disability or mental health struggle, the staff can adjust their approach immediately. This takes the guesswork out for the staff and makes the resident feel truly "seen". This also applies to the tenant who may be instigating the ASB.

Managing expectations - Clear Beginnings and Clear Endings (The Roadmap)

A lot of frustration comes from not knowing where the "finish line" is. The group felt that if residents are given a clear map of the legal process at the start, they are much more patient when things take time. Empower residents by clarifying legal thresholds early. When tenants know what Saxon Weald can do within housing law from the start, expectations align with possible outcomes.

When a case is closed, the Ombudsman requires that closure occurs with a clear explanation. The action taken must be specified, along with guidance on what steps the tenant can pursue if dissatisfied. It was recommended in the group that every closure letter include a direct link to the Saxon Weald complaints process. This ensures residents understand why their case was closed and provides clear instructions on how to exercise their "Right to Appeal" should they wish to challenge the decision.

3.5.5.5 Meeting 5 Recommendations

Ref	Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
R5.1	Agreed update intervals - Residents feel ignored or forgotten when there is no news, leading to increased anxiety and "silence" complaints.	To maintain the Ombudsman's pillar of proactive communication by checking in even when there is no news.	Critical
R5.2	Universal Risk Assessment - Vulnerabilities (mental health/disability) aren't always flagged on Day 1, leading to a "one-size-fits-all" approach.	To identify support needs immediately and ensure Saxon Weald meets the "Accountability" and "Empathy" pillars.	Critical
R5.3	Formal "Closing Statement" Protocol Cases are often closed with generic messages, leaving residents feeling dismissed and unheard.	Ombudsman Requirement: Provide a summary of the investigation, why evidence failed the threshold, and the Right to Appeal.	Critical
R5.4	Stage 1 Roadmap Disclosure. Residents are often unaware of the limitations of the landlord's legal powers, leading to unrealistic expectations.	To manage expectations early by clearly outlining what Saxon Weald can and cannot do under housing law.	High

3.5.6 Meeting 6: Staff Surveys the Mirror Effect & the Final RoadMap

Meeting 6 served as the "evidence anchor" for the entire scrutiny process. By analysing the results of the Housing Manager and Customer Support Team (CST) Surveys, the group discovered a remarkable alignment: the staff's professional frustrations perfectly mirror the residents' lived experiences. This meeting was dedicated to finalising a suite of "win-win" recommendations that solve operational headaches for staff while significantly improving the service for residents.

Detailed Staff Survey Analysis: The "Mirror Effect"

To validate our resident-led findings, the group reviewed data from 22 frontline staff members. The results confirm that the "friction points" felt by residents are caused by the following internal challenges:

The "Visibility Gap" in Customer Support: CST staff reported that once an ASB case is initialised, it effectively "disappears" from their system view. This leaves them unable to provide basic status updates, directly contributing to the resident's "vacuum of silence."

Systemic Failure of Templates: A key finding was that staff are frequently bypassing official Saxon Weald templates. Because the existing templates are described as "awful", cold, or outdated, staff are spending extra time writing their own manual letters from scratch to try and provide a better service. This is an inefficient use of Housing Managers' time and leads to inconsistent communication across the organisation.

Resource & Capacity Constraints: Housing Managers identified that they are "spread too thin" due to non-ASB tasks (parking/loft access). This lack of "breathing space" is why "Agreed Update Intervals" are often missed.

Support for Specialism: There was an overwhelming consensus that complex enforcement (drugs/criminality) requires a Dedicated ASB Specialist, allowing Housing Managers to return to proactive tenancy management.

A Mandate for Transparency: 73% of staff surveyed agreed that a shared tracking mechanism (App/Portal) would improve the journey, drastically reducing the volume of "chasing" calls and emails.

Key Finding: A Shared Struggle

The survey data revealed that staff feel "spread too thin" by non-ASB tasks and are often forced to use outdated communication templates that don't work. Crucially, the CST highlighted a "visibility gap"—once an ASB case is raised, it often "disappears" from their view, leaving them unable to provide updates to concerned residents. This "Mirror Effect" confirms that the current system is failing both the person delivering the service and the person receiving it.

The ASB Pack: Setting the Standard, the ASB 'Action Pack': A Unified Request

The most striking example of the "Mirror Effect" was the shared call for a standardised ASB Pack. While residents identified this as essential for clarity and reassurance, several Housing Managers explicitly requested this tool in their surveys. Staff expressed that having a physical or digital "ASB Pack" would provide them with a structured framework to give to residents on Day 1. This would ensure that both parties are "singing from the same song sheet" regarding evidence collection, diary sheets, and service expectations. The creation of this pack is a

significant "win-win": it professionalises the service for the resident and provides a vital administrative toolkit for the Housing Manager.

A central theme of our review was the need to move away from "ad-hoc" communication and towards a professional, structured onboarding process for residents reporting ASB. The group identified that at the point of report, residents often feel a sense of "freefall" where they are unsure what happens next or what is expected of them. To resolve this, the creation of a comprehensive ASB Pack is essential. This pack will serve as a single source of truth, containing the "Agreed Update Intervals", clear definitions of what constitutes ASB, a guide to the investigation process, and a "Diary of Events" toolkit. By providing this pack at Day 1, Saxon Weald moves from a reactive stance to a proactive partnership, empowering the resident with the information they need to feel supported and informed.

Strategic Recommendations: The "Four Pillars" of Meeting 6

1. The Specialist Support Model: Establishing a dedicated ASB Specialist Officer to handle high-level enforcement. This allows Housing Managers to return to proactive tenancy management, ensuring they have the time to actually "manage" their patches.
2. Capacity Building: A call for increased Housing Manager resource. The group identified that the "vacuum of silence" (the lack of updates to residents) is a direct result of staff being overstretched. To meet the Ombudsman's standards, staff need the "breathing space" to communicate.
3. The "ASB Advice Screen": Equipping the Customer Support Team with a digital, one-page Home Hub review. This ensures that the very first person a resident speaks to has the scripts and "urgency categories" needed to provide a consistent, professional response.
4. Transparent Case Tracking: The introduction of a Live Tracking App/Portal. By allowing residents to see the status of their case in real-time (similar to a parcel delivery), we reduce the volume of "chasing" calls and empower residents with immediate information.

3.5.6.1 Meeting 6 Recommendations

Ref	Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
R6.1	Creation of a comprehensive ASB pack	To provide a standardised physical/digital pack at the start of every case that sets clear expectations, outlines the "Service Promise", and provides the tools (like diary sheets) for the resident to assist in the investigation.	Critical

Ref	Recommendation	Rationale	Priority
R6.2	Dedicated email address for ASB reporting.	ASB reports currently get lost in general inboxes, leading to triage delays and a lack of accountability. Create a professional point of contact that ensures reports are directed immediately to the right team and can be tracked accurately.	High
R6.3	ASB Specialist Officer	To handle high-level enforcement (drugs/noise), freeing up Housing Managers for general tenancy support.	Critical
R6.4	Increased Housing Manager resource	To reduce caseloads so staff have the "breathing space" to provide the agreed regular updates to residents.	Critical
R6.5	CST Advice Screen	To provide a one-page digital toolkit for the call centre to ensure a consistent, professional "Day 1" response.	Medium
R6.6	Live Case Tracking	A transparent app or portal for residents to see case progress in real-time, reducing "chasing" calls.	High

4. Chair's Closing Summary: From Scrutiny to Partnership

As the Chair of this Task and Finish Group, I have been privileged to lead a process that was far more than a formal review of policies. This report is the result of six meetings of intense, energetic, and—most importantly—collaborative discussion.

A Living Dialogue

From our very first meeting, it was clear that this group was not interested in a "sit down and listen" approach. Instead, we created a space where every resident felt empowered to challenge the status quo. Our sessions were characterised by open debate, shared storytelling, and a genuine desire to understand the "other side" of the desk. We didn't just look at data; we interrogated it. We didn't just read letters; we rewrote them.

The Power of Contribution

Every member of this group—from those who have lived through the most difficult ASB cases to those who brought fresh eyes to the website—contributed to the "Golden Thread" of these recommendations. The diversity of our voices ensured that we looked at the ASB journey from every angle: the victim's fear, the neighbours' frustration, and the Housing Manager's workload.

The Shared Conclusion

Perhaps our most significant discovery was the "Mirror Effect" identified in Meeting 6. Realising that the staff's frustrations with outdated systems and high caseloads perfectly matched our own frustrations as residents was a powerful moment. It shifted our perspective from "us vs. them" to a unified "we".

Final Thought to the Committee

We are presenting you with a roadmap that has been road-tested by the people who use the service and validated by the people who deliver it. These recommendations are not just a list of improvements; they are a commitment to a new culture of transparency and respect at Saxon Weald.

I am incredibly proud of the dedication shown by this group. We didn't just find problems; we built the solutions. We now invite the Committee to take these findings and turn our collaborative vision into a daily reality for all residents.

Jacqui Garman

Resident Chair, ASB Task and Finish Group

April 2026