

**RESIDENT SCRUTINY PANEL MEETING
MINUTES
Tuesday 28 March 2023 on Teams**

Present: Members
Adam Field (AF)
Alex Tuckwell (AT)
Kirsty East (KE)
Natalieann Leadbetter (NL)
Paul Evans (PE)
Sue Masters (SM)

In attendance
Sarah Holden (SH), Resident Scrutiny Manager
Katherine Parker (KP), Independent Chair
Amanda Mankelow, (AM) Resident Scrutiny Administrative Assistant (Minutes)

1. Welcome & apologies for absence	Actions
1.1 KP welcomed everyone and thanked them for joining.	
1.2 Valerie George (VG) and Kevin Dodds (KD) were not expected to be present.	
1.3 Steve Hill (StH) was delayed and was expected to join later.	
2. Declarations of interest	
2.1 None.	
3. Minutes of last meeting (Tuesday 28 February) & matters arising	
3.1 Solihull Community Housing's ASB and noise leaflets had been circulated to the panel by email after the last meeting.	
3.2 The panel had not raised any further questions for Solihull Community Housing following their presentation at the last meeting.	
3.3 The slides from Solihull Community Housing's presentation had been circulated to the panel following the last meeting.	
3.4 AT had advised at the last meeting that she needed to look at the recommendations properly before giving feedback. Another opportunity for discussion would be given later in agenda item 4.	
3.5 StH had advised at the last meeting that he would be following up with SH and AM regarding a point he wanted to make about the recommendations. SH and AM would catch up with StH separately about this if he didn't manage to join the meeting later.	SH/AM
3.6 KE had sent her views on the recommendations to SH and AM and these had been incorporated.	
3.7 VG had advised at the last meeting that she needed to look at the recommendations properly before giving feedback. SH and AM would catch up with VG separately about this.	SH/AM

- 3.8 In response to the idea about emulating Solihull Community Housing's "all out days" (the practice of staff attending blocks with known issues for a day to speak with residents), AM read out an email from Eleanor Randall, Community Safety Manager. It stated that TCH do some visits and tenancy audits in problem areas but staffing restraints curtail this, however the team wanted the panel's thought about sending out surveys instead.
- 3.9 SH raised concerns about what would be done with survey outcomes, stating that it may raise expectations if residents take time to answer, trust may fade if TCH do not act. AT spoke about possibly getting a poor response as with other surveys carried out.
- 3.10 The panel agreed to the sentiment of the survey but felt it needed to be given some thought. KE acknowledged that data can't be collected without being specific about what it's for, and that everyone needed to be catered for, for instance will the survey be lengthy. KE advised of a previous employer who used surveys and published 'you said, we did' reports at the end of the year "closing the feedback loop".
- 4. Agree final recommendations**
- 4.1 SH asked for further comments about the recommendations, explaining that following tonight's discussion and follow ups with members who were not present, these would be put into a draft board report for SM and StH to present to board on 18 May. AM shared the interim recommendations on screen.
- 4.2 SH confirmed that SM had the board meeting date in her diary but that StH would likely join online due to travelling logistics. She advised full details would be agreed nearer the time.
- 4.3 AT confirmed she was happy for the recommendations to go to board.
- 4.4 NL joined the meeting at this point.
- 4.5 SH asked KE if there was anything else she would like to add. She suggested providing examples, alongside the recommendations, of organisations the panel wished to be added to the website. SH explained that the TCH website rebuild is underway so there was not a huge amount of information on there currently. SH felt it could act as a triage function if there was more signposting information, stating that the recommendation could say the panel would like to see an exhaustive list grouped by geographical areas. KE spoke of Oasis, DMV and Safe Haven that she knew of. SH advised of DAVVS in Tunbridge Wells. The rest of the panel agreed this would be a good idea.
- 4.6 SH asked SM if she had further input. She advised that police dismissed the idea of putting up CCTV in her case, saying TCH wouldn't be allowed to do it, that it was out of our remit, possibly legally. SH will speak to ER about it as it would be no use recommending something which can't be delivered. Possibly recommendation 2 could be reworded to say "in discussion with the police". SM felt they were really strong recommendations that would make a big difference.
- 4.7 SH asked PE for his comments, he said that people need to be directed correctly and not fobbed off, ensuring that TCH are following through generally when we say we will. SH acknowledged the need to have a timeframe for responding especially with DV as someone's life could be in danger.
- 4.8 AF agreed, saying that residents don't want to be jumping through hoops with this sort of situation.

SH

4.9	SH asked NL for her input. She felt they were good recommendations and suggested that a specific time be given to residents for a call back in DV cases, so the person can ensure they're in a safe place to hold the conversation. SH will check with ER what currently happens in these circumstances.	SH
4.10	SH confirmed that those panel members who are missing would be asked first for their feedback and if anything is tweaked on the recommendations, it would be highlighted to the rest of the panel. SH stated she would aim to get the finished report to the panel by 14 April. The panel agreed to this process. SH advised that the community safety team would then see the document and write a management response indicating whether the recommendations are deliverable, and this would then be shared with the panel.	SH/AM
4.11	KE asked if the next scrutiny panel meeting would be to start a new review. SH confirmed that the new review on damp and mould would be starting at the 25 April meeting, so there would be an overlap before this review's recommendations went to board. SH advised that the April meeting will be in-person, possibly the only one of the year. This would be discussed later in the meeting.	
4.12	SM stated she had found being involved in this, her first review, an interesting process and felt that she had learnt a lot and gained more respect about what challenges the team faces. SH and KP agreed that the reviews are always learning experiences.	
4.13	SH advised of the calls that AM had been making to recent users of the survey and explained that the answers would be shared with the panel. AM talked through how many people she'd contacted from two different groups from July to December last year and the main themes and suggestions which came out of it, stating that some of the conversations were difficult. SH asked the panel to look at the full answers and let her and AM know if there were any additions the panel wanted to make to the recommendations.	All
5.	AOB	
5.1	SH asked if the panel wished the next resident scrutiny panel meeting to start at 5pm or 6pm. For those who had further to travel, it was agreed that 6pm would be more achievable. SH advised that Abdul, the new panel member would be joining then also, and that the members would be catered for.	
5.2	AM reminded the panel that those who hadn't done so already needed to respond in writing confirming consent to share email addresses with IT to create the Sharepoint site.	All
6.	Date of next meeting at Monson House (Tuesday 25 April 2023 6–7.30pm)	
6.1	By the end of the meeting Teresa Godden-O'Callaghan (TGO'C) and Rebecca Horler (RH) hadn't managed to join.	
6.2	KP thanked everyone attending for being present and stated she was looking forward to the next meeting.	