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1. Executive summary

1.1. The Scrutiny Panel agreed to review anti-social behaviour (ASB) following a request by the Board and Management Team in November 2014. The Scrutiny Panel members all had direct or indirect experience and perceptions regarding the service so it was considered an important review to undertake. The Scrutiny Panel were also aware that Homes for Haringey (HfH) as part of their transformation programme are keen that all services are subjected to an independent review by the Scrutiny Panel. This is the first scrutiny review that has included a service jointly delivered by HFH and the Council for HFH tenants and leaseholders.

1.2. This report covers the Scrutiny Panel’s review of the anti-social behaviour service from a customer perspective. The review covered:

- Service standards and compliance
- Relevant documentation
- Monitoring and performance data
- Customer satisfaction
- Management and delivery of the service
- Benchmarking
- Corporate structure, management and resources (staff and financial)
- Staff training and support
- Reporting and information sharing
- Communication channels
- Collection and use of learning outcomes

1.3. The review was carried out from December 2014 to March 2015, and the report was completed in May 2015.

1.4. The scrutiny methodology ensured that a comprehensive review was undertaken as detailed and illustrated in the methodology (section 3).

1.5. The key findings indicate that:

1.5.1. Anti-social behaviour is perceived as a growing problem and that all staff is committed to providing a quality service with resources available however, the number of calls logged has declined since 2013. There is concern that publication of performance data does demonstrate that recording is inconsistent regards accuracy. The data provided for the Scrutiny Panel in TM103 bears little resemblance to the earlier data provided in reports TM0209 and TM0170. There is a need to ensure that there is consistency, accuracy and verification of data. However, the ASB call volume detailed below demonstrates that there is a consistent problem that is experienced across the Borough and tenures.
1.5.2. HFH has started reviewing roles of front line staff and identifying tools such as tablets and additional staff resource for the Tenancy Management team.

1.5.3. There is limited partnership working with external service providers which has had a negative effect on handling and resolving ASB especially around cases involving mental health.

1.5.4. Tracking and management of individual ASB issues are being hindered by the lack of sharing of case management information between the two services.

1.5.5. Communication and information sharing with staff and residents is ineffective.

1.5.6. Silo working and lack of ownership of customer cases is still affecting levels of customer satisfaction identified through the resident on-line survey and Focus Groups.

1.5.7. Information sharing and use of tenant profile information needs to be improved to raise customer experience levels. This relates especially to allocation of tenants following an eviction for ASB, to prevent the repeat of issues that have adversely affected the lives of those living in the community.

1.5.8. Procedures to accommodate the split delivery of the service is resulting in confusion with some residents as they are unsure of where to report cases and why they are not being handled centrally.

1.5.9. Training and keeping up with using new powers of enforcement are being hindered by the failure to develop new policies in a timely manner. The ASBAT team confirmed that the delay is related to the legal service not producing the policy and procedures in a timely manner.

1.5.10. There is concern by some, especially the concierge team that they will be seen as the people responsible for reporting ASB and be subject to repercussions. This highlights the need for training and looking at safety procedures to reassure staff.

1.5.11. Resident Associations are keen to look at ways of engaging and providing local intelligence to support officers, and more could be done to make this a useful role for...
identifying and reporting. There is a pilot proposed to appoint two ASB resident monitors to support residents to report ASB.

**1.5.12.** Learning from cases needs to be improved and successful outcomes communicated to residents. There is no formal case evaluation and sharing of case studies with the teams on a consistent basis.

**1.5.13.** Use of the website to promote awareness and providing access to information is improving but the format and content of information is not easily understood by residents.

**1.5.14.** Residents need to be kept up to date with reviews and given an opportunity to participate when shaping services for the future. Residents could provide valuable feedback as ASB policies and procedures are reviewed.

**1.5.15.** Look at opportunities to generate additional income by charging other housing providers for advice and support and running training sessions for partners.

**1.5.16.** Have a single set standard for CCTV cameras so that images are clear and consistently able to be used for prosecutions.

**1.5.17.** Changing of working practices to focus on efficiency and effectiveness is critical but there is a need to remember that personal needs and support of residents is not forgotten. There is a strong view that prevention activities have been dropped due to staff and financial resources within the ASBAT.

**1.5.18.** The financial cost of handling anti-social behaviour cases is high and accountability for the cost of legal services and additional resources needs to be reviewed. A time recording exercise needs to be carried out by all staff delivering ASB services. It is important to understand time spent on specific activities and ensure that duplication of effort is not happening.

**1.5.19.** Reporting of ASB needs to be better co-ordinated through the dedicated number so that cases are not lost or recorded. It was confirmed by residents that they report ASB to both HFH and ASBAT hence a significant duplication of work.

**1.5.20.** Those reporting and having their cases managed by the ASBAT team receive victim support which is not open to those being handled by HFH teams, although it is noted that there are face to face or telephone contact with all complainants by HFH at the time of the case being resolved or closed.

**1.5.21.** Provision of a ‘self-service’ ASB online reporting service offers benefits to those that have access to the Internet but it is essential that there remain other opportunities for access to meet the needs of all residents.

**1.5.22.** Working practices are still driven by staff need and not customer need, which includes hours of work. Residents are concerned about the lack of police presence and want evening patrols of estates to reduce ASB. This approach has been used as a temporary measure where higher-level ASB has been experienced, and it has delivered positive outcomes combined with the use of CCTV. It maybe that a mobile security service could be considered unless more night patrols can be agreed with the police.
1.5.23. The current service level agreement between HFH and ASBAT needs to be impact assessed to determine whether it allows management on both sides to actually understand what is working and what needs changing.

1.5.24. There is concern that the split of ASB frontline housing functions between the Council and HfH does impact on the ability to offer a ‘one stop shop’ service. This supports the strong views of residents.

1.5.25. Provision of relevant customer satisfaction data requires review as currently no detailed data customer satisfaction information across the different stages of a case are not being reported on. Performance against, ease of contact, being kept informed, case handling and outcome should be individually reported. The Scrutiny Panel have been provided with performance data for this review that has been inconsistent in quality and accuracy and it is recommended that validation and monitoring of all ASB data is allocated to the HFH Performance team. This will give additional confidence to the Board that the data is reliable.

1.5.26. All staff HFH and ASBAT interviewed confirmed that the service should be centralised. The issue that needs resolving is the location and the natural fit due to the majority of ASB is related to HFH residents within the HFH service. However, the Council would prefer ASBAT and Community Safety amalgamated, but this does not address the issue of how to include generic ASB officers.

1.5.27. There was no data provided to allow a scrutiny review of repeat ASB cases but, it was verbally confirmed by staff and residents that a high number can be linked to persons with mental health issues. Consideration to be given to piloting having a dedicated officer to support those with mental health issues going through ASB and to help towards prevention.

1.5.28 For those cases marked as closed in the 2013/14 data, the time taken to close each case has shortened over the year and the speed with which violent and non-violent ASB cases are closed is now similar (see graph below)
1.6. The Scrutiny Panel has identified a total of 11 key recommendations that they would like the Board to consider.

1.7. The Scrutiny Panel are keen that any improvement implementation plan based on their recommendations is developed and agreed in conjunction with them.

1.8. The Scrutiny Panel would also like a summary report to be made available to all staff and residents.
2. Introduction

2.1. Homes for Haringey (HfH) is the Arm’s Length Management Organisation (ALMO) set up by Haringey Council, with the support of residents, to manage over 21,000 tenanted and leasehold homes. Owned and monitored by Haringey Council, their mission is to work with residents to provide quality housing services and decent homes.

2.2. HfH has a service level agreement (SLA) with the Council’s ASBAT team to provide high-level ASB services. It is quoted that 80% of the cases handled are related to tenants/leaseholders of Homes for Haringey. It was quite common for ALMO’s to have specialist ASB teams because ALMO’s report the biggest case loads compared with local Authorities and Housing providers. No data and case details were reviewed to confirm levels of private sector ASB cases.

2.3. Data for 2013/14 indicates that the Tenant Management Officers (TMO) in HFH managed 283 cases (low level) and the ASBAT team managed 224 cases (high level). The TMO officers deal with ASB as part of their tenancy management work, whereas the ASBAT are dedicated specialists only handling ASB. This is reflected in the ability of the ASBAT team to have significantly higher performance rates regards meeting targets for service delivery. There is a question over a definition of high-level cases as looking at the allocation of cases to both sides there are cases recorded as none violent is managed by ASBAT. More detailed analysis of cases needs to be carried out to understand the rationale being used. It may be that ASBAT receiving cases direct select cases that are not high level to manage which leads to confusion on the understanding of the agreed process for case management between HFH and the Council.

2.4. Comparison of ASB type shows that both teams handle similar cases and that cases are passed to the ASBAT team where there is a threat of violence.

![ASB call volume by sector chart]

Based on this practice it is understandable that residents are confused. However, it is accepted that many of the high level cases are not resolved easily and that achieving a resolution may take years. However, the level of successful prosecutions by the ASBAT once they reach court is reported as high 80%.
2.5. The top reasons in 2013/14 for ASB are, verbal abuse, harassment and intimidation (303), misuse of public space and loitering (92), noise (39), vandalism and damage to property (25 and pet and animal nuisance (22). The split of workload shows that both services are working on the same type of cases.

2.6. In 2006 there was a detailed service review that considered the type and level of service that HFH required to provide a service for their residents. The report confirmed that the ASBAT team demonstrated satisfactory performance. This was based upon: increased legal action being taken, out-performing the tenancy management teams in completing casework within target times and speed in completion resulting in increased customer satisfaction. It was noted that the ASBAT manages 25% of all HFH anti-social behaviour cases. The Housing Quality Network recommended a review of ASBAT be carried out after HFH was established to ensure that the new partnership delivered the service required by the ALMO. There was no evidence provided to the Scrutiny Panel that this review recommended has been carried out to date. It may be assumed that the SLA and the review and monitoring introduced as part of the setting up of the ALMO provided a satisfactory review of performance but does not provide the detail of measureable outcomes covered in the 2006 review. One of the reasons why it was recommended to have the ASBAT was that tenancy managers were not handling ASB effectively and a number of incidents were identified by the review where cases had not been logged or action taken. There has been considerable change in management since 2006 and HFH have demonstrated that they are keeping quality records and closely monitor performance.

2.7. The relationship between HFH and ASBAT according to the Final Service Review Report (September 2006) states that it is a partnership and not a contract, and payment for the service is included in the Management Fee. At the time it was identified that HFH were paying all legal costs including those unrelated to properties managed by the ALMO, which was agreed would be stopped. HFH management advised the Scrutiny Panel that charges for current legal costs paid for by HFH are not verified and signed off by HFH management. The legal budget for 2014/15 is set at £196,744 but there is no detail on how this equates to actual number of cases. Also as the Council control the Housing Revenue Account the decision on ASB service costs remains outside the control of HFH.

2.8. The review set out to cover:
2.8.1. **Patterns and incidents and resolution** - the scrutiny panel have noted that specific estates do report higher levels and types of ASB. Details regarding resolution and the impact have not been considered in detail, as this information was not available.

2.8.2. **Performance assessment** (nature of ASB, repeat statistics, actions taken escalation and resolution) Outcomes for ASBAT were provided but no timescale was given so it is assumed the data relates to before and after the SLA was put in place.

2.8.3. **ASBAT performance statistics** - the two key performance indicators based on time were reviewed.

2.8.4. **Process assessment** - procedures were reviewed but they were not tested against actual cases. It was stated by the ASBAT that work shadowing and looking at case history was not allowed.

2.8.5. **Customer satisfaction and feedback** - levels reported were noted but there was a failure to obtain the detail and feedback requested.

2.8.6. **Service standards relating to ASB** - The targets and response rates differ, and there are additional services such as victim support offered to those whose case is handled by ASBAT.

2.8.7. **Strategies, policies and procedures relating to ASB and their effectiveness** – The documentation was reviewed and it is clear that following the review in 2010 that operating procedures have improved and are more consistent.

2.8.8. **Information and advice relating to ASB (leaflets and website)** - There needs to be a quick users guide and leaflets are according to ASBAT 10 years old and need upgrading.

2.8.9. **How customer expectations are managed with regard to tackling ASB** - These are not being met as feedback indicated through the scrutiny survey confirmed high levels of dissatisfaction in contrast to reported results by ASBAT.

2.8.10. **ASB forms completed by residents** - There are no forms completed apart from the satisfaction survey.

2.8.11. **Resident Involvement with ASB** - The resident involvement team declined the opportunity to participate with this review as they stated that residents do not bring ASB issues to them.

2.8.12. **How ASB varies across different geographic areas** - GIS mapping has been completed by the Scrutiny review.

2.8.13. **Who is responsible for handling ASB, structure, management and staffing** - details regarding staff and resources have been reviewed and it is considered that a detailed time recording exercise needs to be instigated to determine activities and time.

2.8.14. **Staff training on ASB** - feedback was south through staff interviews to test the level and frequency of training which confirmed that there needs to be more training as delivered in 2010.
2.8.15. Joint working with Haringey Council and other partners - partnership working has been adversely affected by cut backs to the police, social services etc. This may account for some cases taking so long to be resolved.

2.8.16. How different levels and types of ASB are handled - working approaches were looked at and feedback from the residents survey and Focus Group provided valuable intelligence.

2.8.17. Support for complainants and witnesses - feedback received through the residents survey, Focus Group and resident interviews. Publicity about support needs to be increased as many residents are too afraid to report ASB.

2.8.18. Support for perpetrators - There is a feeling that those committing the ASB are treated better than the victims but that is customer perception.

2.8.19. Prevention - the work of HFH was reviewed and improvements noted.

2.8.20. Customer Experience of ASB - for complainants, witnesses and perpetrators – feedback sought through resident survey, Residents meeting and interviews.
3. Methodology

3.1. The scrutiny review followed the procedures and guidance detailed in the Scrutiny Guidance Manual.

3.2. The subject area of ASB was selected in December 2104 and the review was scoped using the Scrutiny Review Initiation Document in January 2015. Following approval of the Scrutiny Review Initiation Document, the review commenced January 2015. The review was completed in March 2015 with the report being completed in April 2015.

3.3. The review commenced with a desk-top review where the Scrutiny Panel reviewed all documents provided looking at strengths, weaknesses, and quality of information provided.

The panel reviewed the following documents:

- Service Level Agreement
- Financial
- ASB policy and operating procedures
- Performance monitoring
- Customer complaints/satisfaction
- Website and Homes Zone
- Customer journey mapping action plan
- Staff briefing papers
- Board Briefings
- Leaflets

3.4. The Scrutiny Panel carried out an online survey of residents using SurveyMonkey. Hard copies of the survey were made available on request. The Scrutiny Panel also carried out a shorter telephone survey with residents. Appendix 2 refers.

3.5. The Scrutiny Panel carried out two focus groups (along with some individual interviews) with a wide range of HFH staff and residents, seeking views on the service and suggestions for improvement.

Focus groups were carried out with the following groups:

- Tenants and leaseholders
- Broadwater Farm, concierge and estate managers
- Edgecot Grove Residents’ Association

3.6. The Scrutiny Panel also carried out interviews with 15 members of staff from all levels across HFH and ASBAT. The Scrutiny Panel also interviewed one Board member and two local councillors.

3.7. The Scrutiny Panel members put forward their personal ASB case studies. It is clear from this investigation that residents are confused about who and how their case is managed. There is a genuine fear by those acting as witnesses that they will put their personal and family safety at risk by reporting and providing details of ASB.

3.8. The Scrutiny Panel collated all the feedback received and have included the findings and recommendations in this report (section 5 refers). The Scrutiny Panel wish to emphasise that their findings are based totally from a customer perspective and recognise that some or part of the solutions or recommendations detailed may not be possible to be implemented. The Scrutiny Panel do however consider that the findings offer significant opportunity to enhance the service provided.
3.9. The quality of performance information provided for this review has been lacking in detail and demonstrates the challenges faced by management to understand how the service is being delivered and the opportunities for service improvement.
4. Findings and solutions

4.1. Key issues and needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Borough of Haringey Single front line services Service Level agreement (SLA): (source: staff interviews, Councillor interviews and documentation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.1.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.1.2.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.1.3.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.2.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.2.1.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.2.2.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.3.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.3.1.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.3.2.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
included, not enough time, the level and quality of information recorded is not consistent and have not been requested through the SLA for additional performance information. It is proposed that the HFH Performance team take over the issuing and monitoring of performance information to ensure that it is reliable and externally validated from the service providers.

4.1.3.3. HFH have over the period of the SLA increased the level of funding provided to meet the increasing demand for CCTV and meeting the shortfall experienced by ASBAT as external funding sources have ceased. It is understood that the quality of CCTV cameras varies and that this is due to not all being procured through an agreed single supplier. Having cameras that will provide high-resolution pictures is critical for identifying individuals/groups that need to be prosecuted. The SLA needs to be looked at and include an agreed specification and procurement process for cameras.

4.1.3.4. Both residents and Councillors have indicated that they do not understand how the service operates and their needs to be clearer definition on when a HFH case is handle by either service provider. The trigger points for escalation should be clearly defined so that there is not the opportunity to ‘dump’ work on either side. If there was a centralised service then there would not be any opportunity for misunderstanding but offer a smarter working approach.

4.1.3.5. The ASBAT specialist staff resources allocated to dealing with anti-social behaviour have not been subject to any review regards numbers and this may be because the bulk of funding is being facilitated through the Housing Revenue account, and there is an ‘open cheque’ approach. The SLA (2013) indicates that the General Fund makes a contribution to the ASBAT service costs of £99k, and HFH contribute £525k plus legal costs recharged from the Council’s legal services. Without time recording data it is more difficult to determine the overall service cost to HFH because TMO officers work in a generic way so handling ASB is integral to their role. In addition there are estate management officers, quality assurance officers and concierge staff that all have an active role in delivering ASB services and solutions. Three senior managers with a Borough wide remit support the HFH team. It is recommended that there is a review of operating costs to gather a full understanding of what fighting ASB is costing overall. This combined with a full impact assessment would provide a clear picture of opportunities to ensure the quality service is provided but in a way that will allow a full understanding of actual cost. This detailed financial appraisal is not within the scope of the Scrutiny Panel, but feedback received indicates the need to raise it as a recommendation for consideration.

4.1.3.6. There was feedback that HFH and ASBAT is often more reactive than proactive when it comes to tackling ASB issues. A frequent comment made at interviews was,“ we used to do more preventive and awareness work but we do not have the time and financial resources to buy promotional items and have literature that can be given out.” The ASBAT team have confirmed that the limited attendance at resident events is a resource problem and that case management levels make this work more limited. This is not supported by the case workload.

4.1.3.7. The SLA is due for renewal in March 2016 so there is a great opportunity to look at how the service overall is delivered and identify where resources
should be focused. It may be the time to look at consolidating and having a central service and due to the generic working model in HFH it may be more appropriate that the service not just for HFH but the Borough is provided by HFH. The Scrutiny Panel would like to see a couple of residents involved with the review of the SLA as they can provide resident intelligence and feedback that would have a positive impact. The Scrutiny Panel appoints scrutiny monitors to each review completed and would recommend that this may be helpful bearing in mind they have carried out this review.

4.1.4. Recommendations:

4.1.4.1. That there is a complete re-look at performance data and monitoring so that information is provided regularly to facilitate effective management of the service. The key performance indicators do not provide adequate information and focus on speed of contact but no consideration of long term solutions being achieved, and learning outcomes being used to support preventative solutions.

4.1.4.2. There is need for a complete business appraisal of the service that is based on the best way to deliver this critical but expensive service that maximises value for money.

4.1.4.3. The SLA must be more outcome/solution driven and it is suggested that residents should be invited to be part of the process of review.

4.1.4.4. Ensure that procurement of CCTV cameras does deliver the quality of images that will facilitate prosecution. There needs to be an agreed specification and use of appropriate monitoring equipment so that the service is more responsive.

4.1.4.5. Focus on preventative as well as current case management but ensure that there is collective buy in from all involved.

4.2. Call centre (source: resident survey, resident focus groups, mystery shopping, leaflets)

4.2.1. General:

4.2.1.1. Telephone is the most commonly used method of getting in touch with Homes for Haringey or the Council regards ASB. The majority of residents contact HFH.

4.2.1.2. The contact centres are now centralised bringing the Council and HFH call centres together. There has been considerable levels of training to ensure that operators can handle a wide variety of issues effectively and in a timely manner.

4.2.2. Positives:

4.2.2.1. Mystery shopping confirmed that those handling calls were friendly and were able to signpost the caller to the ASBAT team.

4.2.3. Negatives/issues:

4.2.3.1. Waiting time to get through to the call centre was on average 10 minutes.

4.2.3.2. There was no offering of the dedicated ASBAT telephone number to the caller.

4.2.3.3. The caller was put through to the press number options facility, which offers the caller options, but there is no option for ASB/ASBAT. Hence it was a
wasted call for the caller.

4.2.3.4. There was no mention of using the website to get more information where the direct number is provided and helpful advice on how to report ASB.

4.2.3.5. There was no opportunity to tell the operator about the ASB problem so no case number was issued, or the call noted.

4.2.3.6. It is clear that the call centre staff are keen to keep call time to a minimum but this must not be at the expense of the caller not being provided with an opportunity to explain their query and receive the advice and information that may prevent having to call again.

4.2.4. Recommendations:

4.2.4.1. Provide the dedicated ASBAT number as a press option or ensure that all callers are provided with the dedicated number

4.2.4.2. Consider having an online referral form for residents wanting to report ASB who may find it easier to complete than calling the Call Centre or the ASBAT

4.2.4.3. Ensure that the information on the website is highlighted to callers

4.3. Neighbourhood Offices/Walk-in Centres/sheltered housing (source: resident survey, Focus Groups, staff interviews)

4.3.1. General:

4.3.1.1. There is anecdotal evidence from staff that fewer people are using the walk-in centres. However, residents do have a number of officers that are out and about on estates that are there to offer a listening ear and ensure that estates are maintained to a high standard.

4.3.1.2. The Scheme warden plays a key role ensuring that sheltered schemes are safe and have appropriate security to keep residents safe.

4.3.2. Positives:

4.3.2.1. HFH staff are hard-working and when they are able to be contacted show understanding and provide a listening ear to residents’ concerns

4.3.2.2. The presence of concierges is seen as offering additional security and point of contact for residents concerned about ASB

4.3.2.3. Estate services officers provide a valuable contribution to safety on estates and as a source for reporting ASB

4.3.2.4. Scheme managers will deal with any ASB which is usually around, noise, parking problems, smoking or residents that have mental health issues, and if there is continued ASB then it is escalated to the overall manager or TMO.

4.3.2.5. All sheltered schemes have door entry, and CCTV

4.3.3. Negatives/issues:

4.3.3.1. There is concern by residents that the TMO officers do not have the capacity to deal with ASB cases. However, management who consider that the new patch areas did not confirm this and work level is acceptable and should offer no barrier to managing ASB.

4.3.3.2. Residents are unaware of the role and work of the Quality Assurance Officers and the process they use to identify and develop initiatives to combat
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ASB. There is a need to ensure that their role offers opportunity for more resident liaison.

4.3.3.3. Although residents will share ASB information they are afraid to formally report incidents and as soon as there is a need to make a statement they stop.

4.3.3.4. Neighbourhood Schemes do not have CCTV and the communities are made up of tenants and leaseholders, and sometimes there are ASB issues between the two tenures.

4.3.4. Recommendations:

4.3.4.1. Look at promoting the work and roles of all the staff working to prevent and handle ASB through the Home Zone newsletter.

4.3.4.2. The officers need to be recognised for their achievements and new initiatives to fight ASB should be appraised and the results shared with all staff and residents.

4.4. Customer/resident engagement – (source: resident survey, board member interview, focus groups)

4.4.1. General:

4.4.1.1. The Resident Engagement team are in a key position to listen and feedback on ASB issues that may be picked up at community events and Resident Association meetings. However, when the Scrutiny Panel requested to interview the Manager and Resident Involvement officer for this review they stated that they do not have residents bringing ASB issues to their meetings. However, through interviews with other staff it was identified that one Resident Involvement Officer who was not asked for an interview has regularly feedback cases to the TMO.

4.4.1.2. The new Resident Engagement Strategy needs to clarify the role of resident involvement officers as sources for feeding back resident intelligence, highlighting new initiatives and promoting a positive perception of ASB.

4.4.1.3. Some Resident Associations like Edgcot Grove have taken it upon themselves to bring the community and partners together to focus on prevention and reporting of ASB. As a result of one meeting, there have been two arrests and a drug problem has been removed. They have proposed and agreed to bring the surrounding estates together to focus on ASB and appointing resident ASB monitors. They need to develop a reporting and monitoring process that still encourages residents to directly report their cases to the ASBAT.

4.4.1.4. The restructure of resident engagement has seen the focus shift from more traditional engagement mechanisms to a need for new approaches and integrating their roles to support the Tenancy management services including ASB.

4.4.2. Positives

4.4.2.1. ‘Engagement’ is the new word for involvement and is seen to be clearer in terms of people understanding what it means. Through the work carried out
to develop the new Resident Engagement Strategy it is positive that new ways of working are being considered.

4.4.2.2. Many community initiatives and events offer excellent opportunities to invite the ASB teams and partners to show case their work to a wider audience of residents. The Councillors that were interviewed spoke positively about holding estate events and bringing together the staff and residents. It was confirmed that from the events attended that often residents carry out ASB, as they do not know how to use services such as removal of bulk items of rubbish. So these events have a key role to play in helping residents know how they can be helped and how they can help themselves and others in the community.

4.4.3. Negatives/issues:

4.4.3.1. The Resident Engagement Team need to move from silo working and look to how they can support colleague and identify opportunities to play a significant role in making sure that residents have confidence to report ASB.

4.4.3.2. There is no evidence provided that supports the view that residents’ events have resulted in a reduction in ASB but hopefully awareness regards how to report ASB has improved.

4.4.4. Recommendations:

4.4.4.1.1. That the Resident involvement team work with the ASB officers and residents to develop and put in place ASB tenant monitors and monitor the effectiveness and impact through a pilot at Edgcot Grove.

4.4.4.1.2. Actively take on the role of supporting and signposting residents to report and resolve ASB in their communities

4.4.4.1.3. Feedback successful ASB outcomes to residents

4.5. Communication and feedback (source: staff interviews, Focus Groups, resident survey)

4.5.1. General

4.5.2. As with all Scrutiny Reviews to date we have identified communication as a key requirement for delivering effective and quality services.

4.5.3. Having a split service over two organisations makes it difficult to ensure that there is consistent and relevant information sharing and decision-making.

4.5.4. There are regular senior management meetings to look at current cases and monitor performance in line with the SLA.

4.5.5. The ASBAT team at interview confirmed that there is limited working across the Council’s other services like Community Safety.

4.5.6. ASB cases are recorded on the OHMS system

4.5.7. Negatives/issues:

4.5.7.1.1. There is no joint communication strategy for ASB

4.5.7.1.2. Case studies are not included on the website or in Homes Zone which could highlight success and raise awareness to give residents confidence to report ASB. There is a provision in the SLA for the ASBAT team to provide information and articles for use. No examples could be identified.

4.5.7.1.3. There is no detail of performance of ASB including achievements with
legal cases reported. It is likely that reporting on prosecutions may act as a way of preventing people committing ASB

4.5.7.1.4. Consider including in the Landlord app an opportunity to report ASB as well as the facility of an on-line reporting template.

4.5.7.1.5. Estate service officers and concierge officers confirmed that they receive very little feedback from ASBAT and in order to find out what has resulted from an investigation they have to request the feedback. There needs to an automatic case bulletin sent to all front line officers detailing the outcomes and measures that have been taken to tackle and hopefully resolve an issue. These are your key team out in the community and they need to have the information to share with concerned residents.

4.5.8. Recommendations:

4.5.8.1.1. Work with staff and residents to develop an ASB communication strategy for the organisation, there has to be a cascading of information to front line staff so that they can promote and share the positive work of ASBAT at taking enforcement action. This could be easily done by email or texting.

4.5.8.1.2. Include a range of other ways to report ASB, texting, website on-line template or through your new landlord app

4.5.8.1.3. Provide clear and detailed information about case studies and performance that will inspire residents and confirm the good work that is being done.

4.6. Resident feedback (source: resident survey, case studies, resident interviews)

4.6.1. General:

4.6.1.1. Case studies provide helpful feedback from a resident perspective

4.6.1.2. The on-line resident survey was sent out to 4000 tenants and leaseholders and was facilitated by the Home Ownership Team (appendix 2 refers)

4.6.1.3. Resident interviews were provided where residents felt that they needed to talk about their experience

4.6.1.4. The Feedback indicates that HFH and the Council are operating in an environment where ASB is prevalent, common, wide ranging, serious in nature and dealt with in an unsatisfactory manner from the perspective of the complainant

4.6.1.5. The survey split by respondents was 30% leaseholders and 70% tenants

4.6.1.6. Interviews with residents and hearing their concerns confirms that residents are not convinced that the ASB service is customer focused

4.6.2. Positives:

4.6.2.1. The Council and HFH are committed to resolving ASB but they have more work to do around convincing residents that this is the situation.

4.6.2.2. It is highly positive that residents have participated to provide a range of feedback even though it has been highly emotional for many

4.6.2.3. Negatives/issues:

4.6.2.4. With 80% of respondents being concerned and 50% very concerned this
would suggest that ASB is a significant issue

4.6.2.5. 50% state that ASB has increased and 50% say that it has not increased, means that ASB is still a key issue for many residents

4.6.2.6. Respondents cited serious ASB as being, noise, abuse, harassment, bullying, drunkenness and drug dealing as a big problem

4.6.2.7. Drugs seem to be a particular problem and there are considerable concerns that this is not being dealt with in a proactive manner and many residents have to endure drug selling and use in their blocks.

4.6.2.8. With the on-line survey the overall satisfaction levels are around 30% and outcome satisfaction at 20% it appears that HFH /Council are achieving third or fourth quartile performance levels. This is at odds with performance reported to the Board.

4.6.2.9. It is disheartening for both HFH and the council to see that aspirations to provide a swift, effective, consistent, customer focused, fair and solution based service is one that is categorically and consistently not shared by residents

4.6.2.10. The age groups that appear to be causing the most ASB are from 18 to 34

4.6.2.11. Reporting of ASB is in the majority of cases made to HFH but 24% stated that they reported it to both HFH and the ASBAT

4.6.2.12. 33% of respondents stated that they did not report ASB, and the reasons given were, being worried about repercussions (42%), nothing would happen (38%), did not know how to report it (27%). These are disappointing results but emphasise the need for improved communication and publicity around the work and success of ASB handling.

4.6.2.13. It is clear from meeting residents experiencing long-term issues that ASB has a negative impact on individual health and well being. Some have had to resort to medication, afraid to leave their home, and feel trapped, as they cannot move.

4.6.2.14. There is a negative feeling that there is no community policing

4.6.3. Recommendations:

4.6.3.1. Respondents to the survey have indicated that the reality is that the service is not meeting the needs of residents and their needs to be a reality check of why the service is failing from the resident perspective. It maybe that the failure to publicise and feedback progress to residents could be a reason for this perception.

4.6.3.1.1. Look at ways to increase the number of visits and presence of officers on the estates

4.6.3.2. Being pro-active with taking action and keeping complainants informed

4.6.3.3. Look at having late night patrols on estates

4.6.3.4. Install more CCTV cameras

4.6.3.5. Visible partnership working with the police

4.6.3.6. Looking at enforcement opportunities

4.6.3.7. Develop a prevention strategy for ASB

4.6.3.8. Differentiate between victims and complainants

4.6.3.9. Publicising that complainants will be protected and the support offered

4.6.3.10. Expectations by residents on outcomes needs to be better managed and support provided to help understand the limitations of enforcement that can be applied. This is especially important where there are repeated ASB incidents.
### 4.7. Resident Focus group (source: Resident feedback, resident Focus Group survey)

#### 4.7.1. General

#### 4.7.2. Positives:

- **4.7.2.1.** The Resident Focus Group was well attended and included a cross section of involved and not involved residents.
- **4.7.2.2.** All were pleased with the opportunity to participate with the review and felt that the Scrutiny Panel would feedback their views in an honest way.
- **4.7.2.3.** There was no personal attack on individual staff regarding ASB but there is a feeling that resident understanding and expectations are not being met.
- **4.7.2.4.** The Survey was completed by all those that attended.
- **4.7.2.5.** There is an understanding that officers have a large workload and they are concerned that recent staff changes may be at fault.
- **4.7.2.6.** Residents did know to use the website to get ASB information but they felt that it could be easier with a step-by-step guide.
- **4.7.2.7.** Limited ASB around sheltered schemes and minor resident issues are well handled by the Scheme Managers.

#### 4.7.3. Negatives/issues:

- **4.7.3.1.** Residents feel that the use of CCTV cameras is excellent but their personal experience of getting access to footage has not been successful. They have heard that some cameras are broken and that the images produced are so poor that it is impossible to identify individuals.
- **4.7.3.2.** There is different service standards operated by the ASBAT and TMO teams.
- **4.7.3.3.** Where residents collectively have made ASB complaints there is no feedback provided on the outcomes. Hence, residents associations and community groups do not feel that their feedback is valued. They think that the operating procedures only cater for individual ASB complaints and not group ones.
- **4.7.3.4.** Those who have been victims to ASB activity collectively felt that they were not treated with the understanding and respect that they felt was required. This was supported by their feelings that details about the case investigations were not shared with them. It is noted that the ASBAT team do have a victim support officer to support victims but those present had not previously heard about. It is all about getting victims to feel that they are valued and that they have reached a crisis point in their lives when they reported the ASB problem.
- **4.7.3.5.** Residents overall had a negative perception of the ASB service stating that they felt ignored and timescales for action were slow. As the performance stats show that initial contact is meeting the key performance indicator, it is more likely that the issue is around once the investigation has commenced.
- **4.7.3.6.** Residents felt that the ASB teams are not sharing their learning outcomes from cases with other officers within the organisation as repeat incidents occur.
- **4.7.3.7.** Those attending were asked to rate the ASB service on its effectiveness between 1 and 10 with 1 being the lowest score. The residents all rated the service as poor scoring 1.
4.7.3.8. CCTV camera footage when requested by residents to be viewed was not provided. They complained that cameras had been removed without consultation and notification to those in the community.

4.7.3.9. One resident confirmed that they had given a specific date, location and time and was still not able to have the footage checked. There needs to be a process detailed that allows residents to access footage for reasons that are approved by the ASB professionals.

4.7.3.10. Residents would prefer to contact HFH to view CCTV footage and make their requests.

4.7.3.11. There was considerable concern about roaming dogs and dog fouling on estates. They consider that nothing is done to make the estates safer and ensuring that residents are prosecuted for allowing their dogs to foul communal and grassed areas.

4.7.3.12. In Hornsey ASB has been made a ward priority and has the full backing and support of the local MP and Councillors.

4.7.3.13. Confusion about who to contact to report ASB. Some stated that they had gone through the Call Centre, others contacted the ASBAT and others went to their TMO. One resident reported that the Call Centre took her details and it took three weeks for her to get a response.

4.7.3.14. There is a concern that Tenancy Agreements are not being enforced and this had lead to an escalation of ASB.

4.7.3.15. Those residents present who had reported ASB through the Call Centre did not receive a case reference number.

4.7.3.16. Some residents stated that they do not bother to report ASB to their TMO as nothing happens.

4.7.3.17. The Police were reported as being good when they do visit sites but they are slow to respond because they have higher priorities and reduced resources. They would like to see a visual profile of the police and ASBAT officers out on the estates patrolling.

4.7.3.18. Two victims of ASB explained that they felt there was little or no concern for their feelings although the cases were proven.

4.7.3.19. Local resident and community group members present stated that specific types of shops and businesses allowed to operate on estates generated ASB.

4.7.3.20. There is little or no link between Neighbourhood Watch and the ASB officers so that feedback, and sharing of intelligence and joint actions are not put in place to prevent or monitor ASB.

4.7.4. Recommendations:

4.7.4.1. It is clear that resident awareness even amongst involved residents is confused regards the process for reporting and handling ASB and this does support the strong feeling by residents at the Focus Group that the teams should be joined together so service is consistent and information is not lost. Improved publicity and a guidance fact sheet may be helpful to address this issue.

4.7.4.2. The residents suggested that HFH should take advantage of the Government’s initiative that all dogs have to be chipped from next year. The Tenancy Agreement would have to be updated to record the details but at least dogs that are found roaming or fouling can be traced back to residents. It is felt...
that this may act as a way of making owners more responsible. There are free chipping services available that could be accessed to make it affordable for residents.

4.7.4.3. Publicise the work of Neighbourhood Watch schemes on the website and have articles in the Home Zone and encouraging joint meetings with partners and community groups to tackle community ASB issues.

4.7.4.4. Consider consulting with residents about new shops and licences to be issued, as some outlets are encouraging ASB

4.8. Complaints (source: Councillor interviews, staff interviews, document review, mystery shopping, Residents Association (Edge cot Grove and Helston Court)

4.8.1. General:
4.8.1.1. Complaints information about ASB cases could not be provided for this review as it was stated by ASBAT that there had not been any complaints received. Staff members stated that HFH/ASBAT need to use feedback from customers, especially from complaints but also from compliments (using as good practice). It is hoped that this will be improved and there will be an open sharing of complaints related to ASB with both teams. It was confirmed by ASBAT senior management that there had never been a complaint about ASB.

4.8.2. Positives: 😊
4.8.2.1. A Resident Complaints Panel has been set up to look at complaints which have not been resolved to residents’ satisfaction and this will provide an excellent way to monitor and identify where things can go wrong.
4.8.2.2. ASBAT and HFH staff did say that they would like to get more feedback on their performance collected from users satisfaction surveys and be able to learn from mistakes and celebrate success.
4.8.2.3. It is reported that the number of complaints is low and in the main are associated with either party being unsatisfied with the case outcome.
4.8.2.4. Councillors reported at interview that if they contact the ASB teams that they are able to get action to be taken.
4.8.2.5. The Chair of the Residents Association called together a meeting to look at numerous complaints that had been made regards ASB issues around problems with groups of youth and young men in the area.
4.8.2.6. The meeting was attended by Councillors, residents, the police, HFH staff and ASBAT
4.8.2.7. ASBAT was able to confirm that ASB behaviour contracts had been signed to deal with the youth issues
4.8.2.8. There was a discussion about the response speed by the Police which was considered too slow. The police noted all the issues around drugs, and threats to residents. Since the meeting the police have followed up and there have been a number of arrests and the drug problem is resolved
4.8.2.9. It was agreed to have 2 resident ASB monitors for each estate to help residents report ASB and keep everyone informed

4.8.3. Negatives/Issues: 😞
4.8.3.1. The customer satisfaction forms that are sent out to residents after an
ASB case is completed as for feedback on four key parts of the service, ease of contact, being kept informed, case handling and outcome. However, there is no data provided to show which if any of the service areas surveyed are receiving positive or negative information. There is just an overall satisfaction figure provided against the performance target of 70% satisfaction.

4.8.3.2. Complaints are provided to the ASBAT team and they pass ones relevant to TMO cases to HFH. There was no evidence provided that the ASBAT related complaints are shared with HFH.

4.8.3.3. We were not able to ascertain whether any compensation had been paid to complainants regarding the ASB service.

4.8.3.4. The response rate to residents completing and returning their ASB service satisfaction survey is low, and incentives need to be looked at to try and increase return rates.

4.8.4. Recommendations:

4.8.4.1. The overall Customer satisfaction survey target is being met but there is no clarity as to how the calculation is made based on the four key questions asked. It is recommended that data received for each category is recorded and reported so that monitoring of the service is clear and can identify any areas for improvement.

4.8.4.2. All complaints should be reported to HFH and there should be a joint review of the case to identify learning outcomes.

4.8.4.3. Resident Associations should use their role in the community to help identify and report ASB. Bringing all the key service providers together will result in a positive outcome.

4.9. Staff training and performance management (source: staff survey, staff interviews, Councillor interviews)

4.9.1. General

4.9.2. Positives:

4.9.2.1. House Mark benchmarking is used to measure performance since 2006.

4.9.2.2. Following the ASB service review in May 2010, which resulted in the Customer journey Mapping action, plan being developed there was ASB awareness training provided for some 40 staff and a briefing session on the review outcomes and new procedures.

4.9.2.3. The SLA makes provision for training to be provided by the specialist ASBAT team for HFH.

4.9.2.4. The ASBAT team provided performance statistics detailing enforcement actions completed but it is unclear as to the time period it refers. The figures confirm:

- 223 closure orders (crack house closures)
- 54 ASBO’s
- 340 Acceptable behaviour contracts
- 272 injunctions
- 88 possession orders/evictions
- 1 premises closure order
4.9.3. Negatives/issues:

4.9.3.1. There was no evidence provided that refresher or updating training has been offered to the 40 staff since 2010.

4.9.3.2. ASBAT confirmed that there has not been wide training to update on the new enforcement powers that came in November 2014. It was confirmed that to date the new policy required to take on the new enforcement opportunities has not been developed by the Council’s legal service. This is no doubt the reason why no training has been provided. The Resident Scrutiny Panel suggested that the ASBAT team contact those Councils and Housing Associations that have already develop their policies and taken successful action to get the documentation so that the new powers can be used.

4.9.3.3. The performance information provided on cases is in the main unclear and shows that there is duplication of work between HFH and the ASBAT team. There is no information about the number of new and repeat cases.

4.9.3.4. There is too much silo working across the organisation.

4.9.3.5. There are only 2 KPIs for ASB reported to the Board are based on time factors and these do not provide a clear view as to how the service is providing a quality service for residents. The KP1’S should be more outcomes driven.

4.9.3.6. The OHMS system does not make data handling and interrogating easy to use.

4.9.3.7. There was very poor performance data provided for the Scrutiny Panel and it showed that there is no detailed performance reporting provided by ASBAT to HFH.

4.9.4. Recommendations:

4.9.4.1. Consider using residents to help develop key performance indicators for ASB.

4.9.4.2. Look at how ASB reporting can be incorporated into a CRM system.

4.9.4.3. Introduce staff and resident refresher ASB training on the role and current legislation, as well as looking at initiatives and actions that have provided successful outcomes to ASB.

4.9.4.4. Tackle silo working.

4.9.4.5. Performance management needs to improve. Staff managers need to be clearer on what is expected from staff. Staff stated that action plans need to be built into work plans.

4.9.4.6. There needs to be better quality control and monitoring of ASB solutions.

4.9.4.7. ASB needs to be covered in the corporate staff induction.

4.9.4.8. Really use your performance data and financial management information to fully understand what the service is delivering and the actual cost.
4.10. Resident Focus Group – residents survey (source: resident survey)

4.10.1. General findings:

4.10.1.1. As part of the Resident Focus Group event a survey was provided to capture individual residents views. Each person was requested and completed the survey.

4.10.2. Positives:

4.10.2.1. There was one response that indicated that the resident was not concerned with ASB in their area
4.10.2.2. Two residents indicated that there had been a decrease in anti-social behaviour over the last year
4.10.2.3. Estate services officers do offer support and advice to residents and get problems resolved
4.10.2.4. HFH respond positively to the removal of rubbish and fly tipping on estates

4.10.3. Negatives/issues:

4.10.3.1. Not kept up to date with outcomes from cases being reported
4.10.3.2. Three residents reported being very concerned and five quite concerned about ASB in their community
4.10.3.3. One resident reported that ASB had significantly increased, and another that it had slightly increased
4.10.3.4. Biggest concern was around rubbish, litter and fly tipping
4.10.3.5. Residents least concerned about vandalism and graffiti
4.10.3.6. High to medium ASB over all categories experienced in N8 7SL (Hornsey)
4.10.3.7. Do not report ASB as afraid of being attacked
4.10.3.8. Had to copy MP to get a result
4.10.3.9. Need to be more customer focused
4.10.3.10. Less focus on perpetrators and give more time to the community
4.10.3.11. Ensure that officers investigating are aware of the potential for counter complaints and bullying

4.10.4. Recommendations:

4.10.4.1. ASBAT and police to be more visible out on estates
4.10.4.2. Heighten awareness of how to report and deal with ASB with leaflets and enforcement
4.10.4.3. Ensure that tenants are aware of the consequences of enforcement

4.11. HFH staff experience (source: staff interviews)

4.12. General

4.12.1. Maintaining communities that are safe with minimal ASB is the priority of HFH. ASB is in the main managed by the TMO team. There is also input into prevention and reporting by other officers.
4.13. Positives:

4.13.1.1. HFH staff have in the main really embraced the opportunity to participate with this review and this is greatly appreciated by the Scrutiny Panel

4.13.1.2. Staff reported that they felt that handling of ASB and looking at long term fixes on estates was having a positive impact

4.13.1.3. Response to graffiti was timely and offering opportunities for murals has had a positive impact, but it is important to continue to be proactive with dealing with removal of graffiti

4.13.1.4. Senior management committed to service improvement and understanding the service challenges and opportunities

4.13.1.5. Improvements to properties such as removing access to roofs has had a positive effect in reducing ASB

4.13.1.6. Estate improvements like putting up railings to prevent residents climbing into play areas etc. has had a positive impact on loitering by youngsters and providing security for residents

4.13.1.7. Estate management budget of £120k includes funding for CCTV cameras and maintenance. Each camera costs £10k

4.13.1.8. The Estate Services Manager reports ASB identified to the Housing managers

4.13.1.9. Estate improvements are kept to under £250 per property so that leaseholders do not have to be recharged. Estate improvement work includes, fitting cameras, putting in access gates, erecting fencing, improved signage, marked car parking areas, door entry systems and road humps and bollards etc.

4.13.1.10. All cameras that are being purchased from the Estate improvement budget are high definition and mobile and can be used for prosecutions. Previous fixed cameras were less effective providing low quality images.

4.13.1.11. CCTV camera footage is being used to currently prosecute for dumping rubbish, and covert operations working with ASBAT

4.13.1.12. Positive impact from local initiatives such as security patrol, clearing bushes, closing access to alleys, and providing safe play areas

4.13.1.13. Access to CCTV images from the new cameras are emailed from the ASBAT team and monitoring is carried out by the CCTV team

4.13.1.14. The Council are now looking at purchasing for their work the same quality of CCTV cameras, which will widen the coverage of the borough.

4.13.1.15. Quality Assurance officers work with residents to look at estate improvements that will provide opportunities to out design ASB issues such as poor lighting and issues around youths etc.

4.13.1.16. Intervention is focused on being positive rather than reactive.

4.13.1.17. Some residents have taken on responsibility for ASB, but there are a large number that are not engaged

4.13.2. Negatives/Issues:

4.13.2.1. Lack of feedback and sharing of information related to ASB was a great concern by all staff

4.13.2.2. Partnership working with external organisations is essential and the current cut backs in staff has seen a reduction in sharing and dealing with problems
4.13.2.3. Unclear of when ASB cases are handled by ASBAT and what is the trigger point for taking on cases. Currently there is a view that there is a duplication of handling the same category cases.

4.13.2.4. There are no regular surgeries or meetings where residents can come and meet Estate services staff and ASBAT. This would provide a safe environment for confidential discussion.

4.13.2.5. There is no promotion of successful cases on the website or newsletters.

4.13.2.6. ASB cases escalate in the summer and there are not additional resources to handle the spike in workload.

4.13.2.7. There is a need for CCTV footage to be shared with Estate officers and this would be very helpful in their daily work of checking on repair monitoring refuse dumping, cleansing and enforcement.

4.13.2.8. Some HFH officers get verbal and physical abuse and some have been assaulted.

4.13.2.9. Need to have closer working with concierge staff and they need to be seen to reporting ASB and given training to handle the fear expressed about reprisals. It may be an idea to link Estate services and concierge services together as both report repairs needed to the building and estate.

4.13.2.10. There are two contracts dealing with CCTV, the ASBAT and HFH. There is concern that some equipment is not up to the right standard to produce images of an effective quality for prosecution. The Concierge staff will copy footage onto a CD for use by estate services. There could be joint working with Estate services as both are there to tackle ASB.

4.13.2.11. Feedback received from residents indicates that there are not enough fun days on estates but it is strongly felt that the outcome from these events should be impact assessed to determine if they do have a positive impact in reducing ASB.

4.13.2.12. Estate walk about are effective in identifying issues of concerns but there is frustration by staff that it takes too long to get solutions agreed and implemented. There needs to better joint working to look at decisions so that solutions are appropriate. Must use residents and views before implementing change.

4.13.2.13. Housing Providers Forum on ASB has stopped taking place so there is reduced contact with colleagues and sharing of information. They get no feedback from the ASBAT team about ASB work being carried out by other housing providers.

4.13.2.14.

4.13.3. Recommendations:

4.13.3.1. Consider holding an ASB lunch and learn to talk about current cases and initiatives so there is open exchange of information.

4.13.3.2. Tackle issues with some concierges worrying about personal safety.

4.13.3.3. Look to having only one type of CCTV camera type and having all monitoring facilitated by the dedicated CCTV staff.

4.13.3.4. Look at roles of concierge staff to see if there is an advantage in linking roles to Estate services.

4.13.3.5. Review the value and impact of joint estate events to promote ASB.
4.13.3.6. As part of developing an ASB Communication strategy look at sharing information with staff and residents
4.13.3.7. Monitor residents coming in to blocks by having a visitors register
4.13.3.8. Encourage young people that are interested in graffiti to do artistic walls around the Borough

4.14.2. General
4.14.2.1. This review covers both ASB services carried out by the Council and HFH. This has provided an appropriate opportunity to seek feedback from elected councillors.
4.14.2.2. Councillors are confused as to the role of the teams and when cases are referred to the Council. They understand that it can lead to residents not understanding roles and responsibilities

4.14.3. Positives:
4.14.3.1. ASB is being positively fought by both HFH and the Council
4.14.3.1.1. Councillors are able to use their position to get issues resolved
4.14.3.1.2. The Council’s ASBAT team seen as offering residents involvement and education
4.14.3.1.3. Effective CCTV service provided but quality of images are not always good
4.14.3.1.4. Neighbourhood Watch works and the Council work closely with these groups as part of Community Safety
4.14.3.1.5. Not a problem with graffiti
4.14.3.1.6. There are plans to bring ASBAT and the services together into ‘one big team’ to stop silo working and bring specialist resources together
4.14.3.2. Mental health is not a reason for unresolved ASB
4.14.3.3. Supports community estate or street events to raise awareness with local residents
4.14.3.4. There is a good sense of belonging that is fostered through successful ASB work
4.14.3.5. On estate inspections residents raise ASB issues
4.14.3.6. People get to know councillors so will engage and share concerns
4.14.3.7. Would like to see all dogs belonging to tenants and leaseholders chipped and registered so that perpetrators can be identified and action taken


4.14.5. Negatives/issues:
4.14.5.1. Residents report that they see a gap in the service provided and just want the problem solved
4.14.5.2. Councillors are needed to pull things together to make things happen as nothing has been heard or resolved
4.14.5.3. Residents do not understand the process and this is down to lack of awareness
4.14.5.4. Residents have stated that they are afraid to call the noise team because they are afraid they will go round at that time and tell them to be quiet.
4.14.5.5. Services provided by the Council are good
4.14.5.6. Better consultation from the Council with residents on ASB
4.14.5.7. Leaseholders and especially sub letting is a problem and there is a need to look at enforcement of leaseholders and what the law will allow
4.14.5.8. ASB is on the increase in the South Tottenham area, especially hard core around the Pocket Park
4.14.5.9. Two estates have constant ASB on the stairwells
4.14.5.10. Drug dealing is still going on
4.14.5.11. There is a concern about no police presence on estates
4.14.5.12. When I attend estate walkabouts with the residents and Quality Assurance Officers the event is very good but they are very poor at following issues up
4.14.5.13. It is felt that many of the ASB issues are a result of the impact of Right to buy
4.14.5.14. Many residents suffer poor health due to having to endure on-going ASB issues which are not resolved
4.14.5.15. There need to be more resident groups where residents suffering from ASB can go to for help and support

4.14.6. Recommendations:
4.14.6.1. Consider holding a ‘lunch and learn’ event to promote work of the ASB team
4.14.6.2. Ensure that Councillors are invite to estate events

4.15. ASBAT team: (source: staff interviews)

4.15.1. General:
4.15.1.1. The ASBAT team is a specialist team of officers providing a range of ASB services
4.15.1.2. The team is made up of housing trained officers who have been in post for a number of years
4.15.1.3. The staff offer a range of languages which mean that the use of translation services is kept to a minimum
4.15.1.4. ASBAT has had a record of success with high levels of ASB as they are under close scrutiny and pressure by Councillors
4.15.1.5. Consider that a better more consistent service would be provided by bringing the service together
4.15.1.6. Currently looking at how to integrate the ASBAT team with Community
Safety and look at opportunities to refine resources so that the service is benefitting from not working in a silo but sharing resources to deliver a better service.

4.15.1.7. The CCTV service is provided by two officers, one full time and one part-time and they consider that this is the part of the service that provides the biggest impact to the service

4.15.2. Positives:

4.15.3. The ASBAT team have a record of providing a quality service

4.15.4. There is a partnership with HFH which is detailed in a SLA

4.15.5. They have a dedicated victim support officer that ensures the victim understands the process and the outcome

4.15.6. There are two CCTV officers to manage the purchase, installation, maintenance and monitoring of all cameras

4.15.7. CCTV footage of dumping rubbish, drugs and drug dealing on estates has had a positive effect by facilitating arrests

4.15.8. There have never been any complaints from any area about ASBAT or HFH regards ASB

4.15.9. Will use temporary resources to meet additional demand

4.15.10. The Council is accountable for the service and the Cabinet member has to be contacted about service failures

4.15.11. There are two administration officers that handle resident contacts and details

4.15.12. Enforcement record is according to the ASB manager above the average

4.15.13. Meeting performance targets

4.15.14. 80% of all court cases are proven

4.15.15. Send out satisfaction surveys to all users of the service and achieving the target of 70%

4.15.16. Will take action against those with mental health issues but finding it is slower due to reduced social services intervention.

4.15.17. The ASBAT team have 22 cases each, which apparently is considerably higher to the 6 cases per officer recommended by the CIOH.

4.15.18. A programme has been run for young people who have committed ASB aged 10 to 16. They were monitored for six months and if there were no improvement in behaviour then court action would be taken. There has been no reoffending by these young people.

4.15.19. HFH pays for all legal costs

4.15.20. HFH pays for all surveillance cameras and equipment

4.15.21. Staff cuts have been protected, but as external funding has reduced higher contributions have been made by HFH

4.15.22. Use the internal legal service

4.15.23. There are regular SLA meetings with HFH

4.15.24. The CCTV officers confirmed that they have to work every week hours in excess of their contract due to the high workload, which involves providing camera footage, inspecting all cameras, and monitoring activities for HFH staff.

4.15.25. The CCTV officers confirmed that they have sent to HFH a proposal on the way forward to improve the service and invest in new wireless surveillance monitoring equipment which needs an initial capital investment of £250k. A short video was shown which captured events that were recorded on cameras and used to prosecute. It is clear that CCTV, which provides high quality images, is essential. A business case
needs to be developed detailing the benefits and pay back period for this level of investment.

4.15.26. Negatives/issues:

4.15.26.1. Residents complain that it can take twenty minutes to get through to the ASBAT team and often experience the call being dropped

4.15.26.2. Some cases can take up to 10 years to resolve

4.15.26.3. There has been a negative impact on the service due to reduced police support

4.15.26.4. There has been a problem of not all residents calling about ASB receiving a reference number which has resulted in some cases being lost, but that is attributed to the TMO and call centre

4.15.26.5. Housing providers in the Borough receive free support and advice.

4.15.26.6. The Advocacy service is not effective

4.15.26.7. There is no family parent group, which used to be attended by 165 families

4.15.26.8. Outreach work with schools has had to be reduced, as there is no time or funding to support this preventive awareness work. Officers will go where there is a specific request and will engage with those three to four years old

4.15.26.9. There is concern that sharing of information about cases is only done where a specific request is made

4.15.26.10. It is accepted that the quality of information entered into the OHMS system could be improved

4.15.26.11. There are concerns regarding the 9 digit telephone number that it is confusing residents

4.15.26.12. Not all cases of ASB are reported to a single point within the ASB team.

4.15.26.13. Do not appear to use complaints as a learning tool as they could not provide any examples where the service has been changed as a result of feedback

4.15.26.14. The Manager advised that he feeds back to the team feedback from the resident surveys, however, other staff in the team could not confirm that this happened on a monthly basis or at all

4.15.26.15. ASBAT senior managers provided an operating view that was not supported by feedback from frontline officers, which shows that there needs to be better clarity of different roles from within the team

4.15.26.16. Suggested that some ASB issues could be dealt with by Estate Managers

4.15.26.17. Local people afraid to report ASB so we must make them have confidence that it is easy to access and support is available

4.15.26.18. The service Director confirmed that the Housing Providers ASB Forum should be reinvigorated and he welcomed the suggestion by the Scrutiny Panel that the ASBAT team could sell training and ASB services to other housing providers

4.15.27. Recommendations:

4.15.27.1. There needs to be better communication between all managers

4.15.27.2. Improved integration between both ASBAT and HFH around complaints and outcomes would help with understanding the pressures placed on the service
| 4.15.27.3. | ASBAT have designated officers for estates but these are not known to residents, and when previously requested by residents were not provided. |
| 4.15.27.4. | There is a need to introduce a standard specification and supplier for all CCTV cameras, and resources allocated to ensure that they are all maintained. |
| 4.15.27.5. | Consideration needs to be given to investing in CCTV new equipment and resources that will allow the service to continue to provide essential services for HFH, the Council and other housing providers generating an additional income stream. |
| 4.15.27.6. | ASBAT could provide a training hub for other housing providers and raise income through this to reinvest in additional resources to support the CCTV service to upgrade the surveillance system. |
| 4.15.27.7. | There is a need to joint training for staff on both sides every six months to help improve team working and ensuring that skills are maintained. |
| 4.15.27.8. | There is concern by ASBAT that the HFH team do not have the time to provide an excellent service. |
| 4.15.27.9. | Financial resources must be found to update leaflets and promotional items. |
| 4.15.27.10. | There needs to be a victim support officer dedicated to HFH cases as currently they do not have this service, but the work is completed by TMO officers. |
| 4.15.27.11. | Housing providers must be negotiated with to pay for support and advice provided. This would provide an additional income stream to support the additional resources required. |
| 4.15.27.12. | Review the advocacy service and identify what needs to be put in place to make this a success. |
| 4.15.27.13. | Review the difficulties that residents are reporting with the telephone system. |
| 4.15.27.14. | Consider whether a dedicated mental health officer would be helpful to prevent repeat of offences. No actual number of cases could be provided as the monitoring information does not provide this detail, but there was a clear issue for both sides around helping and supporting those with mental health issues since external organisations are not able to support ASB perpetrators or victims. |
| 4.15.27.15. | The Service Level Agreement and the performance indicators and level of detail provided do not facilitate a clear understanding of the service. |
| 4.15.27.16. | Consider having a residents panel that will help shape documentation, website information and review satisfaction feedback. |

**4.16.** HFH Board member feedback: (source: Board interviews)

| 4.16.1. | General: |
| 4.16.1.1. | The Board supported the management request for the Scrutiny Panel to review ASB. |
| 4.16.1.2. | The Board Bulletin is used to inform Board members of organisational performance. |
| 4.16.1.3. | October 2014 Board Bulletin advised the Board Members of the proposal to review ASB services and outlined the scope of the review. |
| 4.16.1.4. | It is important that Board Members have a better understanding of the.
ASB service

4.16.2. Positives:

4.16.2.1. As a Board member he has not been contacted by any HFH resident about issues related to ASB

4.16.2.2. Questioned whether ASB was a real issue or was a perception by residents and the Council

4.16.2.3. Working with the Director of Operations to look at ASB and other housing operational services

4.16.3. Negatives/issues:

4.16.3.1. The Board have only two key performance indicators to measure the success and impact of the service, and there is a feeling that ASB is an issue for Housing Managers

4.16.3.2. Has been little mention of ASB at the Board but as it is a joint service with the Council should be given the same level of scrutiny as all other services

4.16.3.3. Concerned that there are no detailed performance reports and financial appraisal of the service and hoped that the scrutiny report will focus not only on operational issues but value for money

4.16.3.4. Residents have not been consulted or involved with determining what is best practice for Haringey

4.16.3.5. The Board needs greater awareness of this service

4.16.4. Recommendations:

4.16.4.1. Seek to provide the Board with meaningful performance information from HFH and ASBAT

4.16.4.2. The Board will find the feedback from the Scrutiny Report helpful to understand the service and look at integration into HFH

4.16.4.3. Communicate outcomes and issues to both residents and Board members because it appears to be a silent service not open to scrutiny

4.17. Resident Association meeting (source: Edgcot Grove and Helston Court)

4.17.1. General:

4.17.1.1. The meeting was scheduled by the Residents Association to bring together all the service providers and Partners to look at resident ASB complaints.

4.17.2. Negatives/issues:

4.17.2.1. Housing officers’ workload has increased as well as the areas they have to cover. There is little contact with residents now, as they no longer attend estate inspections. Residents are not informed about changes of staff and as a result residents are often unable to trace their housing officer. Residents are also unclear about the role of their housing officer. In frustration, residents bypass protocol and make complaints to their councillors or senior management.

4.17.2.2. Tenancy Managers need to have a better understanding of how to assist residents facing hardship or who have various needs.
4.17.2.3. Mystery shopping identified some poor customer service with a New Tenant Liaison Officer in relation to signing a permanent tenancy:

4.17.2.4. The resident was contacted by phone at work and it was demanded that she speak to the officer immediately or the next day. When they called back they were greeted with ‘Hello number 10’ instead of their name.

4.17.2.5. The officer would not accept that the time they demanded to meet was not convenient as the resident worked full-time with a three hour commute each day. The officer threatened the resident saying that she could lose her property. When the resident commented the rude and aggressive behaviour on, the officer told her that she was being evasive.

4.17.2.6. When the resident asked the officer to text the contact details of her line manager, the officer said that she could not do it because “my fingers are too fat to type on the keys”.

4.17.2.7. Mystery shopping also identified an incident of an officer coming across as threatening and domineering saying “I am your landlord and you can lose your property. I will not call you, you will call me back.”

4.17.3. Recommendations:

4.17.3.1. Keep appointments in line with letters sent out and contact the resident to check if wishing to change appointment time.

4.17.3.2. Always greet residents professionally using standard HfH customer service greetings. E.g. ‘Good morning Homes for Haringey, Joe Blogs speaking’.

4.17.3.3. Give more consideration for contact and appointment times for working residents.

4.17.3.4. Check that customer contact preferences are up-to-date and check them before contacting residents.

4.17.3.5. Line manager contact details should always be provided if requested.

4.17.3.6. Ensure training is provided to Tenancy Managers on how to best support or provide advice for residents who are facing hardship or have other needs.
5. Recommendations

Key themes

- Improving communication with all residents and staff
- Ensuring access to services is centralised and has a variety of approaches
- Engaging with residents in more effective ways to encourage confidence to report and feedback on ASB
- Improving the organisational structure for service delivery by centralising the service and maximising opportunities to generate income to invest in the service
- Using feedback from residents to improve services
- Ensuring residents are more centrally involved in decision-making, monitoring and developing measurable effective performance indicators
- Ensuring residents are treated with respect and consideration when victims of ASB
- Ensuring HfH/ASBAT has complete, clearly accessible, data on all cases and use case studies and success to communicate outcomes to residents

Table of recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Key Recommendations</th>
<th>Priority to residents</th>
<th>Priority to business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review the SLA to include more detailed performance information, clear roles and responsibilities, full service costs including overheads, agreeing an equipment specification for CCTV and involving residents in service monitoring and review</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review how the call centre handles ASB, procedures for handling ASB calls, telephone process- look to include a press option for ASB, all calls to the dedicated ASB number, ensure case reference numbers are used</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Neighbourhoods</strong>- review role and responsibilities of concierge staff, offer training to overcome fear of reporting ASB promote role and work of Quality Assurance Officers and the work around estate improvements</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Resident engagement</strong>- include in the RE strategy the role and responsibility of resident involvement staff to feedback ASB issues to the TMO/ASBAT, work with Resident Associations to develop role and scope for piloting ASB resident monitors. Community events to promote the work of the ASB teams and outcomes</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Communication</strong>- develop a joint ASB Communication Strategy- produce a quarterly ASB case bulletin to share with staff and residents (on-line), Promote case studies and outcomes on the website and Homes Zone, provide information on ASB going to the</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confidential Resident Scrutiny Report – anti social behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Key Recommendations</th>
<th>Priority to residents</th>
<th>Priority to business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board to Councillors, develop an on-line ASB reporting template, look at including an ASB reporting tool to the landlord app</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Resident feedback</strong>- on a six monthly basis use case studies to review processes and procedures through a workshop, review ASB satisfaction feedback process as results not detailed to cover the criteria agreed in the SLA, look at making satisfaction feedback received by an independent service such as the HFH feedback team, develop a prevention strategy that is impact assess on an annual basis, develop a step by step users guide</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Complaints</strong>- look at how complaints are recorded as it is stated by ASBAT that they and HFH have not received any complaints. A complaints should be logged by the Complaints team and not the ASBAT team</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Staff training and Performance management</strong>: Look at SLA and training to be provided and agree an annual schedule of training, look at including residents in awareness training, use ‘lunch and learn’ to keep all staff aware of ASB, hold annual refresher training on policy, procedures, outcomes and enforcement, look at data collection OHMS system and ensure new CRM system will provided enhanced performance information, add ASB to staff induction. Look at accuracy of reporting data and allocate responsibility for validation to the HFH Performance team</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>CCTV</strong>- looks at requirement to update surveillance equipment and develop a camera specification. Look to have having a single camera provider and maintenance contract. Look to sell CCTV services to other housing providers</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Estate improvements</strong>- look at impact assessing estate improvements to identify impact on ASB, and feedback to residents,</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>ASBAT Training</strong> – look to develop a training package for other housing providers and partners that can be charged for, re-establish the Housing Providers Forum and feedback to HFH</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Conclusion**

6.1. The review has identified that from a customer perspective that the service is failing to meet expectations and aspirations of the business.
6.2. The Scrutiny Panel does feel that centralisation of the service supported by all staff is essential to reduce duplication, simplify operating procedures, maximise use of staff skills and give clear understanding of roles and responsibilities.

6.3. There is a need to look to investing in technology and resources that will have a positive impact on service delivery and provide opportunities to increase revenue by providing services for other housing providers and partners.

6.4. ASB is not going to go away but as performance information is inadequate it is very difficult to understand the full scope of the issues and where priorities should be allocated.