



Minutes of the VIVID Customer Scrutiny Panel meeting held at 6pm on Microsoft Teams on 4 June 2026

Present: Lee Sexton (LS), Chair
Rosemary Pyke (RP)
Lisa Macintosh (LM)

In attendance: Margaret Dodwell (MD), Chief Operating Officer
Sarah Smith (SS), Place Shaping & Customer Influence Manager
Natalia Hadfield (NH), Head of Customer Experience
Lauren Cannon (LC), Governance Manager
Tamara Breach (TB), Assistant Company Secretary (minutes)

Part attendance: David Conquest (DC)
Mo Afzal (MA)

Apologies: Sharon Maddison (SM), Vice Chair
Karen Rawlings (KR)

The meeting was confirmed as quorate and started at 6.04pm

DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE PANEL:

VCSP 019/26 Minutes from the meeting held on 19 February 2026
The minutes of the meeting held on 19 February 2026 were agreed and approved.

VCSP 026/26 VIVID Customer Scrutiny Panel Scrutiny & TPAS joint review
It was agreed DC would join the TPAS joint review steering group

FULL MINUTES OF THE MEETING:

VCSP 018/26 Welcome and apologies
LS welcomed attendees to the meeting and noted apologies from SM and KR. He advised the format of the meeting would differ slightly from usual to allow time for the detailed items. Additionally, LS noted this would be LC's final meeting and, on behalf of the entire VCSP, expressed sincere thanks for the significant progress made under her and her team's support.

VCSP 019/26 Minutes from the meeting held on 19 February 2026
The minutes of the meeting held on 19 February 2026 were agreed and approved.

VCSP 020/26 Matters arising
SS provided the following updates on the matters arising.

Repairs improvement group - the repairs improvement group is now called the repairs action group and preparations are underway for its second meeting. 8 customers attended the first meeting, including 1 customer who had previously made frequent stage 2 complaints about repairs but is now engaging more positively with the team. SS advised the meeting gave customers the opportunity to consider what they wanted from the group and enabled open discussion with repairs colleagues about the improvement journey and shared commitment to change. The agenda for the second meeting will be developed jointly by customers and colleagues.

Void inspector role - the remit for the void inspector role has now been finalised. Training materials have been prepared by the voids team and work is underway to recruit customers to take part as void inspectors.

Customer influence year 3 plan - feedback gathered from customers at the recent thank you event has now been incorporated and the plan had been finalised. A copy will be shared with the members. SS added that at least 1 customer is involved in monitoring delivery of the plan through regular attendance at the customer influence delivery group, helping to ensure commitments are being followed through.

ACTION SS

TPAS revisit - the assessor returned to review progress against the original recommendations, signed off all actions, and provided positive feedback. We've been asked to produce a blog on our journey since accreditation and to share information on our equality, diversity, and inclusion work. SS added TPAS continue to connect the team with organisations across the country to share learning and good practice. The accreditation marked the start of an ongoing journey and this work will continue.

The updates to the matters arising were noted.

VCSP 021/26

COO Verbal Update

MD advised a new social housing bill is progressing, with a focus on safety, tenants' rights, and the preservation of social housing stock, including proposals to restrict Right to Buy in order to retain homes within the sector for the longer term. MD also highlighted the continued impact of the cost of living pressures, noting published inflation figures do not always reflect the reality experienced by customers, particularly those on lower incomes. We're reviewing the support available to customers, including financial inclusion activity and the welfare fund, with a continued emphasis on tenancy sustainment.

DC asked whether there had been any change in the number of requests for assistance. MD advised welfare fund requests, which are usually referred through colleagues, have shown an upward trend in recent months. Demand typically increases over winter and falls during the summer, so it will be important to monitor whether this pattern continues or whether levels remain higher. DC suggested comparing the figures with the same period last year.

ACTION MD

MD advised we launched our customer promises in April and have begun rolling out the associated customer advocate credential programme, which all staff will complete over the next 18 months. The executive team have all recently undertaken the professional discussion element. MD added it would be helpful for panel members to see the journal work staff are completing as part of the process.

ACTION NH

MD also reported we've submitted a further bid for grant funding to support the development of new homes.

MD invited members of the scrutiny panel to meet with the group board in September 2026, ahead of the group board meeting, and asked them to consider what they'd like to discuss. This could include their latest review or another topic of their choosing. MD noted it has been a couple of years since the panel last met with the board, when they presented on psychographic segmentation. She added the group board would also be interested in hearing directly from the panel on the ASB review, currently expected in early 2027, either through a presentation or submission of the final report. MD advised there's a clear intention to strengthen the connection between the group board and the work of the VCSP, and asked LS to suggest a proposed topic by mid-August so arrangements could be made. ER will send calendar invites to the VCSP members.

ACTION LS/ER

MD referred to feedback from the governance review undertaken by Campbell Tickell, noting scrutiny members had recognised VIVID's clear intention to listen, learn and hear the customer voice. However, the feedback also suggested there was a gap between that intention and our actions. MD said she was keen to understand directly from panel members what more could be done to demonstrate feedback is being acted on and welcomed an open discussion.

RP asked whether this related to the panel not always receiving feedback on the reports and recommendations it puts forward. LS advised this is now being captured through the recommendation tracker and associated monthly meetings and suggested the issue may instead relate to delays with IT changes, which had taken some time to come to fruition but were now close to being resolved. LS also noted, in some cases, the issue may concern longer-term work that is not directly within the teams' control, such as phase 3 of P25, where progress is happening behind the scenes but isn't yet visible to customers. LS noted customers may only see that something is wrong and that an outcome is expected later in the year, which highlights a gap in communication in the interim.

SS referred to an earlier service review discussion with communications colleagues linked to P25, noting a potential recommendation had been to introduce newsletters focusing on the transformation programme. These could provide customers with updates on the digital transformation journey and the difference it's now making. SS suggested this could be explored further during the panel's scrutiny time, as it may help to address the point about bridging the gap and ensuring key information is shared more clearly with customers.

MD asked if there are specific examples where our intentions and actions do not align, panel members should raise them with NH, SS, or any other relevant colleague, who would be happy to receive feedback at any time.

NH noted it remains important to continue referring to the recommendation tracker and advised steps had been put in place to ensure it's regularly revisited. NH encouraged members to raise any concerns if they aren't satisfied with the updates or responses provided, so further explanation could be given as to why a particular action is or isn't being taken. NH noted the process has improved now actions are being tracked more formally but emphasised members should continue to raise any issues so they could be followed up and the panel can receive the responses it needs.

LS noted Granicus would provide a digital way of sharing information with customers. NH confirmed contracts have been signed and the project was now underway. The communications scrutiny review would be split into 2 parts: the implementation of Granicus as a digital engagement platform to help reach and involve more customers in real time, and a wider review of communications content, including what is shared, how often, and how non-digital customers are engaged.

NH advised she and SS had held the project kick-off meeting with Granicus that afternoon and had started work on the implementation plan, which is expected to take around 3 months to get the platform live. Customer consultation has already taken place on potential names for the platform, and the decision would be shared with the group shortly. NH added panel members would have opportunities throughout implementation to help shape the design and content, with feedback gathered at key stages so all members could contribute where possible.

ACTION NH

The update provided on operational matters was noted.

VCSP 022/26

Performance review

LS advised this item would be a little different, as, at his request, there wouldn't be anyone present to talk the panel through the performance report and invited any questions.

LS noted the service standard measures appeared broadly positive, with only marginal drops where they occurred, otherwise a relatively consistent picture. LS recalled, when the panel first reviewed the measures around 18 months earlier, the results had shown much greater variation across the categories. LS also asked whether these were the standard questions that could not be changed.

NH confirmed they were the TSMs introduced by the regulator of social housing and the questions are set. While the core requirements can't be changed, there's some flexibility in how the survey can be carried out. This year, we moved to a mixed-methodology approach, using a combination of channels to improve representation across customer groups. This reflects previous psychographic segmentation work, which has shown some groups, particularly customers in the 'nurture and assist' category, weren't being heard from sufficiently.

NH advised that 25% of this year's responses have been gathered by email rather than telephone. This helped us hear from a broader range of customers. Although mixed-methodology surveys typically produce slightly lower satisfaction scores across the sector, particularly where online responses are included, this is accepted as a positive trade-off, as the aim is to obtain a more representative view rather than achieve a particular score.

NH added the results highlighted areas for improvement which were consistent with feedback customers had already provided through other channels. One of the main issues continues to be closing the

feedback loop and demonstrating visible action, as customers' satisfaction is influenced not only by opportunities to shape services but also by whether they felt action has been taken and commitments delivered.

LS noted a standout point was the improvement in repairs, following the scrutiny review undertaken around 12 months earlier, this demonstrates the panel's work is being listened to, progress is being made, and customers are beginning to see the impact.

LS noted the number of responses on satisfaction with the landlord's approach to handling ASB was low and observed customers may remain dissatisfied where legal powers limit the action that can be taken. For example, a customer may expect eviction in response to antisocial behaviour, but where that is not legally possible, dissatisfaction may remain even if the appropriate action has been taken.

NH advised ASB and complaints are generally among the lower-scoring areas, for the reasons already discussed, including the nature of ASB cases and the limits on what information can be shared. NH stressed the importance of continuing to improve to make sure customers feel listened to. This is part of the reason for carrying out the scrutiny review on ASB, so the panel can look at how things might be improved and whether more supporting information can be shared.

LS asked what the 0.1% for callbacks completed on time represented in actual numbers, noting this has also been discussed at the CSC. NH advised she'd confirm the volume and what had driven the figure for that month. Although the team have worked hard, the result remains too low, as the expectation should be 100% under the keeping in touch service standard introduced this year. 91% is not good enough and correlates with complaints about communication, so improving performance in this area remains a clear focus for the team.

ACTION NH

The contents of the performance report were noted.

VCSP 023/26

Complaints and lessons learnt update

The complaints and lessons learnt update was taken as read and questions invited.

LS noted the helpful inclusion of guidance on medical cannabis within the knowledge articles. NH explained, following learning from complaints, new guidance had been developed to clarify the distinction between cannabis use and prescribed medical cannabis, to support colleagues in managing these situations appropriately.

LS asked for an update on the work with Farnborough College. NH advised it's being progressed with the HR team and that a further update can be provided.

ACTION NH

LS asked for clarification on 4.2 in the report - *"We are increasing the amount of Stage 2 complaints managed within the centralised team, with 57% managed within March, increasing to 67% in April"*. NH advised we moved to a centralised complaints model a couple of years ago, with all stage 1 complaints handled by the resolution team. This has now been extended to stage 2 complaints, which were previously managed by service managers and senior managers. The report reflects progress in bringing more stage 2 complaints into the centralised team, with capacity increasing as overall complaint volumes reduce following the winter spike.

LS raised that the link could not be accessed because it was contained within the PDF.

ACTION LC

The contents of the complaints and lessons learnt update were noted.

VCSP 024/26

Budget review

The budget review was taken as read. There were no questions.

The contents of the budget review were noted.

Update from Customer Service Committee

LC advised there were currently 14 applicants for the 4 member vacancies on CSC. Interviews are due to take place at the end of the month. The next few weeks will be used to review applications, speak with candidates and identify those to progress to interview. As in previous recruitment rounds, the process may also identify individuals who could be suitable for the scrutiny panel, either before or after interview stage. Recruitment remains open and further applications are still welcome. Overall, the response had been positive, and we've received a number of strong applications.

MD noted at the next CSC meeting, members would begin considering several annual reports, including lettings, ASB and evictions, as part of the annual review of the previous year's activity. Additionally, MD advised a presentation was given in April by The Leadership Factor (TLF), which carries out the independent TSM survey, which provided a valuable opportunity for CSC members to explore the results in more depth. MD suggested when this is repeated next year, scrutiny panel members could also be invited to join the session if they wished, so they can hear directly from the independent provider and gain insight into how our results compare with others.

ACTION NH

The update from the customer service committee was noted.

VIVID Customer Scrutiny Panel Scrutiny & TPAS joint review

LS advised he and SM have attended a couple of meetings with Sam Goodwin (SG) a TPAS associate to progress the joint review initiative.

SS explained the joint review involves 4 organisations: VIVID, Hull City Council, FCHO in Wakefield, Red Kite. We've been paired with Red Kite based on geographical location. As discussed earlier in the meeting, customers on the steering group have chosen ASB as the focus of the review. Over the next few meetings with SG, the steering group will agree the scope of the service review, which will then determine the aspects of the ASB service each organisation would present. Each organisation will showcase its approach to ASB, and the scrutiny members will then decide which areas they want to focus on in more detail, as ASB is a broad and emotive subject. The latest thinking is for the event to take a blended format, with hearing from one organisation in the morning and the other in the afternoon, followed by benchmarking and consideration of recommendations.

2 VCSP members are needed on the steering group, which LS and SM have fulfilled so far. However, given LS work commitments, another member is needed to step in. Members not on the steering group will still be welcome to take part in the joint service review day with Red Kite on 10 September, for which at least 10 involved customers will be needed. The immediate priority is to identify a replacement for LS on the steering group.

DC advised since ASB comes up a lot in his discussions with councils, community safety officers and the police, and he has recently carried out walkarounds with them across a range of properties, he'd be happy to take this on.

LS suggested the findings from the review could be linked into the panel's meeting with the group board either in September 2026 or early 2027. SS agreed and noted given the project timeline, there's also an opportunity to showcase the work at the national scrutiny event in October, which will require further preparation. Additionally, with recommendations expected to follow the review, an update to the group board in the new year would be timely and would align well if the project progresses as planned. It was also noted that SM remains keen to stay involved, but her current circumstances need to be considered and supported. SS advised she'd follow up with David on the key dates already agreed with SG from TPAS and would copy LS into that correspondence. They'll work together to ensure VIVID is appropriately represented in the group, as it's important that customers remain involved in a proposal we're leading.

ACTION SS

DC left the meeting.

LS noted progress on the communications review had stalled while Granicus was being implemented and because capacity within the group is currently limited. LS asked LM and RP to support SM in taking forward the work already started, as he will be away from the following week until the end of July. LM

and RP both agreed. NH advised the next stage was about gathering feedback from the panel and others. She noted this should build on the points raised at the scrutiny day and the feedback already provided, with the aim of developing overarching recommendations covering both the new platform and communication with non-digital customers. NH added this could also include specific recommendations on how the panel might seek views from non-digital customers and what support we can provide to help with that, so the review can be concluded with a clear set of recommendations.

LM asked whether there's a fund to help non-digital customers become more digitally included. NH advised there's been similar initiatives in the past and if the panel felt this was something to revisit as part of the review, it could be considered. NH also noted some actions in the year 3 plan focus on going into communities to support digital inclusion, which could tie into this work.

SS advised it could also link to the work being developed through VIVID Plus. SS thanked LM and RP for taking the work forward and advised the next step is to understand what they need from her and NH, including a refresher on the themes from the scrutiny day and support to help shape possible recommendations. SS added that one possible recommendation might be for us to consider the role we should play in helping customers build digital skills where they want or need to, although no commitment can be made at this stage, this would be for the panel to challenge the organisation on. **ACTION SS**

LS proposed the 25 June for VCSP members to get together to take this forward. Discussion was held about the best format for the meeting to take place (face to face or online). NH noted colleagues would support the session in whatever format worked best, while emphasising the importance of allowing panel members time to meet independently to develop their own recommendations. LC confirmed the governance team can set up whatever is needed and ensure the right people are involved. She asked members to let her know once they've agreed their preferred approach, so she can liaise with NH and SS. **ACTION LM/RP/ER**

The updates provided on the scrutiny reviews were noted and it was agreed DC would join the TPAS joint review steering group.

VCSP 027/26

A year in review

LC advised this report provides an overview of the year and an opportunity for the panel to consider its priorities and areas of focus for the year ahead.

LS reflected there have been significant changes in leadership and membership for a range of reasons and, without being able to increase numbers, the panel has been left quite stretched. Additionally, he said he was hopeful the CSC recruitment would deliver the right members for the committee and give the panel an opportunity to identify suitable people who might wish to get involved with VCSP.

LS noted that the communications review was already underway and the ASB work, originally intended to follow, was now progressing alongside the TPAS review, the panel would therefore need to start considering what should come next, so that momentum was maintained. LS reminded members it had previously been agreed that CSC could suggest future topics but asked whether they remained content with that approach or whether there was another issue they felt should be prioritised in due course.

LC recalled earlier conversations with TPAS noting they were keen for the panel itself to think carefully about what it wanted to focus on. CSC could be influenced by board members who sit on the committee as to what topics they suggest. This is a real opportunity for the panel to shape its own next area of focus. LC suggested that this might include looking at the TSMs and identifying areas where members felt improvement was needed.

The contents of the year in review were noted.

VCSP 024/26

Any other business

LS noted the meeting had been run in a slightly different format than usual and asked members for feedback on whether they felt it had worked better. LS observed the meeting was finishing around 30 minutes early and asked whether everything that needed to be covered had been addressed or whether

members felt the panel should return to the previous format. LS invited members to provide feedback to the governance team. LS added that the format could continue to be refined over time and said that, from his perspective, a considerable amount had been covered. **ACTION ALL**

MD suggested that, when meeting papers are circulated, scrutiny members should be asked to confirm they have been able to access and read the pack. She said this would help identify any issues in advance and avoid the need to share screens during the meeting, which can detract from discussion. If members agreed, she suggested this could be built into the process by asking them to confirm receipt and access with governance when the papers are issued. LS agreed this would be a positive process and asked LC to consider how this is achieved **ACTION ER**

NH asked members to consider whether they preferred business leads to present items in the meeting, or whether they would rather read the papers beforehand and then bring questions. She said either approach was fine and should depend on what worked best for members. NH recognised condensing the agenda in this way gives the panel more time to focus on scrutiny matters as a group, but if members still wanted colleagues to present, they could step out for part of the meeting and come back in when invited, while governance continued to minute the discussion and capture feedback.

LC recorded her thanks for the support she'd received from the panel whilst working with them and wished them the very best for the future.

Date of next meeting – 20 August 2026

Meeting closed at 7.37pm