

Resident and Community Panel Working Group Customer Service Standard Draft meeting summary / actions

Date: Tuesday, 31 March 2026

Time: 6:00 PM – 7:00 PM

Location: Online (Microsoft Teams)

Chair: Jordan Crawford (BCC)

Transcribe: Henry Murray (BCC)

Attendees:

Panel members: 8 in attendance

BCC: Jordan Crawford, Amy Hughes, Henry Murray, David Maggs

1. Welcome, housekeeping and introductions

Confirmation that a transcript was being recorded for the purpose of summary and actions, not video recording.

Participants introduced themselves, including council officers, residents, panel members, and voluntary sector representatives.

Jordan Crawford outlined their role within Policy and Engagement, focusing on resident feedback, complaints, satisfaction measures, and service improvement.

.

2. Purpose of the session

Jordan explained that the session aimed to gather honest resident feedback on the Customer Service Standard, understand what good customer service feels like in practice, and use this feedback to inform revisions and implementation

3. What 'Excellent Customer Service' Looks Like from the last meeting

Residents were invited to describe excellent customer service using two words.

Responses included:

responsive, empathic, friendly, personable, engaging, and accessible. Engagement was further explained as feeling listened to and experiencing genuine two-way communication rather than one-way messaging.

- Question: What does 'engaging' mean?
Response: Being listened to, having mutual interaction, and feeling involved in the process.

4. Communication

Communication was consistently identified as the main issue underlying service dissatisfaction. Priorities discussed included timely responses, clear language, proactive updates, follow-up, respect and acknowledgement, preferred communication methods, and consistency and accessibility

- Question: What matters most in communication?
Responses focused on follow-up, acknowledgement, fairness, and avoiding dismissive or defensive responses.

5. Acknowledgement and timeliness

Residents stressed that acknowledgement of contact is essential, even if no immediate action is taken

- Question: What is a reasonable timeframe for acknowledgement?
Response: 24–48 hours for general requests, with urgent issues addressed faster.
- Question: Should acknowledgements be automated or personal?
Response: A mixed approach was preferred — automated acknowledgement followed by personal contact.

6. Repairs experience

Repairs were highlighted as a major source of frustration. Residents reported lack of confirmation, long periods without updates, missed appointments, and unclear escalation routes.

- Question: What would good repair communication look like?
Responses included confirmation of receipt, clear timescales, job reference numbers, regular updates, and post-repair follow-up.

7. Preferred Communication Methods

Phone calls were generally preferred for reassurance and accessibility, though

residents emphasised the importance of choice. Digital methods were useful but should not replace personal contact.

- Question: Is a phone call the best method?
Response: Often yes, but preferences vary and residents should be able to choose.

8. Digital Options and Technology

The group discussed photo/video uploads for repairs and video appointments for diagnostics. These were viewed positively if kept optional and inclusive

- Question: Are video appointments available?
Response: They are being developed and are already used by some providers.

9. Transparency and Progress Updates

Residents highlighted frustration with a lack of transparency, especially when planned works are discussed once and never referenced again.

- Question: How should residents be kept informed?
Response: Through proactive updates, even when there is no change, and clear explanations when plans are delayed or cancelled.

10. Feeling Valued and Respected

Residents linked poor communication with feeling ignored, undervalued, and discouraged from future engagement. Respect was described as needing to be demonstrated through consistent communication and follow-up.

- This section focused on lived experience rather than formal questions.

11. Housing Officer Roles and Responsibilities

Significant confusion was raised about housing officer roles. Many residents did not know who their housing officer was or what support they could expect.

- Question: Do residents know who their housing officer is or response times?
Response: Many do not, and responsibilities are unclear, particularly around repairs.

12. Case Ownership and Personalisation

Residents expressed a strong desire for named contacts, clear ownership, and personalised communication to improve accountability and trust.

- Question: What would build accountability?
Responses included named contacts, team identification, and clear handovers.

13. Lived Experiences Shared

Residents shared examples of long delays, health impacts from damp and mould, missed appointments, and repeated chasing without escalation clarity.

- Experiences were shared rather than direct questions posed.

14. Measurable Standards and Accountability

Residents challenged how standards could be enforced without measurable targets.

- Question: How can accountability exist without targets?
Response: Standards should include response time targets, follow-up points, and escalation routes.

14. Actions and Next Steps

Jorden Crawford confirmed that feedback would be used to revise the Customer Service Standard, incorporating clearer timescales and accountability.

Summary of Actions

Action	Responsible	Deadline
Communication and Customer Service Standard request for feedback to next RCP with updates.	Jorden Crawford	12 May
How resident comments from workshop will be/ have influenced standard	Jorden Crawford	12 May
How does BCC compare in terms of housing officer number patch size and areas of responsibility	Amy Hughes David Maggs	12 May

Presentation to panel on role of housing officer TBC	Amy Hughes	12 May