manningham
HOUSING ASSOCIATION



Customer Scrutiny Report

Anti-Social Behaviour Review

September 2026

Contents

1. Background

2. Scope

3. Summary – Key Findings

4. Findings

  4.1 Objective 1 – Customer Service Standards and Accessibility

  4.2 Objective 2 – Effectiveness and Oversight of ASB Services

  4.3 Objective 3 – Customer Care and Experience

5. Recommendations

Appendix 1 – Scope, Approach and Methodology

1) Background

1.1 This scrutiny review of anti-social behaviour (ASB) was undertaken to understand how Manningham Housing Association (MHA) receives, assesses, manages and closes ASB reports, and how effectively the service supports customers while protecting residents and communities from harm. The review also considered the consistency of case triage, communication, case ownership, evidence gathering, enforcement, mediation and the use of case-management systems.

1.2 The review followed a pre-information session in which MHA officers outlined the ASB policy and procedure, the organisation's approach to support, fairness and confidentiality, evidence gathering, preventative action, triage, enforcement and mediation. The Forum then identified areas requiring further evidence and scrutiny, including successful and unsuccessful cases, high- and low-risk triage, accessibility of reporting routes, four-week follow-up arrangements, case handover and the forthcoming PanConnect system.

1.3 A further scrutiny session in September considered the service in greater depth. The Forum used the discussion to test how the process operates in practice, including how cases are allocated and monitored, how evidence and outcomes are recorded, how staff cover is managed, and how MHA seeks to balance proportionate enforcement with the needs of customers and the wider community.

2) Scope

2.1 The review focused on the following objectives:

- **Objective 1** – Understand and scrutinise customer service standards in relation to ASB, including how reports are received, triaged, communicated and managed consistently across MHA.
- **Objective 2** – Understand how effective ASB services are defined, recorded and monitored, including case ownership, evidence gathering, enforcement, mediation, performance oversight and the use of case-management systems.
- **Objective 3** – Scrutinise the level of customer care provided throughout the ASB journey, including accessibility, confidentiality, support, communication, follow-up, closure and the experience of customers where the service has not operated as intended.

2.2 The Forum also considered the treatment of non-tenant complainants, tenant screening and sensitive lettings where relevant to preventing and managing ASB, and the potential benefits and risks associated with changes to case-management arrangements.

3) Summary – Key Findings

- The Forum gained a clearer understanding of the end-to-end ASB process, from reporting and triage through investigation, evidence gathering, intervention, enforcement, monitoring and closure.
- ASB can be reported through WhatsApp, email, the MHA website and telephone. However, the Forum identified a need for stronger centralised ownership and routing to ensure reports are consistently logged and not dependent on individual officers or mailboxes.
- Triage is intended to distinguish urgent/high-risk cases, lower-level matters and disputes, taking account of factors including frequency, impact, dates, times, support needs and seriousness. The Forum highlighted the need to demonstrate consistent application of these categories.
- Case management remains heavily reliant on manual recording, with weaknesses in chronology, task prompts, ownership visibility and follow-up monitoring. A previous missed case demonstrated the risk of cases falling through gaps where responsibility or cover is unclear. Existing controls include weekly capacity reviews, handovers, Outlook reminders and staff cover, but the Forum identified scope for clearer procedures, central visibility and greater automation.
- Evidence gathering is established and proportionate to each case, with examples including diary sheets, recordings, correspondence, interviews and physical assessment of alleged issues.
- MHA uses proportionate interventions ranging from informal discussions and written warnings to cautions, mediation and legal action. Serious cases may proceed directly to legal action, with equality, vulnerability, human-rights considerations and wider household impacts taken into account.
- External mediation provides independence, particularly where tenants may question the impartiality of housing staff. The Forum identified a need for clearer value-for-money evidence and to consider offering accredited mediation training to interested Resident Associations to support an additional internal capability.
- Confidentiality and safety are important, particularly where customers fear reporting ASB. Anonymous or discreet reporting can be supported, but the Forum identified a need for greater clarity around managing WhatsApp reports and alternative central reporting routes.
- Customer experience can be affected by communication preferences, staff absence and follow-up delays. The Forum identified smell of marijuana and dog-related cases as examples where communication and handover arrangements did not work as intended.
- Between 1 April 2025 and 31 March 2026, 47 ASB cases were reported, including environmental nuisance, animal nuisance, aggressive or threatening language, and CCTV or perceived harassment concerns. No hate crime reports were recorded, although officers noted this may reflect under-reporting.
- PanConnect is expected to provide additional functionality and reporting routes, but assurance cannot yet be taken until its ASB case-management capability is established in practice. The Forum identified the importance of establishing a baseline and undertaking a subsequent review.

- Overall, the Forum recognised officers' positive commitment and examples of robust intervention, while identifying opportunities to strengthen consistency, accessibility, case ownership, data quality, follow-up and assurance.

4) Findings

4.1 Objective 1 – Customer Service Standards and Accessibility

4.1.1 The Forum reviewed how ASB reports are received, assessed and progressed, and how customer service standards are applied across the service.

4.1.2 MHA currently accepts ASB reports through several routes, including WhatsApp, email, the website and telephone. Officers explained that a tenant portal was also expected to provide an additional reporting route. The Forum recognised that offering multiple routes can improve accessibility, particularly for customers who may be reluctant or unable to use a single channel.

4.1.3 However, the Forum identified a risk where reports are sent directly to individual officers or are received through channels that are not centrally visible. Officers described a previous case that was not picked up because responsibility was assumed to sit elsewhere. The Forum therefore considered centralised logging and clear ownership to be important safeguards.

4.1.4 The triage process uses information such as dates, times, frequency, impact on the tenant or their home and support requirements. Urgent matters are expected to prompt a Neighbourhood Officer response and contact with the reporting person within four hours, while lower-level matters remain subject to follow-up under the procedure. Disputes that do not meet the ASB threshold may be managed differently, with staff expected to speak to those involved before deciding the appropriate intervention.

4.1.5 The Forum welcomed the use of a common-sense and proportionate approach, particularly where an issue may be a neighbour dispute rather than ASB. Members nevertheless wanted to see clearer evidence of how high and low-risk categories are applied, including examples where an initial categorisation changed following further investigation.

4.1.6 Confidentiality and safety were also considered. Officers explained that customers who are fearful of reporting can be reassured that their details will not be shared inappropriately, and discreet language can be used where necessary. Staff may also undertake discreet checks to establish whether others have experienced similar behaviour. The Forum considered this important in reducing barriers to reporting.

4.1.7 Overall, customer service arrangements are established and officers demonstrated awareness of the need for fairness, confidentiality and proportionate decision-making.

The Forum found that stronger centralised reporting, clearer triage evidence and more consistent visibility of case ownership would strengthen the service.

4.2) Objective 2 – Effectiveness and Oversight of ASB Services

4.2.1 The Forum examined how ASB cases are investigated, monitored and brought to an appropriate outcome, including evidence gathering, case review, enforcement, mediation and system oversight.

4.2.2 Officers confirmed that evidence is gathered in ASB cases, with the extent and type of evidence dependent on the circumstances, duration and seriousness of the alleged breach. Evidence discussed included diary sheets, recordings, correspondence, interviews and inspection of the circumstances giving rise to an allegation. The Forum recognised that a proportionate approach is necessary because not every case will require the same level of investigation.

4.2.3 The Forum heard that serious ASB can be escalated promptly, with interventions ranging from verbal or written warnings and housing cautions to legal action. The organisation can move directly to legal action in the most serious cases. Where possession is pursued, wider considerations including vulnerability, human rights, proportionality and the impact on other residents are taken into account.

4.2.4 Examples discussed demonstrated that legal cases can be complex and lengthy. Suspended possession orders can be used where appropriate, allowing an existing case history to be relied upon if further incidents occur during the monitoring period. The Forum noted that this can avoid restarting the entire process where a further breach occurs.

4.2.5 Mediation is used as an early intervention as well as in longer-running disputes. External mediators are used to provide independence where tenants may question the impartiality of housing officers. Informal mediation can also be undertaken by housing staff for lower-level disputes. The Forum identified value-for-money as an area requiring further evidence, as only limited invoice and outcome information had been reviewed. The possibility of accredited mediation training for interested tenant panel members was also identified.

4.2.6 Case review arrangements include weekly capacity discussions and reviews of open cases to ensure cases are progressing rather than remaining dormant. Staff may contact customers to establish whether issues remain and close cases where there is no further issue. Some cases may remain under monitoring after being closed on the system, for example where a suspended possession order is in place.

4.2.7 The Forum identified limitations in the current case-management system. SDM is heavily dependent on manual input and does not provide sufficient automated prompts. The structure of records can make it difficult to establish a clear chronology, because multiple dated notes may sit under one heading. Reviewers may therefore need to read through a

significant volume of notes to understand the investigation stages, rationale and outcome.

4.2.8 The Forum noted that the complaints module provides a useful comparison because it can create tasks linked to an investigation plan, outcomes and learning. Officers indicated that a stronger ASB system could provide due-date prompts, notifications and clearer case detail. However, the Forum recognised that investment must be proportionate to the relatively low annual volume of ASB cases.

4.2.9 PanConnect is expected to provide additional functionality, including improved reporting routes and a more user-friendly experience. However, its ASB case-management capability had not yet been demonstrated sufficiently for assurance to be taken that it would resolve the current gaps. The Forum therefore supported establishing a baseline and reviewing performance after implementation.

4.2.10 Overall, the Forum found that officers have established methods for investigating and managing ASB, with a range of proportionate interventions available. The principal opportunities for improvement relate to system structure, automation, visibility of ownership, data quality and the ability to demonstrate consistent case management.

4.3) Objective 3 – Customer Care and Experience

4.3.1 The Forum scrutinised the customer journey through ASB reporting and investigation, including confidentiality, communication, follow-up, case closure and the experience of customers when processes do not operate as intended.

4.3.2 The Forum recognised that ASB can have a significant effect on customers' sense of safety and wellbeing. MHA Officers described approaches intended to protect complainants' confidentiality and, where necessary, use discreet communication so that reporting ASB does not make the situation worse. Customers can also report matters by telephone or attend MHA in person where they wish to avoid using a particular reporting route.

4.3.3 The Forum considered the importance of accessible and consistent communication. MHA Officers confirmed that customer communication preferences should be recorded and followed. A case was discussed where a complainant required all communication by post rather than email or telephone, which significantly extended the investigation because staff had to wait for written responses. The Forum recognised that respecting communication preferences is important, while also highlighting the operational implications that need to be managed.

4.3.4 Four-week follow-up was a particular area of concern. The Forum identified a smell of marijuana case and a dog-related incident where actions following conclusion had not apparently been picked up. Members wanted to understand what went wrong in the

communication and handover chain, whether absence or workload contributed, and what controls are now in place.

4.3.5 The discussion highlighted that case ownership can become unclear when staff are absent or when work is transferred between MHA officers. In response, the team has introduced weekly capacity reviews, protected catch-up time and clearer arrangements for colleagues to cover one another. Outlook reminders are also used because the current system does not automatically prompt staff about future actions.

4.3.6 The Forum welcomed these practical controls but considered that reliance on manual reminders and individual staff discipline creates an avoidable risk. Members considered that the future system should provide greater visibility of outstanding actions, ownership and deadlines, with clear contingency arrangements for sickness, annual leave and periods of increased workload.

4.3.7 The Forum also considered the customer experience of non-tenants. Officers stated that the same investigative approach is applied to non-tenant complainants, although the Forum requested clearer evidence of any differences in communication, support and outcome. The Forum considered consistency important because ASB can affect people who are not MHA tenants but live in or around MHA communities.

4.3.8 Overall, the Forum found that officers demonstrate a customer-focused and proportionate approach, but the customer experience can be undermined by weaknesses in handover, follow-up and system visibility. Strengthening these controls would provide greater assurance that customers receive timely and consistent responses.

5) Recommendations

5.1 The following recommendations are proposed by the Customer Scrutiny Forum based on the findings of the review.

No.	Recommendation
1	**Strengthen centralised ASB reporting and case ownership** MHA should review the arrangements for receiving and allocating ASB reports so that all reports, including those received by WhatsApp, email, reception and other routes, are recorded in a central system with clear ownership and cover arrangements. The organisation should clarify the status and management of the current WhatsApp route, including how messages are redirected when the relevant officer is unavailable.

	Intended outcome: *Reduced risk of reports being missed, clearer accountability and improved accessibility for customers.*
2	**Strengthen and evidence the ASB triage process** MHA should ensure the criteria for high and low-risk and dispute cases are clearly documented and that case records demonstrate the rationale for the initial categorisation and any subsequent change. Periodic quality checks should be undertaken using anonymised cases to test consistency. ***Intended outcome:*** *More consistent decision-making, stronger audit trails and greater assurance that cases are categorised appropriately.*
3	**Improve case handover, follow-up and contingency arrangements** MHA should review procedures for staff absence, case handover, allocation and outstanding actions, including the four-week follow-up process. The review should incorporate learning from the smell of marijuana and dog-related cases and ensure that contingency arrangements remain effective during sickness, annual leave and periods of increased workload. ***Intended outcome:*** *Fewer missed actions, clearer accountability and greater assurance that cases will not fall through gaps.*
4	**Improve ASB case-management information and automation** MHA should identify the minimum case-management functionality required to provide a clear chronology, visible ownership, investigation stages, deadlines, follow-up prompts, outcomes and learning. Where practicable, automated reminders and task management should be used rather than relying solely on individual calendars or manual monitoring. ***Intended outcome:*** *Improved case oversight, more reliable data and reduced administrative risk.*
5	**Establish a six-month PanConnect review** Following implementation of PanConnect, MHA should establish a baseline and provide the Forum and the Customer Experience Committee with a review after six months demonstrating whether the new system has improved ASB reporting, allocation, case management, communication, monitoring and follow-up. The review should include benefits, exceptions, lessons learned and evidence of impact.

	Intended outcome: *Evidence-based assurance that the new system delivers measurable improvements over the previous arrangements*.
6	**Review the value for money of mediation** MHA should assess the cost, usage and outcomes of external mediation and consider the advantages and disadvantages of developing additional internal mediation capability. This should include exploring accredited mediation training and, where appropriate, offering this training to interested Resident Associations to support positive relationships and good neighbourly relations within their communities. ***Intended outcome:*** *Better value for money, wider conflict-resolution capability and greater clarity about the most appropriate mediation model*.
7	**Improve ASB outcome and performance reporting** MHA should review the data captured for ASB outcomes, including upheld/not upheld or equivalent outcome categories, average case duration and case duration by risk category where feasible. Reporting should also support identification of delays and reasons for cases exceeding expected timescales. ***Intended outcome:*** *Better performance oversight, improved learning and clearer assurance to customers and governance committees*.
8	**Strengthen accessible and confidential reporting** MHA should review customer-facing information on how ASB can be reported, including anonymous or discreet reporting options and alternative communication routes. Information should make clear how reports are logged, allocated and protected when customers are concerned about retaliation or confidentiality. ***Intended outcome:*** *Increased customer confidence in reporting ASB and a more inclusive service*.
9	**Clarify the approach to non-tenant complainants** MHA should document how ASB reports from non-tenants are handled and identify any differences from tenant cases in communication, investigation, support and outcome. An anonymised example should be used for assurance where available.

	Intended outcome: *Consistent and transparent treatment of all people affected by ASB in MHA communities.*

Appendix 1 – Scope and Approach

1. Scrutiny Methodology

The Customer Scrutiny Forum undertook the review using the agreed scrutiny approach. The work included an initial ASB pre-information discussion, followed by a detailed scrutiny session in September. The Forum used questioning, case discussion and review of the information presented by officers to test how the service operates in practice.

The review focused on obtaining assurance, identifying learning and assessing whether ASB services are delivered in a way that is effective, proportionate, customer-focused and capable of protecting residents and communities.

2. Documents and Information Reviewed / Requested

- ASB policy and procedure presentation and explanation of the end-to-end process.
- Information on ASB reporting routes, including WhatsApp, email, MHA website and telephone reporting.
- Information on the ASB triage and risk-categorisation process.
- Case examples and discussion of successful and unsuccessful case management.
- Information on evidence gathering, intervention, enforcement and suspended possession orders.
- Information on mediation and the rationale for use of external mediators.
- Case-management arrangements, including SDM, manual recording, case ownership, handover and follow-up.
- ASB case statistics for the period 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026.
- Information on PanConnect and its expected case-management and reporting functionality.
- Information on customer confidentiality, communication preferences and the handling of non-tenant reports.

3. Officers and Representatives Engaged

The Forum engaged with officers responsible for ASB and neighbourhood management. Officers explained the service process, responded to questions, discussed case examples and described current controls and planned system changes.

4. Customer Perspective and Scrutiny Approach

The review was conducted from a customer perspective, with Forum members testing how the process would be experienced by a person reporting ASB. Particular focus was given to:

- Accessibility of reporting routes
- Confidentiality and customer safety
- Consistency of triage and decision-making
- Communication and customer expectations
- Case ownership, handover and follow-up
- Learning from cases where the process did not operate as intended
- Proportionality of mediation and enforcement

This approach ensured that the review considered not only policy and process, but also how ASB services operate for customers in real-life circumstances.

5. Key Evidence and Limitations

The Forum's findings are based on the information and explanations available during the scrutiny sessions. Where the Forum requested data or evidence that was not confirmed as available during the discussions, the report treats this as an area for further improvement or assurance rather than assuming that the information exists.

The Forum identified the need for anonymised examples covering low- and high-risk cases, cases where triage worked well or did not work as intended, and cases where categorisation changed following investigation. These examples should be retained as supporting evidence where they are available and appropriate to share.

Appendix 1 – Scope, Approach and Methodology

Manningham Housing Association – Customer Scrutiny Forum
ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR REVIEW- SEPTEMBER 2026
Subject: Anti-Social Behaviour
Reporting to / and date: October 2026 (Customer Experience Committee / Board
Forum members: Selected from Tenant Forum (between 4-6 members) Cath Bacon, Rosemary Mupunga, Craig Barron, Salma Khatun, Shahnaz Gul
Aims: **Objective 1 – Customer Service Standards, Accessibility and Consistency** Understand and scrutinise how MHA receives, assesses, triages, allocates and manages ASB reports, including the accessibility of reporting routes, confidentiality, risk categorisation, case ownership and the consistent application of customer service standards across the organisation. **Objective 2 – Effectiveness, Case Management and Performance Oversight** Understand how effective ASB services are defined, recorded, monitored and improved, including evidence gathering, intervention, mediation, enforcement, case progression, handover, follow-up, data quality, performance reporting and the effectiveness of case-management systems and future digital arrangements. **Objective 3 – Customer Care, Communication and Outcomes** Scrutinise the quality and consistency of customer care throughout the ASB journey, from initial reporting and triage through investigation, communication, intervention, monitoring and closure, including how MHA demonstrates fairness, respect, confidentiality, empathy and appropriate support, and how learning is identified where the service does not operate as intended.
Approach and Methodology (Agreed by Scrutiny Forum on 19th August 2026): **Objective 1** *Documents Review* • ASB Policy and Procedure • Information on all current ASB reporting routes, including WhatsApp, email, website and telephone. • Details of the ASB triage • Examples of ASB cases demonstrating how reports were received, allocated and progressed. • Information on customer confidentiality, discreet/anonymous reporting and communication preferences.

- Information on case ownership and arrangements for allocating and covering cases.

Interviews

- Neighbourhoods Team Leader– to discuss how ASB reports are received through different channels, how reports are logged and allocated, and how ownership is maintained. to talk through the triage process, including how risk is assessed, how decisions are recorded and how categorisation may change following further investigation. To discuss how confidentiality, accessibility and customer communication preferences are managed throughout the reporting process.

Objective 2

Documents Review

- ASB performance information for the period 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026.
- Information on case outcomes, case duration and, where available, performance by risk category.
- Examples of successful and unsuccessful ASB cases, including cases involving different levels of risk and intervention.
- Information on evidence gathering, interventions, enforcement, legal action and mediation.
- Information on current case-management arrangements, including SDM, case ownership, follow-up and monitoring.
- Information on staff handover, capacity reviews, absence cover and current controls for outstanding actions.
- Information on PanConnect and its proposed ASB case-management and reporting functionality.

Interviews

- Neighbourhood Team Leader – to discuss how cases are investigated, evidence is gathered, interventions are selected and cases are monitored through to an appropriate outcome. To discuss the management of repeat and ongoing cases, including the use of mediation, warnings, cautions and legal enforcement. To discuss how ASB performance is monitored, including case ownership, case duration, outcomes, follow-up and learning. To discuss how external mediation is used, how its effectiveness is assessed and how value for money is considered.

Objective 3

Documents Review

- Provide details of 2–3 ASB cases demonstrating the customer journey from initial report through triage, investigation, communication, intervention, follow-up and closure.
- Include examples where the customer experience was not as intended, including cases where communication, handover or follow-up was delayed or missed.
- Review any issues relating to follow-up, communication, staff absence or case ownership.
- Provide an example of an ASB case involving a non-tenant complainant, where available, to assess consistency of communication, support, investigation and outcome.
- Provide information on how customer communication preferences and confidentiality requirements are recorded and managed.
- Provide information on complaints or customer feedback relating to ASB, where available.

Interviews

- Neighbourhood Team Leader – to talk through the selected cases in detail, including the customer experience, communication, case ownership, follow-up and outcome. To discuss the learning from cases where the process did not operate as intended and the controls introduced to prevent similar issues occurring. To discuss how customer confidentiality, communication preferences, accessibility and support are managed throughout an ASB case. To discuss how non-tenant complainants are supported and whether their experience differs from that of MHA tenants.

Out of scope: