

Concierge consultation report

Consultation was undertaken with Concierge Service customers and staff through a variety of methods, in accordance with a consultation plan which was agreed by the work stream group.

Staff consultation

All YHN staff were consulted through a dedicated Concierge Service Review Team Brief in March 2009. In addition; a focus group was held for Housing Management and Citywide Services, and a series of dedicated focus groups for Concierge Service Staff and feedback forms for completion.

56 of the 161 Concierge Service staff attended the consultation sessions, out of these staff; 29 took the opportunity to complete a feedback form and make comments which reflected the above, the feedback also showed that 17 staff preferred Option 1, 0 preferred Option 2 and 2 preferred Option 3 the remainder did not register a preference.

The issues raised by staff who took part in the consultation are outline below.

General concerns

- A concern that anti social behaviour will increase due to reduced presence of staff.
- The number of voids will increase as residents may chose to move out.
- Cost and damage to properties may increase due to concierge staff not being on site 24 hours per day.
- The times that staff work on site would need to be discussed with tenants and housing offices as each block has greatly different needs.
- Staff feel that a “one cap fits all” is the wrong approach to take.
- Local knowledge of concierge based in blocks is a valuable asset and staff should be retained in the area.
- Concern about loss of jobs.
- Any review should include quality over quantitative studies
- I feel we have become “a victim of our own success” by being a 24 hour service along with CCAS, our costs are high but we do not have any opportunity at present to bring money in to the service to offset costs.
- Local knowledge should be used to draw up plans for when lodges could be closed down and when they should be manned.
- Concerns about how fast the response times will be.
- Concierge attracts tenants to multi storey blocks and demand for properties may reduce.
- Concern about whether spilt shifts would be possible.
- Staff feel YHN will lose its good neighbour role with the proposed changes.
- Concern about service provision in emergency situations if the system goes down.
- Staff want reassurance that they will get the training they need.
- Staff feel there is a health and safety risk for the responsive staff role.

- Concern that staff won't be able to monitor all the cameras from one point.
- Staff felt the process wasn't fully transparent because estimated charges had been calculated without agreeing issues such as shift allowances.
- Concern that the investment needed wouldn't lead to an overall saving.
- Staff want to be involved in deciding who works where and in what role and would like information about the process for allocating new roles. Staff also wanted information about how trade unions will be involved.
- Concerns about maintaining chartermark accreditation.
- Staff wanted to know whether changes to pay and conditions would be effective throughout the whole of the service.
- Some staff felt that there wasn't enough detail about the options to make a decision
- There were concerns about existing staff who have health problems and will not be able to carry out additional duties.
- Staff wanted to know whether they would be supported if they want to leave the concierge service and work within another department within YHN.
- Staff were concerned about the impact on the police from changing the service.
- Some staff see the review as a good opportunity to develop and learn new skills. However, other staff were less positive about the proposed changes who feel that the service should stay the way it is.
- Staff feel the review should involve a pilot of the different options.
- Staff feel that concierge managers should work shadow concierge staff to understand role more
- Staff feel they should have been consulted earlier in the process
- Staff think that the review should include the management structure within the concierge service

Concerns relating to each option

Option 1

- Customers like staff being there during the night as they feel safer. This is the time when anti social behaviour happens. Anti social behaviour will increase if staff are removed.
- Selective monitoring will need to be different in all blocks depending on issues; this should not be a standard process.
- Staff are concerned about what will happen with the management of keys in this option.
- Staff feel that tailgaters would be more of an issue with this option.
- Staff are concerned about who will take in residents' parcels if there are no concierge on site
- Staff feel residents will miss the presence of staff if they don't live on site
- Some resident concierge felt they would be happier living off site as customers knock on their door during the night
- Staff felt that YHN should bring building cleaning in house in option 1
- Staff were concerned about the loss of night shift allowance
- Staff felt that standards of cleaning will reduce

Option 2

- Staff are concerned about how reliable CCTV will be.
- Staff are concerned about response times and the location of the control room.
- Staff want reassurance that responsive staff will have a base.
- Staff are concerned that some of the equipment needed and the control room would mean there would not be a cost saving.
- Staff are concerned that there will be an increase in the service's carbon footprint using more vehicles
- Feel there would be a loss of daily reports from concierge staff
- Staff want reassurance that PRI information about tenants will be made available for staff safety.
- Concern about who will issue key fobs when staff not on site.
- Staff are concerned about what will happen with incidents such as when customers are stuck in lifts.
- Staff want more information about how will the cleaning function be managed.
- Staff are concerned about how the new technology will be kept up to date.
- Staff are concerned that there will be no service to customers if there is a power cut.
- Staff are concerned that vulnerable tenants will they be put at risk if there is no staff presence.

Option 3

- Staff would like to know where the control rooms would be.
- Staff want reassurance that responsive staff will have a base.
- Staff are concerned about the cost implications of building two control rooms.
- Staff are concerned that there may be an impact on decent homes work e.g. access to keys.
- Staff are concerned that YHN are reducing our 3 star service.
- Staff are concerned that the costs would double for this option compared with option two.
- Staff are concerned that day staff will get less pay than shift workers.
- Staff feel sickness levels could be affected.

Additional services staff would like concierge service to provide

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To clear ASU and YPS properties when tenant moves out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bin cleaning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grounds maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove bulky rubbish
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handyman service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Void clean and clears
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building cleaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collecting prescriptions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recycling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver newsletter/leaflets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chute clearance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise abatement enforcement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing light bulbs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key holders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small repairs eg lock changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help tenant move in
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New tenant visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the wider area from the blocks and provide surveillance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could charge the police for the work we do that supports them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make appointment for gas companies

How staff would change the service if they were given free reign to do so:

- For staff to have a more varied role so they can learn about all the concierge service. They could do this through a rolling shift pattern.
- Pull in SLA's to reduce costs and to provide a better service eg grounds maintenance, cleaning
- Support CCAS staff to be able to respond to alarms
- More joint working with housing offices and support staff in ASU
- Private work for housing associations
- Provide services for external agencies such as social services
- To look after the grounds maintenance
- Continue the good neighbour role
- Staff to be able to do accompanied viewings
- Staff to provide a handyman service for vulnerable tenants
- A permanent caretaker in each block
- Keep night shift with staff doing other work during the day
- Keep and upgrade the lodges equipment

Customer consultation

Customer consultation was undertaken through a variety of different methods led by the Tenant Involvement Team with assistance from the Newcastle Tenants' Federation.

The Living in Flats Group have been involved throughout the review and assisted with the content of the information booklet and the questionnaire which was circulated to all Concierge Service Customers. The booklet and options sheet provided information about the review and the options and the questionnaire asked residents to provide feedback about the options.

In addition, 22 Information sessions were held across the city to provide further information to customers, gather feedback and to provide assistance in completion of the questionnaires. Additional assistance was also offered to residents and help provided included telephone assistance, translations and home visits.

Newcastle Tenants' Federation supported the information sessions and held two open meetings for representatives from tenants' and residents' groups to give feedback on the options and the review. In addition to this managers from the Concierge Service attended a number of Tenant and Resident Association meetings, arranged a tour of the existing service and a visit to a control room environment and some of the blocks it controls.

Resident questionnaire

In June 2009, 4929 postal questionnaires were sent out to residents across Newcastle who receive the concierge service. In addition, a number of blank questionnaires were also distributed at consultation events which resulted in a further 22 forms being completed. By 12 August 2009, 859 respondents had completed the questionnaires. Based on the number of forms which were sent out and returned this represents a response rate of 16.9% which is relatively low for a postal survey. However, as 859 responses have been received so far this is a meaningful sample and can be considered representative of concierge customers.

The comments received from residents on the questionnaires were categorised and each theme was allocated a code in order to analyse the comments received.

Summary of results

Summary of options

- Option 1 was supported by 28.3% of respondents
- Option 2 was supported by 24.8% of respondents
- Option 3 was supported by 19.1% of respondents
- A number of respondents wanted their existing service to 'stay the same'. In total 27.8% of respondents did not indicate which option they preferred.

Option 1

- 243 respondents (28.3%) supported Option 1.
- Over a half of respondents (56.1%) did not offer any comments on this option.
- The top 6 reasons for supporting or rejecting this option was as follows:
 - On-site/personal approach (143 respondents 16.6%)
 - No change/no effect/stay the same (102 respondents or 11.9%)
 - General negative (72 respondents or 9.2%)
 - Issues around safety (66 respondents or 7.7%)
 - Concerns about charge or cost (53 respondents or 6.2%)
 - General positive (44 respondents or 5.1%)
- Respondents were asked what times they would like the selective monitoring to take place. Almost a third of respondents (31.3%) did not comment on this.
- A fifth of respondents (20.3%) favoured 8pm to 8am.
- 16.5% of respondents favoured 12 midnight to 8am
- 11.5% favoured 4pm to 12 midnight.
- In total, 48.1% of respondents favoured a shift which would part of the evening or night-time.
- In total, 20.5% of respondents indicated that they favoured a shift pattern that would work throughout the day time (e.g 8am-4pm, 9am to 5pm and 12 noon to 6 pm).
- A large proportion of those over the age of 65 did not respond to this question.

Option 2

- 213 respondents (24.8%) supported Option 2.
- Two-thirds of respondents (66.2%) did not offer any comments on this option.
- The top 6 reasons for supporting or rejecting this option was as follows:
 - On-site/personal approach (89 respondents 10.4%)
 - General negative (63 respondents or 7.3%)
 - General positive (50 respondents or 5.8%)
 - CCTV and safety issues (45 respondents or 5.2%)
 - No change/no effect/stay the same (38 respondents or 4.4%)
 - Concerns about charge or cost (35 respondents or 4.1%)

Option 3

- 164 respondents (19.1%) supported Option 3. This was the least popular option.
- Two-thirds of respondents (70.1%) did not offer any comments on this option.
- The top 6 reasons for supporting or rejecting this option was as follows:
 - General positive (68 respondents or 7.9%)
 - On-site/personal approach (60 respondents 7.0%)
 - Concerns about charge or cost (30 respondents or 3.5%)
 - General negative (58 respondents or 6.8%)
 - No change/no effect/stay the same (30 respondents or 3.5%)
 - CCTV and safety issues (29 respondents or 3.4%)

Additional Services

Residents were also asked what additional services they would like concierge to provide. The top 6 services respondents would like to see the concierge do are as follows:

- Daily blocks inspections (494 respondents or 57.5%)
- Building cleaning (453 respondents 52.7%)
- Reporting repairs (417 respondents or 48.5%)
- Receiving parcels (403 respondents or 36.9%)
- Litter picking around blocks (399 respondents or 46.4%)
- Issuing fobs, keys (364 respondents or 42.4%)
- CCTV and safety issues (29 respondents or 3.4%)

127 respondents commented further on the types of roles the concierge should carry out. Of the options ticked many respondents stated that there would be no change (22%) in what the concierge do as they 'do' this already. However, 14.2% of respondents stated the concierge should also have responsibility in reducing or tackling ASB or crime related issues in their block. A further 10.2% wanted the concierge to be responsible for cleaning the blocks. 7.9% comments that they wanted to have a concierge that was on-site and offered a personal approach.

Additional comments

493 respondents made further comments on the options. Some of these were reiterated points made earlier.

- The top 6 themes of additional comments on these options were as follows:
 - No change or effect (144 respondents or 16.8%)
 - On site/personal approach (116 respondents 13.5%)
 - Change nothing (keep it the same) (110 respondents or 12.8%)
 - Concerns about charge or cost (77 respondents or 9%)
 - Issues around safety (72 respondents or 8.4%)
 - Positive comments about concierge (72 respondents or 8.4%).

Demographics

- The vast majority of respondents were in the older age brackets. 44.9% of respondents were aged over 65 years of age. In contrast there were only 9.9% of respondents who were aged between 16-34. The proportion of respondents in each age group increased as the age categories got older.
- Almost half of the respondents were male (37.6%) and a further 36.7% were female. 12.6% of respondents did not indicate their gender.
- The vast majority of respondents were white origin (86.9%), and 7.1% were from a BME background. 5.8% of respondents did not provide details of their ethnicity.
- Over half of respondents stated that they were Christian (55.4%) and a further 20.7% stated that did not follow a religion. Whilst 11.9% did not complete this section, a further 4.1% stated that they did not wish to say (totalling 16% of respondents).
- Nearly three-quarters of respondents stated that they were heterosexual or straight. Whilst 13.5% did not complete this section, a

further 8.1% stated that they did not wish to say (totalling 21.6% of respondents).

- 42.8% of respondents stated that they had a longstanding illness, disability or were in ill health. A further 30.8% of respondents stated that they did not have a disability or ill-health and 2.1% stated that they did not know. Over 24.2% of respondents did not reply to this question.

Analysis by Resident Blocks

The table below provides a breakdown in the number of responses received by tenants who live in residential blocks. In total there were 384 questionnaires which were filled out by people who lived in residential blocks. This represents a response rate of 23.3%. The three residential blocks with the highest response rate are in bold in the table below.

Street	No. of properties	Number returned	Response Rate
Adelaide House	105	24	22.9
Denton Park House	80	37	46.3
Fawdon Park House	2	0	0.0
Harehills Tower	65	14	21.5
Hilltop House	80	32	40.0
Howard Street	18	3	16.7
Maytree House	50	4	8.0
Melbourne Court	153	27	17.6
Mill House	96	28	29.2
Proctor Court	56	11	19.6
Queens Court	116	17	14.7
Shaftoe Court	35	7	20.0
Shieldfield House	126	23	18.3
St Annes Close	252	38	15.1
Stoddart House	28	1	3.6
The Spinney	93	20	21.5
Tynedale House	45	11	24.4
Vale House	135	51	37.8
Wyndley House	111	36	32.4
Total	1646	384	23.3

The breakdown for options is similar for the whole sample.

- Option 1 was supported by 29.3% of respondents who lived in residential blocks
- Option 2 was supported by 24.6% of respondents
- Option 3 was supported by 22.8% of respondents
- A number of respondents wanted their existing service to 'stay the same'. In total 23.2% of respondents did not indicate which option they preferred.

Analysis by Non Residential Blocks

The breakdown for options is similar for the whole sample.

- Option 1 was supported by 27.3% of respondents who lived in residential blocks
- Option 2 was supported by 24.7% of respondents
- Option 3 was supported by 15.1% of respondents
- A number of respondents wanted their existing service to 'stay the same'. In total 32.9% of respondents did not indicate which option they preferred.

Summary

	Total Sample	Residential	Non-Residential
Option 1	28.3%	29.3%	27.3%
Option 2	24.8%	24.6%	24.7%
Option 3	19.1%	22.8%	15.1%
No option	27.1%	23.2%	32.9%

Information sessions

This section provides a summary of the feedback received at the 22 information sessions held across Newcastle. 302 residents attended these sessions in total.

General concerns and feedback

Many concerns and views were shared by residents across the city. These are outlined below:

- Customers like the familiarity of having the same member of staff on site and feel that this gives the staff a sense of responsibility and pride in the site.
- Customers prefer to have staff on site at night, both at current 24 hour and resident sites as they are available to assist with 'falls, strokes and when stuck in lifts'.
- Concern over increase in tailgating, Anti Social Behaviour and void levels if staff aren't onsite all of the time.
- Concerns that the network won't be stable enough and customers will be left without service provision if it goes down.
- Concerns about where the funding is coming from for the changes as the technology will be expensive to upgrade.
- Concerns about the service charge increasing – residents feel they will be getting a lower level of service at a higher charge.
- Concerns about affordability based on the estimated charges. People feel that those who are working and pay full rent will be forced out of concierge blocks.
- Residents felt that the review is being done 'to them' and that they haven't been given real choice. Many customers felt that they should be able to choose the best service for their block rather than 'one size fits all'.
- Leaseholders feel they should only pay for the service which they receive and should have choice on the level of service they get.
- Leaseholders felt treated unfairly – they were unable to make a decision in the consultation because there was no information about how much they will pay due to change over to an unpooled charging system.
- Concerns that staff won't be able to monitor all of the cameras from one location and that some incidents will be missed.
- Customers like the good neighbour role currently provided and worry this will be removed.
- Concern over the response times as little information on numbers of staff on duty.
- Perception that services will be lost or decline.
- Many customers, particularly vulnerable customers rely on concierge for additional help. They are concerned about where they will get help from if the service is changed.

Westgate Court

There were 2 attendees at this session. The main issues raised were relating to booking of the community room, giving out keys for the community room and keeping spare keys for residents.

Shaftoe Court

There were 4 attendees at this session. The main issues raised are outlined below:

- Some residents felt they didn't need a full time service. Want staff to only come on specific days to sort out rubbish e.g. 3 times per week rather than every day. However other residents felt that they need a resident caretaker there to provide help for residents out of hours.
- Would like a member of staff that they know rather than different staff dropping in at different times of the day in expensive vans. Feel that you don't get to build a relationship when staff change all the time.

Cruddas Park Information Centre

There were 10 attendees at this session. The main issues raised are outlined below:

- Some residents felt that option one is very similar to what they have now.
- The main concern in this area was about tailgaters and a worry that problems with tailgaters would increase because the presence in lodges is a deterrent.

Melbourne Court

There were 13 attendees at this session. The main issues raised are outlined below:

- There was a strong feeling that their concierge should remain resident.
- Feel that they get a much reduced quality of service when current concierge is on holiday and feel that this is the service that they are being offered for the future.
- The current concierge deals with anti-social behaviour and residents are concerned that it will increase if the concierge is not resident.
- Feel angry that staffing is being reduced and money is being spent on cameras.
- Very unhappy that costs are going to up and service is decreasing. Feel that the review is only being done for financial reasons.
- Some people feel cameras on all entrances were important and others felt it was more important to have is the corridors/walkways etc.
- Want different areas to have choice – not a standard service across the whole city. Can people be given the option to pay more to have resident concierge e.g. if everyone in block agrees £1 per week.
- Feel resident caretaker is a deterrent and area will decline. Can't put a value on this. Vested interest will be lost when non-resident and the sense of community will also be lost.

- Resident Concierge here is used by some residents quite a lot out of working hours. They were therefore concerned about what service they would get at these times.
- Residents feel it is unfair that for option 1 the estimated charge is the same for the 37 hours per week and 24 hours per day.
- Would like picking up rubbish to be written into job description.
- Concern about cut in wages/effective cut of wages in terms of forcing staff to pay rent.
- Elderly people in the block feel that they will no longer feel safe.
- Feel that the board have already decided what will happen.

Denton Park House

There were 29 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below:

- Many elderly residents who rely on concierge for assistance e.g. if locked out, falls, strokes, stuck in lifts.
- They get a fast response now because the caretaker lives on site – worried this will be lost.
- Feel block will deteriorate without a full time resident care taker.
- Will lose local connection – caretaker living on site gets to know residents.
- Fear about security if person not on site. Lots of people moved into the flats because of the security of having someone on site.
- Concerns of the cost for residents paying full rent – 24 hour would be more expensive than the charge they pay now.
- Worried about an increase in tailgaters if there is no caretaker resident.

Hilltop House

There were 32 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below:

- Residents want to keep their current care taker.
- Concerns about loss of local knowledge and personal touch.
- Concierge does a lot of additional things in their own time and residents will lose this support.
- Concerned about what will happen with the flat that caretaker lives in now.
- Concerns about service charge and increase and how people will afford to pay for this.
- Caretaker cleans windows inside flats for people who can't do their own, people will have to pay to have this done.
- Unhappy that they feel they are getting a reduced service at a higher price
- Concern if option 2 or 3 are implemented will lose service if cameras have been turned off because of complaints about invasion of privacy.

Moorland House

There were 4 attendees at this session. The main concern for residents here was how they would access the block if they were locked out.

Molineux Court

There were 14 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below.

- Concerns about the cost of the new technology and how this will be financed.
- Concerns about whether the new technology would work in their area.
- Feel unhappy that there were only 3 options to choose from.
- Feel YHN should use a private company to provide the service.
- Feel that the cleaning charge under option one is a scare tactic to prevent residents from choosing this option.
- Would like the service to stay as it is and pay more for this.
- Concerns that the service can't be managed from a central control room.
- Some residents would like to opt out of the service and not pay for it.
- Concerns about how long will it take before the new system is up and running.
- Concerns about safety and response times.
- Concerns about affordability of the estimated charges.

Merlay House

There were 5 attendees at this session. The main concerns were about a decline in security and the removal of staff from the blocks at night.

Walker Community Housing Office

One attendee came to this session. They felt that their service was being removed and that there would be a decline in security.

Mera Community Centre (opposite Wyndley House)

There were 23 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below:

- Would like the service to stay the same
- Think that they only have the option of option one as it is most similar to current service
- Feel that YHN board has already made the decision.
- Concerns that calls about incidents won't be responded to. Want assurances that there will be a quick response.
- Feel unhappy and believe they would be getting a lesser service but paying more, particularly for options 2 and 3.
- Concerns about the cost of implementing the changes.
- Feel there will be a problem with lack of continuity as the resident concierge know the habits and daily routines of the tenants.
- Feel that the whole service shouldn't change – just areas where there are problems.
- Concerns about safety of residents in case of a fire.

Pandon Court

There were 6 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below.

- Concerns about an increase in abusive intercom callers, as the presence in the lodge helps to address this.
- Feel they need the preference of having the concierge on site during the night.
- Are concerned that if customers are hearing impaired they will struggle to use the intercom.

- Leaseholders feel they should only pay for the additional services that they receive e.g. handyman service etc.

Adelaide House

There were 17 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below:

- Concerns about security. Feel safer with having someone on site, lots of problems with people hanging around outside the block and tailgaters.
- Location of caretakers flat means that he can identify the problems as it is located above the area where people hang around outside. Worried incidents won't be identified.
- Feel that the review is just about making money.
- Level of increase in charge means that tenants could have a bungalow or a house with a garden for the same type of money. Not comparable and unfair.
- Concerned that no one will pick up the phone to answer when they call.
- Want to keep current concierge and to continue to be resident.
- Resident caretaker takes pride in the block, feel this will be lost.
- Concerns about access if locked out of the block
- Would like access to the camera service through their TV, will give added security if they can watch.

Tynedale House

There were 13 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below.

- Would like the same person to be based there all of the time
- Concerns about costs proposed in the review and affordability of service charge.
- Want familiarity of having staff they get to know and build relationships with.
- Want more cameras to be able to see people in lifts and the car park. Feel this is a big security issue.

The Spinney

There were 20 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below.

- Option 1 is same as the service they have now – don't want that to change.
- Don't feel that option 2 and 3 would meet their needs.
- Like having face to face contact.

Queens Court

There were 19 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below:

- Concerns about being able to afford increased rent with service charges. Residents feel like they should give up work and go on benefits.
- Concerned about the high proportion of people in receipt of housing benefit who won't consider cost as part of their decision. They might choose the highest level of service because they don't pay for it.

People who pay full rent won't be able to afford their rent and eventually multi storey blocks will become benefit ghettos.

- Currently have the same as option one. However most residents don't use the free phone number to contact the service out of hours, contact police if have any problems.
- Feel that YHN aren't being sympathetic to the fact that there's a recession by proposing to increase the charges by such an amount. Feel charges should reflect the service you get – disagree with pooling of charges.
- Concerned that staff would not be able to monitor the whole of the city effectively from one central point and that incidents would be missed.
- Concerned that problems with tailgaters would get worse without staff present.

Eastfield Community Centre

There were 20 attendees at this session. The main issues are outlined below:

- Concerned that response time will not be quick enough depending on the location of the control room
- Concerns about staff being able to know who should and shouldn't be in the block because the tenants change so often – this will make it difficult to address tailgaters.
- Staff based at blocks have the local knowledge and this will be lost
- Would like the cameras to be able to cover the areas surrounding the blocks as this is where they have problems with anti social behaviour
- Think modern technology cannot replace the human touch. Concerns that one control room won't be able to monitor the whole of the city and incidents will be missed
- Feel YHN are neglecting their duty of care to tenants by changing the service
- Feel that the response times should be written into a contract or service standard and tenants should be entitled to compensation if these are not met
- Concerns about the cost of the new technology
- YHN should work with tenants in blocks to identify the best locations for cameras as different blocks have different needs.
- Salford in Manchester – estates have concierge and staff who patrol the whole estate – all tenants pay for this service not just those in multis. Think this should be looked at. Also they ensure landings can only be accessed from stairwells by tenants that live on that floor. This has helped address problems of trespassers
- Would like the same technology as sheltered housing – you can see who is buzzing you before you let them in
- Would like staff to have a note to say which tenants are vulnerable in any way e.g. health problems
- Feel tenants should have been given more options than the 3 they've been given
- Need to publicise clearly the times that the onsite staff will be in each block and procedure for reporting issues. When staff are on site they should be clearly visible

- Concerns that levels of anti social behaviour will increase if staff aren't on site as staff warn perpetrators which addresses the problem
- Concerns about the link with the postal service – keeping mail for postman and taking in parcels – will this be maintained
- Concerns that people will get into back entrances when they are prevented from accessing the front door by staff
- Ensure responsive staff are kept busy between incidents
- Can we maintain our 9-9 service where concierge intercept calls?

Vale House

70 attendees came to this session. Due to the high volume of attendees, staff had to arrange a second session at a local community centre. The main issues are outlined below:

- Worried about increases in service charges.
- Feel it is unfair to pool service charges.
- Worry that it will be less secure if concierge is not living on site.
- Feel that people who live on site take more pride in their work and the service will decrease if they don't live on site.
- Would like to keep their current concierge.
- Feel the changes are being done to them without real choice.
- Older residents are concerned that they will feel more vulnerable.
- Would like guarantees that the quality of service will not decline.
- Concerns about what will happen in case of a fire.
- Feel the local connection and personal touch will be lost if there is no resident concierge.

Kenton customer service centre

One attendee came to this session. They were worried that anti social behaviour would increase if perpetrators realised that there was no concierge located in the block.

