Chartered Institute of Housing



RECAP

Repairs Culture, Accountability and Participation

Resident Insight Report

November 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
What is ReCAP?	3
How we listened	3
Our approach	5
What we found	5
Our analysis	5
Resident insight overview	7
Resident insight themes	8
Theme 1: Communication and transparency	8
Theme 2: Use of data and technology	9
Theme 3: Meaningful resident voice, participation and scrutiny	10
Theme 4: Standards and accountability	11
Theme 5: Right-first-time, timely, high-quality repairs	12
Theme 6: Respect, dignity and tackling stigma	13
Theme 7: Proactive, coordinated and locally responsive delivery	14
Theme 8: Organisational capacity, workforce and leadership	15
The culture thread	15
Conclusion	16
What happens next?	16

Introduction

ReCAP (Repairs Culture, Accountability and Participation) is a project led by the Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH), working with the National Housing Maintenance Forum (NHMF) and Tpas, to improve how landlords and contractors deliver and are held to account for repairs. The project will create two practical tools: a resident scrutiny toolkit and a culture and accountability framework; both will be grounded in what residents have told us.

This report is part of the project's evidence base for both of those outputs, and it sets out the eight themes that came through from what residents have told us. It helps us understand what good practice looks like for all residents and then explores what each of the themes means for the toolkit and framework. We have also created a video version of this report with an audio narration and subtitles.

When we spoke to residents, they told us a good repairs service is one where they know what is happening, are believed and treated with respect, and can see how their feedback changes things. This report starts by sharing, in their own words, what more than 100 residents and staff told us over the summer, and what we think it means for the next stage of ReCAP.

What is ReCAP?

ReCAP is led by CIH, working with NHMF and Tpas, and will run from May 2026 to summer 2027.

ReCAP grew out of the Better Social Housing Review, published in 2022. The review found that residents do not always get a fair, decent and well-communicated repairs service. It called on landlords to partner with residents, contractors and frontline staff to define what excellent repairs look like.

The recommendation then fed into a project called Rethinking Repairs and Maintenance (RERAM), which reviewed good practice and set out 12 guiding principles for improving repairs services. One of those principles was about making sure that all residents have the right space and voice to challenge and scrutinise how change is delivered.

ReCAP is designed to be the next step in that journey into more effective repairs scrutiny. The project will work with the sector to create two practical tools: a resident scrutiny toolkit, and a culture and accountability framework for landlords and contractors. The approach across the project means we want to build those from what residents tell us is their experience.

That means we started with residents, not providers or existing good practice, because they are best placed to say if a repairs service is working. Everything that follows, including the pilots planned for next year, should come from what residents have told us.

How we listened

We started the project by being clear that residents know their homes and their repair services better than anyone, and this shaped how we began gathering data. We also wanted to have inclusive ways to engage a wide range of residents, so we had a series of in-person workshops as well as a short, four-question survey both on paper and digitally.

A key part of our approach was sitting down with a mixture of residents from different providers and different types of homes from across the country and having honest conversations about where we are and where we want to be.



Our approach

Workshops: a World Café format. We ran two in-person workshops using a World Café format: small groups moving between tables, with each table working through a different question before the group moved on to the next. This was designed to encourage people to talk to each other and explore what matters to them, both in terms of challenges and ideas for change.

A survey to reach further. We ran a survey alongside the events, both on paper and online from July to September, to ensure people who couldn't or didn't want to attend a workshop could still reflect and write down their ideas in a way to feed in. It also brought in residents from landlords who weren't at either event.

A desktop review of existing good practice. Alongside what residents and staff told us, we reviewed 15 published sources: scrutiny reviews, Housing Ombudsman reports, and examples of practice from landlords already working on this. A key focus for the review was scrutiny reviews or projects that were resident-led or resident-informed. We then compared what we found against what residents had told us during ReCAP to understand where there is evidence of good practice, but also where there are gaps that need addressing.

Across the survey and the workshops, our focus was on the same key questions: what happens now, what gets in the way, what good looks like, and ideas for change. We then reviewed all of this together, which meant reading and analysing every response, comment and idea ourselves, and the data was both open-ended and anonymous. We did it this way so the conversations were open and people could talk about what mattered most to them.

We then shared and reviewed our themes with the National Housing Federation's (NHF) Tenant Advisory Panel (TAP) to sense-check our findings and the draft of this report from a resident perspective.





What we found

More than 100 residents and staff engaged directly, across two in-person events, an open survey and a panel discussion. The majority of those taking part were residents. Staff were involved mainly as facilitators, helping run the workshops and survey, rather than as the voices quoted. All direct quotes in this report are from residents.

Source	When	Who took part
Tpas National Tenants Conference workshop	14 to 15 July 2026	Over 40 people from around 30 providers
Repairs Café, hosted by Your Housing Group	13 August 2026	Over 60 residents and staff from 17 organisations
ReCAP survey (online and paper)	10 July to 19 September 2026	14 completed responses (11 online, three on paper at Tpas) 12 residents and two staff
NHF Tenant Advisory Panel discussion and meeting chat	22 September 2026	Panel members responding to the draft themes



Our analysis

Every comment and suggestion from each survey response and workshop was read, analysed and grouped into patterns using language that residents used themselves. We then reviewed these patterns and checked for similarities to build eight themes which helped describe what residents told us. We followed this process across all the findings to keep our approach consistent.

We analysed and grouped the 622 comments from the two workshops first and then re-ran this when the survey responses came in, which means that the themes reflect all responses. In total, we reviewed 622 workshop comments plus 170 coded survey extracts.

Alongside this, we reviewed 15 published scrutiny reviews, Housing Ombudsman reports and examples of good practice; we have listed these at the end of the report so you can look at what we have drawn on. We then compared them against what residents told us, theme by theme, to see where good practice already exists and where the sector has further to go.

What to bear in mind. How often something came up is a guide, not a measure of importance. The themes are also closely linked to each other, so a solution for one often helps another, but the way we have presented them in the report helps us be clear about what is important to residents.

The survey is small: six of its 14 responses came from residents of one provider. That means it adds depth rather than weight, so when a theme relies mainly on the survey or panel instead of the larger workshops, we've tried not to generalise too far from it. The survey also asked about scrutiny directly, which is partly why scrutiny comes through so strongly in that source.

We then met with the NHF TAP to check through those themes and start to review ideas for change. We will continue to work with the panel across the whole project to ensure that our findings and outputs are always checked in with residents both in terms of what they mean, but also how we talk about them and report on them.

The panel, too, was responding to themes we had already drafted, so some agreement was built in rather than offered fresh.

We say this plainly because being open about where the evidence is strong and where it is thin is part of doing this properly. Where a finding rests mainly on the survey or the panel rather than the two larger workshops, we've flagged that in the text below.

Resident insight overview

There were eight themes in total, and these are supported right across resident comments from the survey, the workshops and the panel session. The strongest themes were around communication and the use of data and technology, especially in the workshops, and the survey added more around how resident voice can lead to change.

Theme	Description
Communication and transparency	Quite simply, residents want to know what is happening, when and why without having to repeatedly chase up for answers. They also want to have honest conversations about what happens next when things don't go to plan.
Use of data and technology	Technology and online options should help make things easier and should be one way that residents can choose to communicate. Data should be used to inform services and also to understand the resident experience.
Meaningful resident voice, participation and scrutiny	Having a voice really matters, and it is important to residents to be able to see where and how their feedback has made a change.
Standards and accountability	There should be clear and consistent service standards for landlords, contractors and sub-contractors to deliver to. Where standards are not met, there should be consequences built into contract management that involve the resident voice.
Right-first-time, timely, high-quality repairs	The right person, with the right parts and information, doing a repair that lasts and is checked.
Respect, dignity and tackling stigma	Being believed, treated respectfully as an individual, and not judged for living in social housing.
Proactive, coordinated and locally responsive delivery	Repairs planned and joined up across teams and contractors, with planned works visible to residents.
Organisational capacity, workforce and leadership	Good service delivery depends on skilled staff with the right resources and supportive leadership.

Each of the themes is covered below in more detail; we set out what residents told us, what we know about good practice in this area and what this means for ReCAP as a project.

You will see that the points and challenges raised across the themes do overlap, so this means some of the solutions sit across more than one theme. Culture and stigma run right across all the evidence and themes, so we discuss these at the end of the section.

Resident insight themes

Theme 1: Communication and transparency

This was the clearest and most consistent concern for residents across all the evidence we looked at. What residents are looking for in terms of communication is often quite a simple ask: what is happening, when is it happening, and why. Communication also needed to be easy, so residents didn't have to repeat themselves or chase a response.

Residents also understood and accepted that things don't always go to plan; what mattered was being told honestly when things went wrong and having open conversations about what happens next.

What residents told us. Residents shared their experiences about times when they were not kept updated about their repairs; some experienced appointments that were changed with little or no notice. Some residents even reported learning that work had taken place on their home after it had happened, which they felt demonstrated how communication can fall short.

When communication broke down, this could be between services or internal handovers, such as what part needed to be ordered, organising a second visit or sharing information between a landlord and a contractor.

It was accepted that things do go wrong and delays do happen, but what was important was that someone explained what was happening and what was being done to fix it.

- *"If not completed the first time, communication can be lost; what happens next isn't clear" (workshop)*
- *"Leaseholders have to actively seek information" (survey)*
- *"Nothing worse than not knowing who to chase" (panel)*

In the TAP session, it was also highlighted that updates are sometimes left on an app without the tenant being told, with no way to reply, and that contractors in the home sometimes give residents wrong information about future works, which raises false hope.

What good looks like, in residents' words. Reviewing what residents told us about communication in the TAP session helped us set out what a meaningful communication standard would include. They suggested:

- Realistic initial appointments
- Automatic updates when a repair is raised, assigned, delayed or completed
- Clear and honest reasons for delays with a plan of what happens next
- Updates that explain who is attending, when and what they will do
- Named contacts or a team that will be responsible for keeping the resident up to date
- A choice of communication methods
- A shared platform to record the repair that the resident, landlord and contractor all see.

What the wider evidence shows. The Housing Ombudsman, the independent body that investigates complaints about landlords, published a spotlight report on repairs and maintenance entitled Repairing Trust which also highlighted communication as a key issue. A scrutiny review by Link Housing highlighted the importance of keeping residents informed across the whole repair process and introduced software to help residents track their repair. NHF TAP members also pointed out the relevance of Awaab's Law: Guidance for tenants in social housing, where ensuring residents are aware of legal duties around repairs and hazards will be important.

ReCAP suggestion. Consider developing a minimum communication standard covering each stage of a repair, from report to completion, based on the list above and tested in a pilot.

Theme 2: Use of data and technology

Closely related to communication is how residents experience data and technology. Residents see technology as something that can help or hinder, depending on how it is used. While not always the most important issue to residents, it was the most discussed topic in workshops, with a clear message: digital communication should be one of a suite of choices and should make things easier. Data and information should help reflect the resident voice about what matters to them and what is happening in their homes.

What residents told us. Many residents had positive experiences of using technology in relation to a repair in their home; being able to track a repair, upload photos or get text updates was seen as helpful. However, other residents had negative experiences with technology, for example, portals or apps that didn't always work, a lack of acknowledgement for online reports, or data records that didn't always reflect what was really happening in a resident's home.

Those involved in scrutiny talked about the importance of accurate data, with missing or inaccurate data making it much harder to understand the full picture and hold landlords to account.

In the TAP session, this was built on by members who had negative experiences with AI systems and chatbots as well as missing or inaccurate records, especially when teams changed or providers merged.

- ***"When you report online, no appointment is given, or acknowledgement" (workshop)***
- ***"Data isn't representative of the truth" (workshop)***
- ***"Tenants who give up chasing just look satisfied in the data" (panel)***

What good looks like:

- Fair and equal communication offers across different channels
- Options for non-digital ways to report repairs
- Residents told when they are dealing with AI, with a real person available
- Records, including adaptations and needs, that follow the resident and the job, even through mergers
- Performance data that counts what residents experience, such as missed or changed appointments
- Data that scrutiny panels can access and understand, with training to use it
- A broad view of digital exclusion that includes language and jargon, cost and access, and physical and mental health.

What the wider evidence shows. In the InFocus Review, LiveWest found that using preferred appointment times and an appointment arrival tracker worked well in helping residents stay updated. Similarly, L&Q worked with residents to inform its digital tool 'RepairFinder' based around how they describe repairs. Both show ways to work with residents to use digital methods in an effective way.

ReCAP suggestion. Consider a pilot that explores training for involved residents to better equip them to use, review and understand performance data in repairs scrutiny, and a section in the toolkit that helps residents explore and question what sits behind performance figures.

Theme 3: Meaningful resident voice, participation and scrutiny

This was a theme that was particularly strong in the survey, raised by 12 of the 14 people who answered. This was also explored in the workshops, where residents said it is important for their experiences and feedback to inform positive change, and that it is easier for them to see how they have been involved in change.

What residents told us. Residents talked about raising the same, or similar, issues for long periods of time with little or no action. They also talked about the challenges of getting recommendations from scrutiny reviews to be actioned or being clear on who in the organisation would be responsible for those recommendations moving forward. They also described challenges around ensuring leadership engagement and buy-in for the scrutiny process, but also the organisation trying to shape which residents would be involved in scrutiny and how.

There were also examples of good practice, such as several routes into involvement, tenant question time, short scrutiny sprints and landlords trying to involve everyone who is interested.

- *"If we provide feedback, what are you doing with that?" (workshop)*
- *"Often feels like we're constantly repeating ourselves" (survey)*
- *"They might look, but little seems to change" (survey)*

What good looks like:

- A mix of residents involved, reaching beyond a small group of highly involved tenants
- More leadership involvement with scrutiny panels and projects
- Access to the right data and information
- A clearer feedback loop that can track what evidence was gathered, what the recommendations are, their progress and timelines
- Earlier involvement of residents in the procurement process
- Residents informing and shaping the use of technology
- Shorter, focused reviews alongside longer ones, so repairs are looked at more than once a year.

In both the workshops and TAP session, there were residents who had experience of procurement, but it was reflected that this could be a complex and lengthy process. It was also important to map out and be clear about the whole repair journey from the resident perspective as a useful scrutiny tool. Another challenge that was explored was that it can be hard at times to scrutinise beyond your own personal experiences. However, all residents were clear that lived experience is vital to effective repairs scrutiny, so it will be important to balance lived experience against patterns across all residents' experiences.

What the wider evidence shows. A scrutiny review by Abri showed how involved residents can set out their own scope in a review and effectively examine and engage with performance data. Work by Midland Heart highlighted different routes into resident involvement, which shows how scope can be widened beyond traditional scrutiny. Work by Onward examined resident complaint data that then changed how contractors' vans were stocked; all of these examples demonstrate how data and information can be used to deliver a more effective feedback loop.

ReCAP suggestion. The scrutiny toolkit should set out a clear and effective scrutiny feedback loop and explore what panels are likely to need from providers to make that work.

Theme 4: Standards and accountability

As well as having a clear say in the standard of services, residents felt it was important to set out what happens when standards are not met. Residents want to see more work in developing shared standards between providers, contractors and suppliers, with clear consequences for when those standards fall short. This was an area that came through as an important focus for residents with less evidence of good practice in our desktop review, so we feel our findings show this is a key area for ReCAP to work on.

What residents told us. Achieving accountability and consistent standards across different contracts and providers came up repeatedly. Residents described the same contractor being sent back to redo poor work, missed appointments with no consequence, and housing officers left to take the blame for contractors' failures. Some had been told by operatives that poor work did not matter because "it's only social housing". Residents also pointed out that they have no direct relationship with the contractor: the landlord holds the contract, and the Ombudsman only looks at the landlord.

- *"Not enough consequences to contractors when they don't fulfil contract" (workshop)*
- *"Giving the contractor easy money" (survey)*
- *"Contract terms should be visible, and scrutiny panels should be able to challenge them" (panel)*

When this theme was explored within the NHF TAP session, an important point emerged: how contractors are paid and whether this is per visit, and whether this creates reasons for the work to be extended. Residents were unsure about how this applied to them, but it connects to the issues raised across all workshops about repeat visits and slower resolution.

What good looks like:

- Shared standards across all providers and contracts
- Increased transparency about contracts and contractor agreements
- Contractor behaviour tied to the social value commitments in their contracts through impact, not just performance at the end
- Penalty clauses and compensation for residents when contractors miss appointments or do poor work
- A direct route for residents to raise problems with the contractor, and for contractors to own their mistakes
- Residents involved in procurement and able to sign off a repair as complete
- Clear information on provider, contractor and resident responsibilities for disrepair in the home
- Complaints used as a source of learning data to inform improvement.

('Social value' here means the wider community commitments a contractor promises as part of winning the contract, not just the repairs work itself.)

What the wider evidence shows. Our desktop review found little evidence of good practice that directly align with resident concerns around accountability and standards across providers and contractors.

ReCAP suggestion. The relationship between landlord, contractor and resident is a priority for next year's pilots, and the conversation now needs to include contractors. The culture and accountability framework could reflect the importance of clarity and consistency of standards across contracts and providers.

Theme 5: Right-first-time, timely, high-quality repairs

This theme follows directly from work on consistency standards and reflects a key concern at the heart of repairs delivery: residents want the right person, with the right parts and information, to do a repair properly the first time, and for that repair to last. A timely response is also important, but residents were clear that closing a job against a target is not the same as fixing the problem.

What residents told us. Residents described repeat visits before anyone diagnosed the problem, the wrong trade being sent, operatives arriving without parts, and repairs that failed again weeks later. Survey respondents described landlords not checking completed repairs below a certain cost. Faults were sometimes found when the resident called again. When no one checks, residents end up checking the work themselves.

- *"Incorrect diagnosis at first point of contact" (workshop)*
- *"Repairs are never inspected" (survey)*
- *"There's never actually the supplies on the van" (panel)*

What good looks like:

- Accurate diagnosis when the repair is first reported, including using pictures
- Operatives arriving with the right parts, tools and information about the job and the resident
- Fixing related problems while already in the home
- Completed work checked, and residents able to sign it off or ask for a second opinion without going through a complaint
- Measures that look at whether the repair lasted, not just whether it was closed.

What the wider evidence shows. Growing backlogs and inconsistent quality appear in several scrutiny reviews. Onward's work on van stock and LiveWest's preferred appointment times show practical fixes.

ReCAP suggestion. The toolkit could help residents look beyond just first-time-fix numbers by also considering how well problems are diagnosed at the start, how often repairs need repeat visits, how long repairs stay unresolved, whether finished work is checked, and if residents are satisfied after the job is done.

Theme 6: Respect, dignity and tackling stigma

Running across all the themes is an important point about how residents are respectfully treated as individuals, not just as a 'case to close'. It is really important for residents that they are heard, believed, treated as individuals, and respected in their own homes. Residents were clear that there is no 'standard resident', so a good repairs service needs to be able to adapt to individual needs.

What residents told us. Residents spoke about disability, vulnerability, language, privacy and cultural awareness, and could give examples of having to 'battle' to be believed when reporting a problem. For example, residents described incidents such as having to 'prove' their needs in relation to adaptations, even when that evidence had already been collated by their provider. Residents reflected that all residents had different, relevant skills and experiences and that this should be taken into account and listened to.

- ***"Customers to be believed on the issue being reported, not a battle" (workshop)***
- ***"Treat as a human being, not as a disabled person" (workshop)***
- ***"Listen, listen to us" (survey)***

Residents and panel members described being treated differently because they live in social housing, with examples of feeling that poorer standards in repairs did not matter because "it's only social housing". When we explored issues of stigma in the NHF TAP session, it was highlighted that there were examples of staff making assumptions about residents not paying their own rent, which shaped their perception of what service standards were expected due to this. It was also discussed that overall experiences of stigma can lower residents' own expectations, so that poor work is accepted without challenge.

- "Don't stigmatise the rented customer, do a good job!" (workshop)
- "Good values and knowledge of need" (workshop)
- "What can we expect? We're social housing tenants!?" (panel)

What good looks like:

- Residents' needs, including adaptations and communication needs, recorded and shared with contractors before they visit
- Reasonable adjustments agreed and reviewed with each resident
- Training for staff and operatives in respectful communication, cultural awareness and trauma-informed practice
- Plain English and no stigmatising language
- Respect running both ways, between residents, staff and contractors
- Recognising residents' own knowledge of their homes.

What the wider evidence shows. A Housing Ombudsman report found 45% of residents live with a condition affecting daily life, but only 19.5% felt their landlord made reasonable adjustments. There has been a wide range of research that reflects the impact of stigma on residents' lives and services, and the Housing Ombudsman has been clear about the negative impact of stigmatising attitudes on disrepair, especially with respect to damp and mould (Spotlight on: Damp and mould, it's not lifestyle). In terms of good practice, Greatwell Homes used tenancy information to identify residents who might need more contact. Using tenancy information this way, and passing a resident's needs on to a contractor, work well only when the resident knows this is happening and has agreed to it.

ReCAP suggestion. The framework should include a clear standard on respect that names stigma directly and builds individual needs into how repairs are handled from triage throughout the repairs journey.

Theme 7: Proactive, coordinated and locally responsive delivery

It was important to residents that planning covered both responsive repairs and long-term property condition. Here it was felt that it was more effective to look at the whole household and property and manage repairs as a journey, rather than a series of one-off jobs. Although residents recognised the discussions focused mainly on responsive repairs, it was also important to them to understand how planned works interact with that, and some residents stated they found it difficult to understand when cyclical works were due.

What residents told us. Residents talked about experiences where, when their repair crossed different teams in their organisation, this could mean that both communication and accountability broke down. Examples included repair operatives not fully updated about the job before they arrived or repairs passed on to a housing officer not logged into the system. Overall, many residents valued locally based repair operatives who knew the area and the homes they worked in.

When the concerns around planned works were discussed in the NHF TAP session, members felt it was important to consider how these impacted on a resident's home and what repairs might be needed. Planned works were seen as often the most disruptive, but often the most impactful. It was challenging to understand when these might be happening, and this did impact repairs within the home.

- *"Planning: when appointments change, staff just assume the tenant will be home" (workshop)*
- *"Better planning!" (workshop)*
- *"A yearly projection of works to be done" (survey)*
- *"Finding out from my housing association what's on their list of planned works is near on impossible" (panel)*

What good looks like:

- Increased accountability for one person or team to own a repair from start to finish
- Follow-on work agreed and booked before an operative leaves the home, where possible
- Housing officers being more aware of what planned works are due and to support reporting repairs
- More transparency and visibility on planned works programmes
- Preventative work, such as clearing gutters, and links between responsive repairs and planned works
- Local knowledge built into how services are planned and delivered.

What the wider evidence shows. The Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission Report on Housing Repair shows what being proactive can look like in practice: it trained customer care staff to contact older residents who had not reported a repair in over two years, rather than waiting for them to come forward. Yorkshire Housing's scrutiny review on repairs speaks to the local knowledge point directly, finding that tenants preferred local contractors because they understood the area and felt more accountable to the people living in it.

ReCAP suggestion. How far planned works sit within ReCAP is an open question for the project team. Residents see responsive repairs and planned works as one experience.

Theme 8: Organisational capacity, workforce and leadership

None of the above is possible without the staff and capacity to deliver it, and that came through from residents and staff alike. Residents were clear that ensuring that staff had the right support and resources was key to effective repairs services. Both residents and the staff we spoke to recognised that the delivery of good repairs services is not possible without organisational resources, leadership and support.

What residents told us. Residents talked about shortages and high turnover of their landlords' staff. Staff built on this by discussing the challenges around recruiting qualified tradespeople and inconsistent experiences of training. Residents talked about housing officers covering larger patches, and staff working who had not had training or hands-on experience in repair services. Residents also wanted to see more engagement from senior managers in the scrutiny process. Several said change depends on management at every level being committed to it, and one elected tenant representative called for a "total rethink of culture, involving tenants".

- *"No consistency with training, some staff really efficient, others not" (workshop)*
- *"Only ever worked in offices they can't see a problem" (survey)*
- *"Implementation often takes months, if not years" (survey)*

What good looks like:

- Workforce and skills reviews that look at capacity, not just performance
- Training that covers attitudes and behaviour as well as technical skills
- Housing management staff spending time with repairs teams so they can explain things to tenants
- Continuity of staff where possible
- More active involvement of senior managers and leadership in the scrutiny process.

What the wider evidence shows. Published good practice covers leadership, training and service culture, but says much less about the staffing and capacity pressures that staff described.

ReCAP suggestion. The culture and accountability framework needs to address the conditions behind the service, not only the behaviour of individual staff.

The culture thread

Earlier in the report we talked about how culture and stigma cut across everything that residents have told us; we explore this more here as it doesn't just apply to one theme. What we found suggests that it shapes how residents are treated, how contractors and staff see the people they serve, and what residents feel able to expect and report.

This matters in scrutiny; if residents' expectations are lowered, it may affect performance data, and the residents most affected may be the least likely to come forward. Therefore, the ReCAP toolkit and the framework should both treat tackling stigma as part of the work, not as a separate issue.

Conclusion

Earlier in the report we talked about how culture and stigma cut across everything that residents have told us; we What residents told us adds up to a clear picture. People want to be kept informed, treated with respect, given real influence over decisions, and given standards that landlords and contractors are held to in practice, not just on paper. None of that is unfamiliar to the sector. What stands out here is how often residents are still waiting for it, and how stigma and lowered expectations can make that gap harder to see in the data.

ReCAP's task now is to turn what residents have told us into a toolkit and framework that puts these standards into practice, rather than adding another list of good intentions. That work starts with the pilots and the panel review set out below.

What happens next?

The next stage is to focus first on sharing residents' feedback about communication with landlords and contractors, find out who is already doing this well and where the gaps are, and use that to build the toolkit and the framework. This will also inform a series of small pilot projects designed to explore what residents have told us is important to them; then the learning from those will go into a full report of the whole project next autumn.

Ideas for change

These ideas come directly from what residents have told us, which we explored throughout the report; they are detailed here as a group, and some are closely linked. These are ideas that we now hope to develop into further learning or pilot projects in the next phase of the project.

Getting the right information to and from residents, whether that's about a repair, performance data, or a contract, comes up again and again, so this needs to be worked on together, rather than as separate projects.

We suggest:

- A minimum communication standard, tested across the stages of a repair
- Training for scrutiny panels in using performance data
- Clearer accountability between landlords, contractors and residents, including making contract terms open to scrutiny.

It is also important to note two things that run through all the findings: addressing stigma and treating all residents with respect, and supporting staff so they can do their job well. The project will ensure these are both covered in the work for the culture and accountability framework.

References

These are the 15 published sources reviewed as part of the desktop review described above. Where a source is publicly available online, the link is included. One of these is an internal document (board papers) that is not published online; this is marked accordingly.

- Abri, Resident Scrutiny Review, including Addendum: Repairs (2021), Abri. https://www.abri.co.uk/documents/279/Resident_Scrutiny_Review_including_Addendum_-_Repairs_2021-combined.pdf
- Midland Heart, Tenant Insight Report (2025), Midland Heart. https://www.midlandheart.org.uk/media/lqvfkxkm/mh-2025-a4-tenant-insight-report-0226-v6.pdf
- LiveWest, InFocus Review (resident scrutiny group repairs review, September 2024), LiveWest. https://www.livewest.co.uk/sites/default/files/2025-01/InFocus%20Review%20Sept%2724.pdf
- Greatwell Homes, Statement from Executive Director (2024), CIH Good Practice Hub. https://www.cih.org/knowledge-hub/housing-quality/good-practice/greatwell-homes/
- L&Q, 'We're completing repairs more efficiently with RepairFinder', L&Q Group. https://www.lqgroup.org.uk/media-centre/news/were-completing-repairs-more-efficiently-with-repairfinder
- London Borough of Hackney, Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission, Housing Repairs (committee papers, 2021/22), London Borough of Hackney. Committee papers; no single final report published online.
- Onward, Scrutiny Board Report (August 2022), Onward. https://onward.co.uk/?p=12659
- Yorkshire Housing, Repairs Service Scrutiny Final Report (2021/22), Yorkshire Housing. https://www.yorkshirehousing.co.uk/media/gi5pwuiw/repairs-service-scrutiny-final-report.pdf
- Link Housing, Tenant Focused Repairs (2024), CIH Good Practice Compendium. https://www.cih.org/knowledge-hub/good-practice-compendium-library/sha-good-practice-compendium-2024/excellence-in-tenant-scrutiny-sha-gpc-2024/
- Housing Ombudsman Service, Spotlight report: Repairing Trust (May 2025). https://www.housing-ombudsman.org.uk/app/uploads/2025/05/Spotlight-report-on-repairs-and-maintenance-repairing-trust.pdf
- Housing Ombudsman Service, Spotlight on: Attitudes, Respect and Rights - A Relationship of Equals (March 2024). https://www.housing-ombudsman.org.uk/reports/spotlight-reports/spotlight-on-attitudes-respect-and-rights-relationship-of-equals/
- Housing Ombudsman Service, Learning from Severe Maladministration: Access Issues (November 2025). https://www.housing-ombudsman.org.uk/reports/learning-from-severe-maladministration-reports/learning-from-severe-maladministration-november-2025/
- Housing Ombudsman Service, Learning from Severe Maladministration: Emergency Repairs (May 2025). https://www.housing-ombudsman.org.uk/app/uploads/2025/05/Severe-maladministration-publication-May-2025.pdf
- Housing Ombudsman Service, London Borough of Ealing, decision 202425738 (September 2025). https://www.housing-ombudsman.org.uk/decisions/london-borough-of-ealing-202425738/
- Housing Ombudsman Service, Spotlight on: Damp and mould, it's not lifestyle (October 2021). https://www.housing-ombudsman.org.uk/reports/follow-up-spotlight-on-damp-and-mould

We have also referenced Awaab's Law: guidance for tenants in social housing (gov.uk), which sits outside the desktop review but is relevant to Theme 1.

Get in touch

If you'd like to be involved, share your experience, or be kept up to date with ReCAP, you can get in touch with:

- Dr Eve Blezard, CIH policy and practice lead: eve.blezard@cih.org
- General ReCAP enquiries: policyandpractice@cih.org.

Chartered Institute of Housing

Suites 5 and 6, Rowan House, Westwood Way, Coventry, CV4 8HS

T: 024 7685 1700
E: policy@cih.org

www.cih.org

0508 © Chartered Institute of Housing