

Report to:	Board
Date of Meeting:	23 February 2026
Report for:	Information and Comment
Report Author:	Natalie Meagher Natalie.meagher@phahomes.co.uk

Learning From Complaints 2025 Outturn Report

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 We received significantly less complaints from residents in 2025 (9). The majority of complaints were partly or fully upheld (6) but there were no significant patterns. Including learning information as part of the complaint responses is helping us to improve service in ways that matter to residents.

2 Summary of Complaints and Learning

- 2.1 The attached schedule summarises the complaints received during the year. No resident complained more than once, and all complaints were responded to in time, and none was escalated. Only one complaint resulted in a payment, and this was £150 for spoiled food after an electrical failure (deemed goodwill as no contemporaneous report was made) and a payment of £50 for the time a resident spent cleaning after a contractor did not properly clear up.
- 2.2 Complaints can be grouped as: -
- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| a) PHA Service | 5 complaints of which 4 were partly/upheld |
| b) Contractor quality | 3 complaints of which 2 were partly/upheld |
| c) Repeating Damp | 1 complaint which was not upheld |
- 2.3 All of the PHA service complaints which were upheld involved communication in some form – not being careful with language; not updating customers on planned repairs; failing to respond to communications on time or at all. This highlights how important communication is to residents and improving how, when and how much we communicate needs to be an ongoing focus if we are to delight residents.
- 2.4 The two contractor complaints which were upheld involved poor quality of physical work. This highlights the need to encourage residents to let us know if they are unhappy with work as well as the importance of ‘spreading’ post inspections, so we get a good overview of contractor work for more expensive jobs.

3 Board Response

- 3.1 The Housing Ombudsman Code requires that the Board considers the complaints received during the year, our response to them and any learning arising from them. A statement from the Board is then shared on our website with residents.
- 3.2 We also need to confirm that we continue to be compliant with the Housing Ombudsman Code. No changes to our arrangements or to the code have taken place since last year and whilst we will review our self-assessment prior to submission, we do not anticipate any changes to our being compliant.

4 Policy & Strategy Implications

- 4.1 There are no new policy or strategy issues arising from the report

5 Financial Implications

- 5.1 There are no new financial issues arising from the report.

6 Charitable Implications

- 6.1 There are no charitable issues arising from the report.

7 Resident & Equality Impact

- 7.1 There was no obvious pattern of complaints in terms of known information about the residents concerned or where they live or tenure – but the sample is really too small to draw any particular conclusions.

8 Key Risks

- 8.1 Failing to respond positively and openly to feedback from residents about poor service or service experience may undermine trust and our overall levels of satisfaction. It also can lead to us missing important information – such as feedback about safety issues.
- 8.2 We are actively trying to be a good listening organisation and one that looks for ways in which we can respond to things that residents care about. The TSM results suggest we have a good base from which to start but – as this year's complaints show, there is always more to do, and we should be careful to avoid any complacency – but always to assume that any negative feedback from residents is rooted in opportunities for us to learn and improve.

9 Summary & Recommendations

- 9.1 The number of complaints this year has been relatively low. The majority have been upheld and have provided opportunities to improve our service and to resolve the issues experienced for those customers. They have also allowed us to feed back to contractors about our expectations and to monitor their work more closely.
- 9.2 The most consistent issue – as in previous years – is that of communication. This is common in many organisations and simply means that we need to be vigilant and creative and communicate more than we think is strictly needed all the time.
- 9.3 The Board is asked to
- a) consider the report and
 - b) to highlight those comments that it would wish to include in a public response
 - c) as well as any further information or work that it would wish to see from the leadership team.
- 9.4 A statement will be included in a report on complaints published on our website.

Report by: Natalie Meagher
Head of Housing

Date of Report: 14.02.26

Complaints Summary 2025

Number	Issue	Outcome	Escalated?	Payment?	Learning
22	Customer concerned about recurring damp and mould and perceived lack of action	Not Upheld	Not Escalated	No	Need to take more proactive action at an early stage taking account of individual resident impact
23	Customer felt grounds maintenance contractor had caused damage to car with spray of garden material from strimmer	Not upheld	Not Escalated	No	
2301	Customer felt harrassed by communication about a ring doorbell that suggested they did not have permission to install	Upheld	Not Escalated	No	Not to use accusatory language in letters. The use of more curious language (Eg. If you do not already have permission from us for your doorbell, please get in touch) would have allowed a positive dialogue with the customer even in the absence of the historic record of the permission. Permissions need to be logged on resident or property system file
26	Customer was happy with overall kitchen install but felt that some expected standards had not been met and that the contractor had not delivered good quality or service in all areas	Partly Upheld	Not Escalated	Yes - £200	Clearer explanation of agreed works ahead of major works commencing; physical checks by in house team to ensure standards met before the contractor leaves site; reminding residents that if a failure of electricity causes fridge/freezer losses, we need to be notified asap to ensure compensation; reminding residents that private agreements for work with our contractors are not matters that we can mediate or resolve
9	Customer was unhappy with the standard of work carried out by the fencing contractor	Upheld	Not Escalated	No	Check on the work of the contractor for the following 6 months to ensure no pattern of poor performance or quality
14	Customer was seeking advice on a shared ownership staircasing sale. They did not receive a response to communication through our website	Upheld	Not Escalated	No	Ensure that communication via the website receives an immediate acknowledgement; consider how service requests are acknowledged more widely and improve info on staircasing on website.
16	Customer unhappy with delay in carrying out communal repairs	Upheld	Not Escalated	No	More communication needed to explain delays to residents
4	Customer had small leak under the kitchen sink and was unhappy that they were advised not to use the sink until it was repaired, that they were told they could use the bathroom for any essential dishwashing and that the repair was deemed urgent.	Not Upheld	Not Escalated	No	Continue to communicate the timescales for repairs when residents call/contact and explain the reasons for these timescales
13	Customer was left with intermittent hot water over a weekend, had concerns that a ventilation unit in the loft was not functioning correctly after servicing and that an email about this was not responded to	Partly Upheld	Not Escalated	No	Carry out further investigation to see how an email sent by the customer appeared not to have been received.