

Sheltered Housing Communal Cleaning Satisfaction Survey 2026

8 May 2026

1. Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of the Sheltered Housing Communal Cleaning Satisfaction Survey carried out in March 2026 across nine sheltered housing schemes.

The purpose of the survey was to understand tenant satisfaction with the communal cleaning service, identify strengths, highlight areas for improvement, and support future service planning.

A total of 274 sheltered housing residents were invited to take part through hand-delivered paper surveys, with 73 responses received (27% response rate). Engagement was particularly strong at Belmans Court, Greenfields and Vyntoner House, each achieving around 40% or above. Honeycroft returned no responses, reflecting its unique set-up as a bungalow scheme with only a weekly-cleaned community room.

Communal cleaning is delivered for two hours per day, Monday to Friday, across shared areas including hallways, stairwells, lounges, kitchens, laundry rooms, lifts and toilets. Cleaning does not include tenants' individual homes. Depending on the scheme, services are provided by Tendring District Council (TDC) or Everbrite. Mead House is currently cleaned by Everbrite due to recruitment challenges for a permanent TDC cleaner.

The survey was co-designed with the Tenant Panel subgroup. Overall, tenants report high levels of satisfaction, with both TDC and Everbrite performing at a "Good-Very Good" level. Staff are consistently praised for their professionalism, courtesy and reliability. However, the results also highlight variation between schemes and clear improvement areas, particularly around complaints handling, communication, and consistency of standards. Mead House shows more mixed results due to temporary arrangements, while the absence of responses from Honeycroft suggests a different engagement approach is needed. A process of recruiting tenant block champions for each scheme will commence in June 2026 to strengthen tenant involvement in monitoring and service improvement.

These findings will support ongoing improvement work and will be reviewed alongside the 2025/26 Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSMs) survey once available, helping the service focus on areas that will strengthen performance against TSM TP10 (communal areas cleaned and maintained).

2. Link to Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSMs)

- TSM TP10 (communal areas cleaned and maintained) has improved over three years - 49%, 51%, now 57% in 2025/26, however remains below the LA benchmark of 63%.
- **Note:** The detailed 2025/26 TSM survey results will be reviewed alongside this report once available, to triangulate findings and help to focus on any particular identified issues.

3. Communal Cleaning Survey Approach

- **Survey period:** 2nd to 4th March 2026.
- **Method:** Hard-copy surveys hand-delivered to all sheltered housing tenants.
- **Survey design and scoring:** 9 criteria were set out in the survey each asking for a 1–5 level of satisfaction (Poor=1, Fair=2, Good=3, Very Good=4, Excellent=5). There was also an opportunity to provide additional comments, which have been passed to the Council’s Facilities Manager who is responsible for managing the cleaners.
- **Promotion:** Discussed at residents’ meetings in February 2026.
- **Tenant involvement:** The Tenant Panel subgroup (ASB, Neighbourhoods and Rents) reviewed the draft survey and suggested amendments, including adding a question about floor level. A total of 274 residents were surveyed across nine schemes. The recruitment of tenant block champions for each scheme will commence in June 2026 to strengthen tenant involvement in monitoring and service improvement

4. Overall Survey Response Rate

- Total residents surveyed: 274

Total responses received: 73 (*Note: Some residents chose to answer some but not all questions*)

- Overall response rate: 27%

Table 1: Responses by scheme

Sheltered Housing Scheme	Properties	Responses	Response rate
Belmans Court	45	18	40%
Crooked Elms	30	8	27%
Greenfields	34	14	41%
Groom House	31	5	16%
Honeycroft	21	0	0%
Kate Daniels House	30	7	23%
Mead House	29	5	17%
St Mary’s Court	25	5	20%
Vyntoner House	29	11	38%

4.1 Observations on survey response rates

- Response rates are generally acceptable, with Belmans Court, Greenfields and Vyntoner House achieving around 40% or above, which is considered a strong engagement rate.
- Honeycroft returned no responses, reflecting its different set-up (bungalows with only a community room cleaned weekly), therefore limiting insight into tenants’ views of this particular communal cleaning service suggesting a different engagement method is required.

5. Key Survey Findings

Across the sheltered housing schemes, tenants generally express confidence in the communal cleaning service. Many describe staff as polite, reliable and committed to maintaining communal spaces.

However, there are clear differences between schemes and between cleaning providers, particularly around communication, flexibility and complaints handling.

5.1 Variation between sheltered housing schemes

- Some schemes — notably Greenfields, Vyntoner House and Belmans Court - show consistently positive feedback across most aspects of the service.
- Others, such as Groom House and Mead House, show more mixed or less strongly positive feedback, suggesting localised issues or differences in staffing, supervision or communication.
- Honeycroft - no responses were received. Given its unique set-up (bungalows with only a community room cleaned weekly), a separate engagement approach may be required.
- Mead House - is normally a TDC-cleaned scheme, but is currently cleaned by Everbrite due to recruitment challenges. Results show more mixed satisfaction, particularly around communication and flexibility, and should be treated as a separate case for targeted follow-up.

Appendices A to I detail average satisfaction scores by sheltered housing scheme.

Using a 1–5 scale (Poor=1, Fair=2, Good=3, Very Good=4, Excellent=5), the average rating for “Overall satisfaction with the cleaning service provided” is:

Table 2: Average overall satisfaction level

Provider	Average overall satisfaction (1–5)	Comment
Everbrite	4.43	Strong, but slightly lower
TDC	4.75	Very strong, higher than Everbrite

Both providers are performing at a “Good–Very Good” level overall, with TDC scoring higher on this headline measure.

Note: These “overall averages” are simple averages, not weighted by question importance.

5.2 Strengths and weaker areas

Strengths

- High satisfaction overall: both providers achieve “Good–Very Good” ratings across most categories, with particularly strong scores for professionalism, reliability and quality.
- Positive staff perception: tenants consistently rate cleaning staff as courteous and professional, which is a strong foundation for service improvement.
- Very strong performance at some schemes:
 - Greenfields (TDC), Vyntoner House (Everbrite), Crooked Elms (Everbrite) and St Mary’s Court (TDC) show very high scores across multiple categories, indicating well-run services and good local relationships.

Improvement areas

- Complaints handling: this is the lowest scoring category for both providers (Everbrite 3.70, TDC 3.36). Tenants are less confident that issues are resolved effectively when they do complain.
- Variation between schemes: some schemes (e.g. Groom House [TDC], Mead House [TDC but currently provided by Everbrite]) show lower or more mixed scores, suggesting inconsistency in standards and/or communication.
- Honeycroft data gap: no responses from Honeycroft means the housing service has no tenant voice on the weekly community room cleaning, despite its different service model.
- Communication and visibility: while TDC scores well on communication overall, Everbrite’s lower communication score suggests tenants may not always understand what is included in the service, when cleaning is done, or how to raise issues.

Summary

- TDC excels in communication, flexibility and overall satisfaction.
- Everbrite excels in professionalism, reliability and bathroom cleaning.

Table 3: Comparison Table – TDC vs Everbrite

Criteria	TDC – Summary	Everbrite – Summary	Everbrite Score	TDC Score	Higher Score
Overall satisfaction	Strong tenant confidence across most schemes; Mead House an exception due to temporary arrangements.	Generally positive across most schemes; some variation where communication is weaker.	4.43	4.75	TDC
Quality of cleaning	Strong across most schemes; occasional mixed views in bathroom areas.	Strong standards at several schemes; some variation between sites.	4.43	4.71	TDC
Reliability	Also strong, though with slightly more variation between schemes.	A key strength; tenants frequently describe staff as dependable.	4.57	4.54	Everbrite
Professionalism	Very positive across TDC schemes, especially St Mary's Court.	One of Everbrite's strongest areas; staff widely praised for courtesy.	4.66	4.63	Everbrite
Communication	A clear strength; tenants feel well informed & confident raising issues.	More mixed; tenants sometimes unclear about routines or reporting routes.	4.43	4.79	TDC
Flexibility	Strongly positive; staff seen as willing to adjust and respond to needs.	Some tenants feel the service is routine-driven and less adaptable.	4.32	4.87	TDC
Responsiveness to requests	Generally strong; tenants often report prompt responses.	Mixed; some requests picked up well, others not always acted on.	4.11	4.38	TDC
Complaints handling	Weaker area; tenants often unclear about follow-up or outcomes.	Shared improvement area; Everbrite tenants show slightly more confidence in resolution.	3.70	3.36	Everbrite
Bathroom/shower cleaning	More mixed; some tenants suggest improvements needed.	Generally positive where applicable; good standards noted.	4.26	3.95	Everbrite

6. Recommendations

6.1 Improve communication and visibility

- Co-design with the Tenant Panel subgroup and publish a simple “What we clean and when” leaflet/poster for each scheme.
- Introduce visible cleaning schedules and sign-off sheets for each scheme.

6.2 Communication and complaints handling

- Standardise a simple complaints/escalation route for communal cleaning by creating a one-page “If something isn’t right” guide with clear contact details and expected response times.
- Feedback loop: “You said, we listened” for each scheme, with a quarterly summary of key issues raised and actions taken, shared at residents’ meetings and on noticeboards and web page.

6.3 Cleaning provider-specific actions

- **Everbrite** – focus on communication and flexibility
 - Brief Everbrite cleaning supervisors on survey findings, highlighting lower scores for communication and flexibility compared to TDC.
 - Agree a simple protocol for staff to proactively check in with tenants (e.g. “Is there anything you’d like us to focus on today?”).
- **TDC** – consolidate strengths, improve showers/baths and complaints
 - Provide refresher training on complaint handling and follow-up, ensuring tenants receive clear updates when they raise issues.
- **Everbrite** – Mead House targeted review
 - Conduct a focused walkabout with tenants, Everbrite, council officers and tenant block champion to understand specific concerns.
 - Agree short-term improvements and confirm the longer-term plan for recruitment to a permanent TDC cleaner.
- **Everbrite** - Honeycroft targeted review
 - Targeted engagement (e.g. drop-in session) to understand satisfaction with the community room cleaning.

6.4 Tenant involvement and monitoring

- Support the block champions to gather qualitative feedback to complement survey data.
- Repeat the sheltered-specific survey annually, aligned with TSM reporting, to track progress and maintain focus on communal areas to support the housing service’s ambition to move closer to or above the 63% LA benchmark for TP10.

7. Conclusion and Next Steps

The 2026 survey demonstrates that communal cleaning services across sheltered housing schemes are generally well regarded, with strong staff professionalism and reliable day-to-day delivery.

The findings provide a clear basis for targeted improvements, particularly in communication, complaints handling and consistency across schemes.

Immediate next steps include:

- Developing scheme-specific cleaning information materials
- Standardising a simple complaints and escalation route
- Provider-specific actions for Everbrite and TDC
- Targeted engagement at Mead House and Honeycroft
- Strengthening tenant involvement through the block champion roles
- Repeating the survey annually to track progress and support improvement against TSM TP10

These actions will help the service move closer to the 63% LA benchmark for communal areas cleaned and maintained, while ensuring sheltered tenants have a stronger voice in shaping the service.

8. Appendices (A to I) – Average Satisfaction Scores by Sheltered Housing Scheme

See following pages.

Appendix A – Belmans Court (Everbrite, 18 responses)

Criteria	Avg rating (1–5)
Overall satisfaction	4.28
Quality of cleaning	4.22
Reliability	4.33
Professionalism and courtesy	4.50
Communication	4.28
Flexibility	3.89
Responsiveness to requests	4.06
Complaints rectified effectively	4.00
Cleaning of communal showers/baths (if appl.)	3.67

Appendix B – Crooked Elms (Everbrite, 8 responses)

Criteria	Avg rating (1–5)
Overall satisfaction	4.38
Quality of cleaning	4.38
Reliability	4.75
Professionalism and courtesy	4.75
Communication	4.63
Flexibility	4.75
Responsiveness to requests	4.13
Complaints rectified effectively	4.13
Cleaning of communal showers/baths (if appl.)	5.00 (small base)

Appendix C – Greenfields (TDC, 14 responses)

Criteria	Avg rating (1–5)
Overall satisfaction	4.86
Quality of cleaning	4.79
Reliability	4.50
Professionalism and courtesy	4.50
Communication	5.00
Flexibility	4.93
Responsiveness to requests	4.07
Complaints rectified effectively	2.79
Cleaning of communal showers/baths (if appl.)	3.50

Appendix D – Groom House (TDC, 5 responses)

Criteria	Avg rating (1–5)
Overall satisfaction	4.40
Quality of cleaning	4.40
Reliability	4.60
Professionalism and courtesy	4.60
Communication	4.60
Flexibility	5.00 (small base)
Responsiveness to requests	4.60
Complaints rectified effectively	4.50 (small base)
Cleaning of communal showers/baths (if appl.)	4.60

Appendix E – Honeycroft (Everbrite – Community Room, 0 responses)

- No survey responses received - only a weekly-cleaned community room; no internal communal corridors or blocks.

Appendix F – Kate Daniels House (Everbrite, 7 responses)

Criteria	Avg rating (1–5)
Overall satisfaction	4.29
Quality of cleaning	4.29
Reliability	4.86
Professionalism and courtesy	4.86
Communication	4.43
Flexibility	4.57
Responsiveness to requests	4.57
Complaints rectified effectively	3.29
Cleaning of communal showers/baths (if appl.)	4.43

Appendix G – Mead House (Everbrite, 5 responses)

Criteria	Avg rating (1–5)
Overall satisfaction	3.80
Quality of cleaning	4.00
Reliability	4.00
Professionalism and courtesy	3.80
Communication	2.60
Flexibility	3.00
Responsiveness to requests	4.00
Complaints rectified effectively	3.00
Cleaning of communal showers/baths (if appl.)	3.00

Appendix H – St Mary’s Court (TDC, 5 responses)

Criteria	Avg rating (1–5)
Overall satisfaction	4.80
Quality of cleaning	4.80
Reliability	4.60
Professionalism and courtesy	5.00
Communication	4.40
Flexibility	4.60
Responsiveness to requests	5.00
Complaints rectified effectively	4.25 (small base)
Cleaning of communal showers/baths (if appl.)	5.00 (small base)

Appendix I – Vyntoner House (Everbrite, 11 responses)

Criteria	Avg rating (1–5)
Overall satisfaction	4.82
Quality of cleaning	4.91
Reliability	4.64
Professionalism and courtesy	4.73
Communication	4.55
Flexibility	4.55
Responsiveness to requests	3.91
Complaints rectified effectively	3.18
Cleaning of communal showers/baths (if appl.)	4.73