# TSM 2025 Return – our survey approach

As per the Regulator of Social Housing's Tenant Survey Requirements (Annex 5), below details our approach to running the tenant perception survey.

## Summary of achieved sample size (number of responses)

When the survey process was closed, we had over 2,950 responses. Following data cleansing, which involved deleting duplicate responses and incomplete responses, this meant that 2,930 results were used to calculate the Tenant Satisfaction Measure Results.

At the time of analysing the results from the closed survey and producing the housing management information measures, the relevant population (tenanted LCRA properties) was 20,678.

This is a high response rate and is statistically robust. The technical guidelines require larger landlords like Wigan Council to achieve a sample size that gives 95% confidence that the results reported are accurate to a margin of no more than +/- 3%. With 2,930 responses, Wigan Council achieved a margin of +/- 1.7%, which provides a robust level of accuracy. It gives us a high level of confidence that the results from this sample survey are representative of the views of Wigan Council tenants.

## Timing of survey

The perception survey was run as a snapshot in a specified window in Autumn/Winter 2025.

Phase 1 – **7.10.25** digital surveys were issued to all tenants who had an email address or mobile phone number. This was followed by 2 reminder emails/texts.

Phase 2 – **17.10.25** postal surveys were sent to a proportionate, age-based sample of the remaining tenant population who did not have an email address or mobile phone number.

Survey closedown – end of November 2025.

## Collection methods

The survey was primarily conducted online, with a digital first approach. However, postal surveys were issued to a sample of tenants selected to reflect different age groups, where no email address or mobile phone number was available, or where tenants specifically requested a postal survey.

In Phase 1 GovMetric sent out either an email or SMS survey to the main tenant in each household where we had a valid email address or mobile telephone number.

In Phase 2 GovMetric sent out a postal survey to the main tenant of the sample households who could not receive the survey via email or SMS.

Throughout the process responses were monitored for age, gender, housing type (general needs / sheltered) and geographic area (neighbourhoods) to ensure that survey responses were representative. By monitoring responses, we were satisfied that representativeness was achieved in line with RSH requirements.

Throughout both phases of the survey window, a comprehensive communication plan was implemented, to explain to tenants why the survey was being conducted and to encourage responses. Staff and Elected Member communications were also circulated so that they could respond to any queries raised by tenants.

Of the 2,930 survey responses, the breakdown of survey methods is:

| Method | Number of responses | % of responses |
|---|---|---|
| Email | 2,560 | 87.4% |
| SMS text message | 325 | 11.1% |
| Postal survey | 45 | 1.5% |

## Sample methods

We had previously determined that to achieve a margin of +/- 3%, which was recommended as our stock size fell in the 20,000 – 25,000 band, we required:

| Tenant group | Population | Responses needed | Surveys to be sent out |
|---|---|---|---|
| All LCRA | 20,678 | 1,014 | 3,380* |

**This was based on a 30% response rate. On previous snapshot surveys we had achieved a 40% response rate.*

A decision was taken to maximise responses and rather than target surveys to a random sample of 3,380, a census method would be taken in Phase 1, with surveys sent out to all tenanted households where we had email or mobile contact details. At 20,678 tenanted households this provided a more robust approach and provided all tenants with the opportunity to provide feedback.

Whilst this meant most tenanted households received a survey in Phase 1, we wanted to ensure specific groups were not at a disadvantage due to the digital first approach and that the results were representative of the tenant population.

As explained earlier in this document in Phase 2 GovMetric sent out paper copies of the survey to a sample of tenants based on age, who had not received a survey via email or SMS text message, therefore this year we did not have to identify a sample of tenants to receive the survey.

## Summary of representativeness

At the mid-point of the survey, we tested representativeness of responses against the relevant tenant population.

For the characteristics against which representativeness has been assessed, it was decided to focus on 4 characteristics:

- Tenant characteristics used – age profile and gender
- Stock characteristics – general needs or sheltered housing property
- Neighbourhood – Wigan is divided into 7 neighbourhoods with housing stock in each area

**Age profile:**

Overall, the age profile of respondents is slightly less representative of the tenant population, with a tendency toward higher participation from older tenants and lower engagement from younger groups. We will continue to promote the survey through our social media channels, tenant forums, and engagement with younger tenant representatives via the Housing Advisory Panel, with the aim of improving representation among younger age groups.

| Age Bands | Relevant Population | | End-point survey responses | | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16-24 | 492 | 2.4% | 30 | 1% | -1.4% |
| 25-34 | 2,289 | 11% | 219 | 7.5% | -3.5% |
| 35-44 | 4,030 | 19.4% | 499 | 17% | -2.4% |
| 45-54 | 3,728 | 18% | 584 | 19.9% | 1.99% |
| 55-64 | 4,134 | 19.9% | 687 | 23.5% | 3.6% |
| 65-74 | 3,197 | 15.4% | 601 | 20.5% | 5.1% |
| 75+ | 2,891 | 13.9% | 308 | 10.5% | -3.4% |
| | **20,761** | | **2,928** | | |

**Gender:**

The responses received at the mid and endpoints of the survey were very closely aligned with the tenant population with only negligible differences.

| Gender | Relevant population | | End-point survey responses | | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 12,987 | 62.55% | 2,139 | 62.7% | 0.15% |
| Male | 7,760 | 37.38% | 1,259 | 37.2% | -0.18% |
| Other* | 15 | 0.07% | 1 | 0.1% | -0.06% |
| | **20,762** | | **2,929*** | | |

**Housing Type:**

The survey is generally representative by housing type, with only a small and balanced level of variation between groups.

| Housing type | Relevant population | | End-point survey responses | | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General needs | 19,475 | 93.8% | 2,967 | 92.1% | -1.7% |
| Sheltered housing | 1,287 | 6.2% | 232 | 7.9% | +1.7% |
| | **20,762** | | **2,929*** | | |

**Neighbourhood:**

The survey is well balanced across neighbourhoods, with most differences small (within ±2 percentage points), indicating good geographic coverage.

| Neighbourhood | Relevant population | | End-point survey responses | | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leigh | 3,507 | 17% | 455 | 15.6% | -1.4% |
| Wigan North | 910 | 4.4% | 150 | 5.1% | 0.7% |
| Wigan Central | 4,288 | 20.8% | 589 | 20.2% | -0.6% |
| South Wigan and Ashton North | 1,943 | 9.4% | 212 | 7.3% | -2.1% |
| Lowton and Golborne | 1,508 | 7.3% | 278 | 9.5% | 2.2% |
| Ince, Hindley, Abram, Platt Bridge | 5,186 | 25.1% | 770 | 26.4% | 1.3% |
| Tyldesley and Atherton | 3,290 | 15.9% | 462 | 15.8% | -0.1% |
| | **20,642** | | **2,916** | | |

* Where data was captured

In partnership with our survey provider, we are developing an additional survey aimed at tenants who did not respond this year, to better understand the reasons for non-response. The insights gathered will help inform and refine the approach and methodology for future surveys. For example, we may explore alternative channels, such as trialling WhatsApp in place of SMS for survey distribution.

## Weighting

We did not apply any weighting to generate the reported perception measures, as representativeness was achieved across all measurable groups.

## The role of any external contractor in running the survey

We again worked in partnership with the external contractor GovMetric to design and manage the tenant satisfaction survey, in line with the RSH's requirements. The approach taken ensured the process remained without bias and results were kept confidential and independent.

Postal surveys were sent out by GovMetric and responses returned to them, with them responsible for validation and collation.  Wigan Council's access was limited to viewing the actual results.

## Tenants not included in the sample frame

Annex 5 asks for the number of tenant households within the relevant population that have not been included in the sample frame due to the exceptional circumstances described in paragraph 63 with a broad rationale for their removal.

This is not applicable for Wigan's survey – there were no exclusions due to the exceptional circumstances, and a mixed methodology approach was used to provide an alternative way of responding for households who could not respond to the digital survey.

However, during the 2025/26 TSM survey process, a cohort of 81 households in privately leased temporary accommodation, along with 2 households in general fund leased properties, was inadvertently excluded from the survey sampling frame. We identified that our new data warehouse tenant report was configured to include council tenants only, resulting in the exclusion of this cohort.

The omission was unintentional and was not related to the survey methodology nor any attempt to influence outcomes. The excluded cohort represents approximately 0.39% of the relevant tenant population.

We have considered the potential impact on representativeness. As these households are in temporary accommodation, their experiences may differ systematically from those of general needs tenants, and their exclusion may therefore introduce some degree of bias. However, given the relatively small size of the cohort, we consider the overall impact to be limited.

For illustrative purposes:

If the cohort had achieved the same response rate as the overall survey (14.7%), this would equate to approximately 12 additional responses.

- In a best-case scenario, where all 12 respondents reported being very or fairly satisfied, overall satisfaction would increase from 63.3% to 63.4% (an increase of 0.1%).
- In a worst-case scenario, where all 12 respondents reported being very or fairly dissatisfied, overall dissatisfaction would increase from 21.6% to 21.9% (an increase of 0.3%).

To mitigate this issue, we will:

- Review the characteristics of the excluded cohort and assess the potential impact on results.
- Fully disclose the exclusion and its cause within our TSM summary of approach.
- Strengthen our data reconciliation processes to ensure alignment between LADR, stock lists, business intelligence reports, and survey sampling frames.

## Reasons for not meeting the sample size

This is not applicable; we achieved a high response rate to the survey.

## Incentives

A prize draw consisting of 1st place prize of £100 and 4 2nd place prizes of £50 each was offered as an incentive to tenants who completed the survey and gave consent to be entered the draw and contacted.

## Any other methodology considerations

There were no other methodological issues likely to have a material impact on the tenant perception measures reported.

## Appendix

**Repairs SLA Timescales**

(Currently under consultation)

| Work Type | Description Work | Examples of Work | Original Target | Suggested Target Date last year in SLA (hours / days / months) | Newly Agreed Target for Sign Off |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Out-of-Hours / Call Out | Tenant call-out out of hours to make safe. | | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 hours – no change |
| Emergency Works | Linked to individuals' safety, make safe activities related to electricity, bursts, leaks, flooding, lack of heating & hot water **(note WLBS don't deal with gas)** loose and dangerous roof tiles. | | 24 hours | 24 hours | 24 hours – no change |
| Qualifying Works | Full or partial loss electricity, water, space or water heaters. Unsafe electricity fitting. Toilet not flushing or blocked where no other toilet. Blocked sink, bath or basin. Tap cannot turn on. | | 1,2,3,7 days | 1, 2, 3, 7 days | 1,2,3,7 days – no change |

| Work Type | Description Work | Examples of Work | Original Target | Suggested Target Date last year in SLA (hours / days / months) | Newly Agreed Target for Sign Off |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Leaking pipes, cistern or roof. Insecure external window, door, lock. Loose or detached banister rail, rotten timber flooring or stair tread. | | | | |
| Prioritised Works - Mould | Fungicidal Wash and Paint | | 2 days | 2 days | 2 days – no change |
| Care Leavers | Regardless of the type of repair, description on ticket to denote care leaver (###) and WLBS will prioritise. Timescales dependent on type works, size of job and availability of materials. | | Relevant target date applied dependent upon works. | As aside and prioritise where possible. | No change |
| Routine Repairs – Opti System | Small single trade jobs, with booking officer / tenant agreeing appointment date | | 28 days | 28 days | 28 days – no change |

| Work Type | Description Work | Examples of Work | Original Target | Suggested Target Date last year in SLA<br>(hours / days / months) | Newly Agreed Target for Sign Off |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Routine Repairs – D2D | Small single trade jobs not covered on Opti system | | 28 days | 28 days | 28 days – no change |
| Measured Repairs | Where full specification and measurement of requirements need to be undertaken by WLBS, requiring additional visit prior to arrangement of works. | Partial/full Bathroom installation (inc WHB/WC/Bath)<br><br>Partial/Full wet room installation<br><br>Plastering partial/full room (inc HSL)<br><br>DPC over 5m2<br><br>New internal doors<br><br>External timber gates | 28 days | 42 days | 42 days |
| Wet room Floor | This often requires multiple visits, as the floor | | 28 days | 56 days | 42 days |

| Work Type | Description Work | Examples of Work | Original Target | Suggested Target Date last year in SLA (hours / days / months) | Newly Agreed Target for Sign Off |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Replacement | under the vinyl is damaged, so the new vinyl floor cannot be installed without other works being undertaken by a different trade. Will also often require plastering and skirts. This requirement needs to be identified on the ticket to speed up delivery. | | | | |
| Asbestos Survey / Removal pre works | Multiple contacts with tenant and visits required, for measurement pre-production and then fitting. Shorter lead time to UPVC, although sheer volume of glazing increases lead time – beyond 28 days. | | 28 days | 56+ days | 28 days |
| Double Glazing | Multiple visits, multiple trades e.g., electrical, joiner, gas (radiator), extensive preparation | | 28 days | 56 days | 28 days |

| Work Type | Description Work | Examples of Work | Original Target | Suggested Target Date last year in SLA (hours / days / months) | Newly Agreed Target for Sign Off |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Replacement | each day as a wet trade, and the tenant to be available in their property for a number of days for full completion. Often other works are on the ticket, which also extends timescales. | | | | |
| Extensive Plastering e.g. ceilings/full walls/full rooms / HSL (Hall, Stairs, Landing), DPM works | Where more than one job is included on a work ticket e.g., installing a PIV, but the loft hatch needs to be increased in size | Plastering partial/full room (inc HSL) over 5m2<br><br>DPC over 5m2<br><br>New internal doors and casings<br><br>Over skim to textured coated surfaces (inc electrics) | 28 days | 84 days | 84 days<br>(Reported as 60 working days in the TSM return. Used only in exceptional circumstances due to the content of work required in the property) |

| Work Type | Description Work | Examples of Work | Original Target | Suggested Target Date last year in SLA<br>(hours / days / months) | Newly Agreed Target for Sign Off |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Multiple Job Works | | Extractor fan through DGU<br><br>Install new electric shower (inc tiling and seal up)<br><br>PIV Installation<br><br>uPVC doors and windows inc plastering and skirting boards | 28 days | 84 days | 84 days<br>(Reported as 60 working days in the TSM return. Used only in exceptional circumstances due to the content of work required in the property) |
| UPVC Front & Rear External Doors | Multiple contacts with tenant and visits required, for measurement pre-production and then fitting. Tenant chooses colour & style, long lead times dependent on | Plastering after new door installed | 28 days | 90 days | 84 days<br>(Reported as 60 working days in the TSM return. Used only in exceptional circumstances |

| Work Type | Description Work | Examples of Work | Original Target | Suggested Target Date last year in SLA (hours / days / months) | Newly Agreed Target for Sign Off |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | option chosen – beyond 28 days, checking of product prior to installation. | | | | due to the content of work required in the property) |
| UPVC Window Frames | Multiple contacts with tenant and visits required, for measurement pre-production and then fitting. Long lead time for production to exact size – beyond 28 days, often the same ticket is left in place when works change from review situation to replace. | | 28 days | 90 days | 84 days<br>(Reported as 60 working days in the TSM return. Used only in exceptional circumstances due to the content of work required in the property) |
| New Staircase | Multiple contacts with tenant and visits required, for measurement pre-production and then fitting. Long lead times as customised to property and needs to conform to current regulations – | Plastering to walls once stairs installed<br><br>New skirting boards | 56 days | 90 days | 84 days<br>(Reported as 60 working days in the TSM return. Used only in exceptional circumstances due to the |

| Work Type | Description Work | Examples of Work | Original Target | Suggested Target Date last year in SLA (hours / days / months) | Newly Agreed Target for Sign Off |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | beyond 28 days. These are quoted works. | | | | content of work required in the property) |
| Kitchen Complete Replacement | These are capital works, require multiple visits, multiple trades and the tenant to be available in their property for 10-14 days for full completion. Often the ticket has other works included e.g., DPM in kitchen, plastering in other rooms, etc. | | 28 days | 12 Months (Emergencies can be booked in as a priority – as long as this is justified and dependent on volume of works) | 12 months |
| Bathroom Complete Replacement | These are capital works, require multiple visits, multiple trades and the tenant to be available in their property for 10-14 days for full completion. | | 28 days | 12 Months (Emergencies can be booked in as a priority – as long as this is justified and dependent on volume of works) | 12 months |
| Wet room Complete | These are capital works, require multiple visits, multiple trades and the | | 28 days | 12 Months – needs to be arranged by | 12 months |

| Work Type | Description Work | Examples of Work | Original Target | Suggested Target Date last year in SLA (hours / days / months) | Newly Agreed Target for Sign Off |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Replacement | tenant to be available in their property for 10-14 days for full completion.<br>These works shouldn't be ordered by repairs, as there is a requirement for occupational therapist to approve. | | | the adaptations team | |
| New Void Targets | | | | | |
| Dispersed | Minor works in furnished tenancies/health checks only. | | 2 days | | 2 days |
| Minor Void | Minor works | | 14 days | | 14 days |
| Major Void | Major works/measured works etc | | 28 days | | 42 days |
| Major Void | Major works/kitchen/plastering /multiple trades. | | 42 days | | 56 days |