

Appendix 1 – Survey approach and methodology

Sect 1a – background (LCRA) and Sect 1b – background (LCHO)

1. Background

As the TSMs are required to be reported at a Group entity level, our submission contains combined information for the following registered provider entities under 4878 Peabody Trust:

- Peabody Trust (4878)
- Peabody Developments Limited (L3885)
- Town and Country Housing (L4251)

Surveys for Peabody Developments Limited are carried out as part of the Peabody research programme.

Town and Country Housing (TCH) currently carry out their own survey programme which is aligned with the approach of Peabody as the parent company.

Both entities used rolling monthly telephone interviews as the main data collection method using an external research provider. Peabody used TLF (Leadership Factor) and TCH used KWEST.

2. Methodology used

Sections a to k below set out our survey approach in line with paragraph 35 of the Tenant Survey Requirements - [TSM - Tenant Survey Requirements \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/100000/tenant-survey-requirements.pdf)

a) Summary of the achieved sample size

Summary of number of responses and statistical reliability:

	Peabody	TCH	Peabody Group (unweighted)
LCRA stock at start of surveying year (based on 2025 SDR)	70,824	11,193	82,017
LCRA required statistical accuracy			+/- 2%
No. of LCRA responses	5,353	2,008	7,361
LCRA responses to TP01	5,304	1,987	7,291
LCRA achieved statistical reliability:			±1.1
LCHO stock at start of surveying year (based on 2025 SDR)	9,773	1,447	11,220
LCHO required statistical accuracy			+/- 3%
No. of LCHO responses	986	311	1,297
LCHO responses to TP01	971	300	1,271
LCHO achieved statistical reliability:			±2.3%

b) Timing of survey

For both Peabody and TCH, the tenant perception survey was carried out throughout the whole year on a rolling monthly basis. Surveys began in April 2025 and ended in March 2026.

Year-to-date scores were monitored on a monthly basis, with more detailed analysis being conducted on a quarterly basis to identify trends, wider learnings and opportunities for driving improvement.

c) Collection method

Telephone was chosen as the main data collection method based on historic continuity for both Peabody and TCH, as well as research agency experience and advice for the following reasons:

- Telephone quickly highlights any issues that could be present e.g. incorrect telephone numbers, disabilities or language barriers preventing residents from participating.
- Phone surveys allow residents who are less likely to be heard to share their experiences as they are proactively contacted and asked to participate, rather than relying on residents to choose to participate following an invite distributed via email, SMS or post.
- It helps to ensure the number of partially completed surveys remains low, so we gather complete feedback from tenants
- It allows the representativeness of the achieved sample to be simply monitored and controlled, and adapted quickly if needed.

For both Peabody and TCH, telephone calls were made at different times of the day and Interviewers made up to 5 attempts to secure a survey response with each sampled LCRA and LCHO household.

Please note, we used a separate methodology for our Supported Housing Agency Managed residents. This was a small number of residents, but the results were incorporated into our main results. Section 3 contains full details for this resident group.

d) Sample method

A stratified sampling method was used for both LCRA and LCHO, taking into account tenure type, property type, age group, region (for Peabody) and borough (for TCH).

Quotas were set for age and region, with the other criteria being monitored throughout the year to ensure the representativeness of the sample.

e) Ensuring representativeness

For Peabody, to ensure the sample achieved was representative of the total tenant base, TLF created a sample frame from the total population at the start of the year. This included tenants who had opted out of surveying, as it was important their profile was included for representativeness. For any missing information, these were categorised as 'unknown' and still included within the sample frame.

Every three months Peabody sent TLF an updated view of the resident base, allowing TLF to make relevant updates in data quality. This was done to make sure we reflected the true tenant base, keeping track of significant developments.

Sample representativeness was monitored monthly through the data collected within TLF and KWEST's in-house telephone units. Both contractors have specialist software that can provide extensive stats for monitoring each wave of research.

Much of Peabody's housing stock is in ethnically diverse areas and therefore any language barrier to participating was recorded and monitored. This allowed us to make an informed decision on whether or not a translation was required. We did not require any translation this year and will keep monitoring in future years.

TLF also monitored refusal rates, drop-out rates and any barriers to participation, allowing us to review the methodology being used and ensure it is the most appropriate approach.

In addition to the quarterly total population data file, each month TLF received a customer database from Peabody to sample from. This file included updates on tenant contact details and removed people who had moved out. A purpose-built macro sampled down the database randomly to a 1 in 7 strike rate for the key criteria and removed any opt-outs and households that had already completed the survey from the database.

This approach has the advantage of being representative of our resident base, as well as being usable by our regions within our regional operating model.

Sample and population data is monitored through TLF's online portal throughout the year. The tables below show the final sample figures for Peabody for 2025/26 for LCRA and LCHO for Age, Region, Property type and Tenure type:

Age							
LCRA				LCHO			
Age Group	Age Group (Sample) - %	Age Group (Sample)- count	Age Group (Population)	Age Group	Age Group (Sample) - %	Age Group (Sample)- count	Age Group (Population)
25 and Under	3.27%	175	2.30%	25 and Under	1.40%	14	1.2
26-35	9.45%	506	10.70%	26-35	18.40%	181	18.8
36-45	16.29%	872	18.20%	36-45	28.20%	278	29.6
46-55	20.92%	1120	21.50%	46-55	21.10%	208	20.6
56-65	24.49%	1311	23.70%	56-65	11.80%	116	11.5
66-75	13.88%	743	12.40%	66-75	4.50%	44	3.7
Over 75	7.88%	422	8.20%	Over 75	1.90%	19	1.8
Not Known*	3.81%	204	2.90%	Not Known	12.80%	126	12.8
Total:		5353		Total:		986	
*Not known is over-represented due to the 68 responses from Supported Housing Agency Managed residents.							

Region							
LCRA				LCHO			
Region	Region (Sample) - %	Region (Sample) - count	Region (Population)	Region	Region (Sample) - %	Region (Sample) - count	Region (Population)
North West London	29.70%	1590	29.90%	North Counties	31.10%	307	30.40%
North East London	25.30%	1354	25.40%	South London	26.40%	260	26.60%
South London	24.60%	1315	24.70%	North West London	22.10%	218	21.80%
North Counties	20.30%	1084	19.90%	North East London	20.00%	197	20.80%
South Counties	0.10%	6	0.10%	South Counties	0.40%	4	0.30%
Total:		5349*		Total:		986	
*Total is 5349 rather than 5353 due to 4 anon responses for Supported Housing Agency Managed residents, so region can't be identified							

Tenure

LCRA

Tenure	Tenure (Sample) - %	Tenure (Sample) - count	Tenure (Population)
General Needs	78.40%	4196	78.00%
GN - Affordable Rent	10.30%	549	9.80%
Housing for Older People	2.30%	123	2.70%
Intermediate Market Rent	2.20%	119	2.30%
Supported Housing	1.90%	99	1.90%
Keyworker	1.50%	80	1.70%
Supported Housing Agency Managed	1.30%	68	1.40%
Rough Sleepers Initiative	1.60%	88	1.40%
Young Persons Service	0.20%	9	0.20%
General Needs - Agency	0.10%	5	0.20%
Temporary Housing	0.10%	5	0.10%
London Living Rent	0.10%	4	0.10%
Supported Housing - Affordable Rent	0.10%	4	0.10%
Housing for Older People Affordable	0.10%	4	0.10%
Total:		5353	

Table not included for LCHO as these all have a tenure of 'shared ownership'

Property type

LCRA

Property Type	Property Type (Sample)	Property Type (Sample) - count	Property Type (Population)
Flat	63.40%	3349	62.70%
House	27.80%	1468	27.40%
Maisonette	5.10%	268	5.50%
Room in shared house	1.20%	61	1.70%
Bungalow	1.10%	56	0.90%
Bedsit	0.60%	32	0.60%
Studio flat	0.50%	27	0.60%
Bedspace	0.10%	5	0.30%
Basement	0.30%	17	0.20%
Shared flat or house	0.00%	2	0.10%
Total:		5285*	

*Total is 5285 rather than 5353 due to 68 responses for Supported Housing Agency Managed residents where property type unknown.

LCHO

Property Type	Property Type (Sample)	Property Type (Sample) - count	Property Type (Population)
Flat	74.10%	731	74.10%
House	22.70%	224	22.90%
Maisonette	0.80%	8	1.30%
Studio flat	1.70%	17	1.00%
Bungalow	0.30%	3	0.50%
Duplex	0.20%	2	0.10%
Bedsit	0.10%	1	0.00%
Total:		986	

f) Weighting

The only weighting we have used is at an entity level to reflect the comparative size of Town and Country Housing within the Peabody Group structure.

Surveys for Peabody Developments Limited are carried out as part of the Peabody research programme.

Town and Country Housing (TCH) currently carry out their own survey programme which is aligned with the approach of Peabody as the parent company.

Using the stock figures submitted in the 2026 SDR, we have weighted the perception measures as follows:

	LCRA	LCHO
Peabody Trust	71,154	10,101
Town and Country Housing	11,225	1,442

Total owned stock	93,922
Peabody proportion	0.87
Town and Country Housing proportion	0.13

Due to the way the data needs to be entered into the Regulator's template, these weightings have been applied to the raw response data rather than the final % figure.

This weighting approach has produced 21 validation errors in the 2026 submission template where checks compare the total of the figures entered in sections 4 and 5 against a proportion of the actual number of survey responses entered in sections 1a and 1b (90% for TP01 and 75% for all other measures).

The example below for TP01 LCRA shows how we collate the data in the background to demonstrate the difference between the actual number of responses and the weighted figures entered into the template:

LCRA				
	Peabody	TCH	Peabody Group unweighted	Peabody Group weighted (combined)
Very satisfied	1369	707	2076	1282.9
Fairly satisfied	1702	761	2463	1579.7
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	673	257	930	618.9
Fairly dissatisfied	587	138	725	528.6
Very dissatisfied	973	124	1097	862.6
Total respondents (base used to calculate % satisfied)	5304	1987	7291	4872.8
% satisfied	57.9%	73.9%	62.3%	58.7%

The far right column (Peabody Group weighted (combined)) is what we enter into the official submission template, and shows why the percentages differ.

The formula used in the background for this final column is

(Peabody no. of responses x 0.87) + (TCH no. of responses x 0.13)

g) External contractors used

Peabody used TLF (The Leadership Factor) and TCH used KWEST to carry out the tenant perception interviews throughout the year.

Both contractor organisations are experts in tenant perception surveys and are responsible for all elements of the research carried out for each entity.

All calls conducted by TLF and KWEST are recorded for training and monitoring purposes, and TLF share call recordings with Peabody monthly (where residents have given consent) to gain a greater understanding of residents.

h) Households excluded from the sampling frame

From 1 January 2026, Peabody Central Housing Trust (PCHT) residents are no longer included in TSM surveys due to PCHT not being a registered provider. Since the TSMs began, only three surveys have been carried out for these residents, which were in December 2025. These are included in this 2025/26 submission as the residents provided their feedback in good faith and at the time the survey responses were received, we had not received formal confirmation to remove this resident group, so they were a valid part of the sample. There are approximately 18 occupied homes managed by this entity as at end March 2026.

No households were intentionally excluded from the sampling frame. When creating the sample frame, all eligible residents were included to ensure the target number of responses would give a true reflection of the population. Residents without a valid telephone number were excluded from participating in the survey, due to not being able to contact these residents. However, TLF did pass these details back to Peabody for internal teams to investigate further and update contact details where possible and make these details available again for surveying.

In particular this could apply more to some of our care and support residents (within the LCRA category), some of whom might need in-person support to complete the survey.

Within the group of residents that Peabody does not hold phone numbers for, there are approximately 1000 Supported Housing Agency Managed homes where we do not know the identity of the tenants and all interaction is through a managing agent. These residents were surveyed separately during 2025/26 by the managing agents and further information about this approach can be found in Section 3.

i) Reasons for failure to meet required sample size requirements

Not applicable – A sufficient number of responses were gathered to meet the requirements.

j) Incentives used in the survey to encourage response

No incentives were used in the survey.

k) Methodological issues that have a material impact on satisfaction

Overall, there do not appear to be any significant methodological issues that have a material impact on the tenant perception measures reported.

Independent half-year benchmarking was conducted by TLF which included both TLF clients and non-clients. This indicated that telephone surveys were the main methodology conducted by registered providers and so results were comparable to Peabody. This

benchmarking also allowed comparisons and learnings to be made from others within the sector.

Alternative methodologies were trialled for a small group of residents (see section 3), but this did not have a significant impact on reported measures due to the relatively small volume in comparison to other surveys.

l) Other perception surveys using TSM questions but not included in calculation of TSMs

We carry out an annual Care and Support satisfaction survey which consists of five core questions and four service specific questions. One of the core questions for overall satisfaction uses the TP01 wording for comparison against satisfaction of other residents, and for the different services within Care and Support. Many of the residents in Care and Support are included under the definition of LCRA, so we don't include these in the official TSM results as it would be a duplication.

m) Information on any visual features used alongside the required response options.

Not applicable – the majority of our TSM surveys are currently carried out by phone. The surveys carried out for Supported Housing Agency Managed residents (see section 3 below) did not use any visual aids or emoticons with paper or online versions.

3. Approach to collecting feedback from Supported Housing Agency Managed residents

Peabody has approximately 1000 homes within the Supported Housing Agency Managed (SHAM) tenure. Peabody does not hold contact details for the residents in these homes as this relationship is managed by agencies. Residents' relationship is with the managing agent, so although Peabody is the landlord, these residents wouldn't recognise Peabody in the same way our other residents in alternate tenures would.

To ensure all residents linked to Peabody were included in our TSM approach for this year, we set up the TSM survey in Snap and asked our managing agents to issue the TSM survey on our behalf. As we do not hold the personal information of these residents, it was left up to the agencies to distribute the survey in the most appropriate way to meet the different residents' needs.

The survey was done on a census basis across 1000 residents. We received 68 responses in total from 25 managing agents through these methods:

Method	No. of responses	Corresponding Submission template method
A member of staff is completing this survey with me by phone	6	Telephone
A member of staff is helping me to complete this in person	29	Face to face
I am completing this myself on a paper copy	19	Postal
I am completing this myself online (phone / tablet / laptop)	14	Internet

The column on the right above shows which methodology these responses were entered as on the submission template.

This gave a 7% response rate. This was lower than last year, so we will look at extending the timings for next year to work to improve this.

We learnt from the limitations experienced last year where the managing agents completed a template providing the top level results for each survey method, which meant we didn't have access to the responses at an individual survey level. By using Snap instead this year, we

were able to collect the responses at individual survey level as we do for surveys carried out by TLF. The raw response data was then passed to TLF for inclusion with the rest of our TSM results.

We continue to work on improving the quality of the data from this resident group. Changes we make through 2026/27 will be detailed in next year's submission.