

Annual Return on the Scottish Social Housing Charter

Consultation questions

We welcome your general feedback on our proposals as well as answers to the specific questions we have raised. You can read our consultation paper on our website at www.housingregulator.gov.scot

Please do not feel you have to answer every question unless you wish to do so.

Send your completed questionnaire to us by **Friday 8 November 2024**.

By email @: consultations@shr.gov.scot

Or post to: Scottish Housing Regulator
5th Floor, 220 High Street
Glasgow G4 0QW

Name/organisation name

Kingdom Housing Association

Address

Saltire Centre

Pentland Court

Glenrothes, Fife

Postcode KY62DA

Phone

Email kingdom@kha.scot

How you would like your response to be handled

To help make this a transparent process we intend to publish on our website the responses we receive, as we receive them. Please let us know how you would like us to handle your response. If you are responding as an individual, we will not publish your contact details.

Are you happy for your response to be published on our website?

Yes

No

If you are responding as an individual:

Please tell us how you would like your response to be published.

Pick 1

Publish my full response, including my name

Please publish my response, but not my name

1. There are some indicators which we do not routinely use in our regulatory assessment of social landlords' performance. As part of the consultation we are proposing to stop collecting the following indicators **14, 20, 23, 24, C3 and C4**.

Do you agree with our proposals to remove these indicators?

Yes, we agree with the removal of these indicators. They don't provide any useful benchmarking opportunities and can be time consuming to collate. Some of the relevant information is also captured within other indicators.

2. Following feedback from stakeholders we propose to amend the following indicators **10, 15 and C2**.

Do you agree with our proposals to amend these indicators?

10 - Right First Time

There are still some big areas of confusion in this indicator. The name talks about the "reporting year" and the definition talks about "within a 12 month period" which doubles the timeframe we need to be looking at. It also feels unfair to report something as "reported again" if it needs to be repaired again up to 12 months later, as this doesn't necessarily mean the repair was substandard in the first place but that is implied through this indicator.

Will there be any further clarification on complex repairs to ensure consistency?

15 - ASB

Using locally agreed timescales seems counterproductive as it means reliable comparisons cannot be made. It also seems like there is little value in only counting the number of cases resolved and not looking at the themes, resolution types or escalation of cases.

Measuring per 100 or 1000 homes does make it a bit more meaningful across landlords, but we still don't think this indicator **or** the service complaints indicators 3 and 4 provide much value the way they are currently reported.

C2

We agree with this amendment.

3. We also propose to introduce an additional indicator to monitor long term voids.

Do you agree that we should collect an additional indicator in relation to long term voids?

Yes, it would be good to see a breakdown of long term voids vs short term voids.

However there are a number of exclusions here which landlords may apply differently and over complicates the required response.

4. We propose to collect two new indicators in relation to tenant and resident safety. Do you agree with the additional indicators we propose to collect in relation to electrical safety and fire detection?

Yes, but we do feel it needs some additional contextual information around non access, no credit in electricity meters etc.

5. Do you agree with our proposed approach to collect landlords' performance in relation to compliance with tenant and resident safety duties as part of the Annual Assurance Statements?

Yes

6. Issues of damp and mould continue to be an important area of concern for tenants. We therefore propose three new indicators in relation to damp and mould. Do you agree with our proposals to introduce these indicators?

Yes, we agree that this is an important area to focus on, given the potential severity of the impact to our tenants.

There should be clear definitions within the Guidance on when a case of damp/mould is 'resolved'.

Using the term 'within a 12 month period' again means we need to be looking at two years worth of data, and with a lot of us having to do these manually, it's a big undertaking!

7. Do you agree with the proposal to collect the "Average length of time taken to resolve cases of damp and/or mould" or would the "median" be more appropriate to measure the time to resolve cases of damp and/or mould?

I think the average time taken is appropriate and gives consistency across the ARC as other indicators ask for the average but we acknowledge that the median does give a different perspective on the result. It could be an option to collect both, as it's no extra work if we have all of the data anyway.

8. Damp and mould is a complex area for landlords. Are the new indicators we propose on damp and mould clearly defined?

As per question 6 and guidance should be clear on how non-access would affect the average length of time taken to resolve cases? Does the clock keep going until we successfully gain access?

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback