

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

Gerri Mogan Rosehill Housing Association Limited

Address

250 Peat Road

Glasgow

Postcode G53 6SA

Phone 0141 881 0595

Email geri.mogan@rosehillhousing.co.uk

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?

I14 - Prefer for this to be retained as provides a sector wide picture of level of refusals
I20 - It is our preference that this indicator is retained as we believe it is helpful to get a sector wide picture of the funding position for adaptations i.e. current reduction in grant funding and increased use of landlords' resources to deliver adaptations.
I23, I24 and C3 - agree, as information is already or will be captured elsewhere.
C4 - disagree. Abandonments are not solely related to evictions, so would be useful to continue to have a sector wide picture of abandonments.

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?

I10 - agree, it simplifies the right first time calculation
I15 - agree
C2 - agree, but recognise we only operate within 1 LA area

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?

Agree, due to the current housing emergency, this would tie up with the wider plans to bring properties back into the letting pool. Would be helpful to know reasons for long-term voids e.g. meter issues, mixed tenure issues or awaiting significant improvement works.

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 electrical safety and fire detection?

Agree with both. However, in terms of failed EICRs need some clarification. Technical guidance/ indicators states "How many times in the reporting year did you not meet the requirement to complete an electrical installation condition report (EICR) within five years of the last EICR?"
So, if we fail in reporting year 1 and report on it, we don't report it again in Year 2 assuming we complete it?

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?

Agree

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?

Agree. They appear straight forward enough in terms of the calculations. However, clarity on cases per property is required – if we have property 1 with mould in bedroom 1 (blocked window vents) as a case and resolve it, if tenant then reports within 12 months of bedroom mould, mould in bathroom (broken extractor fan) is that to be treated as a different case or a reopened case?

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?

Our preference is the calculation being based on median time rather than average time taken to resolve cases as this would attempt to even out any spikes in data for one case that continues for a long period of time.

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

They appear so but taking account of the issue covered under our response to Q6, it is important that clear and suitable technical guidance is developed. It may be helpful if these indicators could be reviewed after the first year of implementation to ensure they are working fine and that the technical guidance is being applied consistently across the sector.

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback