

## 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](http://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](mailto:consultations@shr.gov.scot)

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

#### Name/organisation name

Melville Housing Association

#### Address

The Corn Exchange

200 High Street

**Postcode** EH22 1AZ

**Phone** 0131 561 6460

#### Email

[jmcmorrow@melville.org.uk](mailto:jmcmorrow@melville.org.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

#### 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

**X**

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?

Indicator 14 Tenancy Offers Refused: Yes

Indicator 20 Costs of Adaptations by Source: No – would like to see this remain given the recent announcements regarding cuts to adaptation budgets. This would allow an understanding of how the reductions have impacted on our community and nationally. Note there is no split between minor or major adaptations when we look at the average time to complete.

Indicator 23 % of Homeless Referrals: Yes

Indicator 24 % of Homeless through other routes: Yes

C3 Number of lets split between general and supported needs: Yes

C4 Abandoned Homes: No, this could be incorporated within indicator 22

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?

Indicator 10 % of Reactive Repairs Right first time: Yes – but definition needs to be made more clearer e.g. what does reported again mean. What is the definition of same repair. Timescales within a 12 month period not realistic as same description of repairs can be made (e.g. no heating, may be a totally different fault) Definition could be simpler “number of repairs reported in the reporting year in which we had to ask a contractor to go back and fix”.

Indicator 15 % of ASB resolved within target: Proposal to reintroduce measurements against locally agreed targets will not allow proper benchmarking as each organisation will have its own target. Focus needs to be on resolution being achieved.

C2 Lets by Source: Yes – note however to make proper comparison you will need number of homeless lets made in each local authority 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?

Yes, however facility to explain why a property is long term void needs to be available as some RSLs will have properties that they plan to demolish that may come under this category.

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?

Yes: Electrical Safety, however, numbers need to be in context of total stock figures.

Note there may be some benefit in asking a question on which of these have abeyances under SHQS.

Yes: Fire Safety, however, numbers need to be in context of total stock figures.

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.

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?

Average length of time taken preferred option. Consideration needs to be given as to clear definition on what constitutes resolution.

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

It would be helpful to have something that identifies causes of damp/mould e.g. fabric issue, condensation issue, etc.

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback