

## 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

Ayrshire Housing

#### Address

119 Main Steet ,Ayr

Postcode KA8 8BX

Phone 01292

Email

#### 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?

14 – tenancy offers refused in the year  
20 – cost of adaptations completed by source of funding  
23 – homeless referrals (offers and relets) (RSLs)  
24 – as above but for LAs  
C3 – Number of lets between general needs and supported housing  
C4 – Abandoned Properties

14 – we feel this should remain as it shows the challenges for RSLs at times to relet properties. In light of the declared housing emergencies in many LAs it is useful to keep this in.

20 – we believe this should remain as it will highlight the amount of rental income being used for completion of adaptations in light of the reduction in funding for adaptations from SG. Being able to adapt a home and keep a tenant in their own home for longer offers better customer service and dignity for tenants.

23 – Agree with removing

C3 – Agree with removing

C4 - Disagree with removing this indicator - Currently these actions are not recorded as a legal action but can equate to a high number of tenancies ending. It is therefore important that this data is captured as it can provide an insight into why tenancies are failing and what can be done to prevent this.

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 – we welcome the simplicity of the new measure but feel there will be interpretation re “reported again” – 12 months seems a long time for something to be regarded as the requirement for right first time, for example if a boiler is fixed but 10 months later the part fails is this to be considered as a failure in right first time – even though it worked for 10 months? – think the indicator should be reviewed again.

Indicator 15 – agree with amendment

Indicator C2 – agree with 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?

Agree with this – there does need to be a differentiation between long term voids where reliance on a third party has caused the delay e.g. meter readings etc.

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?

EICR – agree with new indicator  
Smoke and heat detectors – agree with this new indicator

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 – may be useful to issue some guidance for Boards as to what to expect in terms of evidence re Tenant health and safety compliance for the AAS process.

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?

Damp and mould – we welcome the recording of this data but think there needs to be clarity around the term “resolved”.  
% of cases re-opened - important the context of any re-opened cases is taken into consideration as a re-opened case may not always reflect the performance of the landlord.

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?

Maybe both be collected initially to show where one or 2 cases have distorted the average length of time. Both figures can be easily calculated form the same data.

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

The indicator doesn't mention condensation – often a pre-cursor to damp and mould – is it implied condensation cases be recorded – more clarification would be helpful.

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback