

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

Ochil View Housing Association Ltd

Address

Ochil House

Marshall

Alloa

Postcode FK10 1AB

Phone 01259 727480

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?

Indicator 14 – we agree with this proposal to remove
Indicator 20 – this indicator shows level of grant funding received for medical adaptations so, in the current climate, we would prefer to keep this for benchmarking purposes
Indicator 23 & 24 – we agree with proposal to remove as there has been confusion over these indicators and we do collect information at C2 (Lets) so there is some level of duplication
Indicator C3 – we agree with proposal to remove as again this is duplicated at C2
Indicator C4 – we would prefer this indicator to remain as Indicator 22 records Court Actions that result in eviction it does not record Abandonments that have been recovered in accordance with the Section 18 of the Housing Scotland Act 2001. It could be combined with 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 – we feel the indicator would be better described as “Percentage of reactive repairs reported again).
Indicator 10 (ii) “Of those, number of reactive repairs that were reported again during the reporting year” – should this refer to the number of reactive repairs during the reporting period that had been reported in the previous 12 months? We feel the reference to “reporting period” is confusing/misleading.

Indicator 15 –we support the amendment to this indicator as currently, cases opened in the previous reporting year that were not closed, got lost.
Indicator C2 – we already collect Homeless Lets by Local Authority area so no issue 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?

New Indicator Long Term Voids – As this excludes major repairs/decants/refurbs etc. it will only record those voids that are difficult to let therefore, we have no issue in providing this data and agree it would be useful to see across the sector where landlords have difficulty in allocating properties.

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?

Electrical safety

It would be helpful to clarify how EICRs that identify remedial works should be treated (i.e. the requirement to complete an EICR within the 5-year period may have been met, but there may be outstanding remedial works not completed within the 5-year period – would this be a pass or fail?).

Fire Detection

We support the inclusion of 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

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 with reporting on damp and mould.

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?

We feel that average would be a better measure, not median.

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

Some clarity is required on whether condensation mould is to be included in the reporting of cases, where there is no building fault.

Where lifestyle advice has been given to prevent condensation mould and the advice has not been followed, would this be considered as a reopened case? Some clarity is required about this.

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback