

## 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

North Lanarkshire Council

#### Address

Civic Centre, Windmillhill Street

Motherwell

**Postcode** ML1 1AB

**Phone**

**Email**

[BusinessDevelopment&Support@northlan.gov.uk](mailto:BusinessDevelopment&Support@northlan.gov.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?

Our response in respect of your proposals to remove the each of the indicators noted above would be as follows:

**14** – We would agree with the removal of this indicator;

**20** – We would agree with the removal of this indicator

**23** – Not applicable (RSL's only)

**24** - We would agree with the removal of this indicator.

**C3** – We would agree with the removal of this indicator.

**C4** – We do not agree with the removal of this indicator as there is a need still to monitor this, however the crossover with Indicator 22 Court Actions makes it more confusing as the abandonments with a decree are still abandonments but not counted at C4, therefore it would be beneficial to include these abandoned properties in the number and potentially have an additional reference to the number of Abandoned properties where the tenant was subject to eviction action.

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?

Our response in respect of your proposals to amend each of the indicators noted above is as follows:

**10** – No .we do not agree with the proposed amendments –While we do agree this indicator needs amended, we are not sure how the proposed changes will improve this indicator, the existing problems have not been addressed. It will be very difficult for landlords to determine whether specific repairs are exactly the same as previous ones and furthermore, monitoring of this will need to be over a 2 year period adding further complexities to this already confusing indicator. The new definition is still very vague and the implementation for the proposed changes is too short a timescale for landlords to implement changes to our systems & reports.

**15** – Yes, while we do agree with the changes to this indicator because it will allow us to report more accurate figures of cases resolved within target, eliminating the reporting of cases failing due to the technical issue of the timing of the reports, however we still feel this indicator does not allow us to compare performance with other landlords.

**C2** – Partially Agree - While we agree with the changes recommended for this indicator, we feel that further changes could be made to make it more meaningful in terms of Lets to Homeless people. In this respect it would be beneficial if RSL's reported the overall percentage of homeless lets made by the RSL in each Local Authority area, this would also require them to report the total number of lets by 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?

No - This indicator would only provide a snapshot at year end and to be meaningful would require further breakdown if being requested. LA's already report a similar indicator to the Scottish Government in the Housing Statistical Annual Return (HSAR). If this indicator does go ahead, we would ask that the breakdown of categories, definitions and calculation match the pre-existing SG indicator.

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, we agree with the introduction of these indicators.

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, we agree with this proposed approach.

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?

While we agree in principle with the proposal to introduce indicators around Damp and Mould, for the first and second questions we would need further clarification on the point at which cases would be classed as resolved. Similar to indicator 10 it may also be difficult to identify when a case is re-opened if it is truly related to the initial case or if it is a new issue emerging, and monitoring of this indicator will need to be over a 2-year period adding further complexities.

The third question in this category will also only give a snapshot in time.

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?

Whilst the 'median' would be preferable to landlords we do worry that this may be more difficult for tenants to relate to. Could we measure both?

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

We think more clarity is needed around how the information has to be collected and how it is to be recorded is needed

E.g. how do we identify a case? Issues with damp and mould come in via complaints, are found as part of pre-inspection, are discovered through energy survey's - are these all to be recorded the same way?

In relation to cases being resolved – how do we define resolved? Is it only where work has been carried out and would it be all work including re-instatement where required?

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback