

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

North Ayrshire Council

Address

Cunninghame House, Irvine

Postcode KA12 8EE

Phone 01294 310000

Email

housingperformance@north-ayrshire.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?

We agree with the proposals to remove the indicators except for C4, we recommend retaining this indicator. Monitoring and reporting on abandonments is crucial due to their significant financial impact and resource-intensive process, which is not captured by court actions data.

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: This indicator requires further definition, especially regarding complex repairs. The proposed rewording and criteria for 'repairs completed right first time' are unclear and need more technical support. to develop a workable KPI.

Indicator 15: Locally agreed targets vary widely, and we feel this should be removed from the indicator. This indicator is not able to help landlords, although they are able to manage and resolve cases, but they can't control the number of cases that they receive. Locally agreed targets are service standards, not performance measures. The current measure of ASB cases per 100 homes is problematic as it includes private owners and lets. We would need further information on what cases should be recorded. It might be beneficial to select an indicator which is focused on outcomes, this would account for complex cases with better outcomes.

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?

We have no issue with this indicator being introduced.

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?

We agree with the following 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?

I can confirm that we are happy and supportive around the collation of landlord's performance regarding compliance with tenant and resident safety duties and for these to be included in the Annual Assurance Statement. This was the approach taken in the 2023/24 submission with further evidence and compliance assurance to be provided for next year's submission.

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?

We agree in principle with the additions to the indicators. However, we propose splitting the indicator as follows:

Cases of Rising & Penetrating Damp: These are generally related exclusively to building repairs and can occur year-round.

Cases of Condensation Dampness: These are seasonal, occurring in the cooler months, and can be related to building repairs, building usage, or a combination of both.

In the case of condensation dampness resulting in mould, does "resolve" refer only to the repair aspect, or does it also include mould caused by building usage? Different causes may need to be distinguished.

Should all mould be included? For example, mould can frequently occur in silicone sealants at wash hand basins, baths, and showers. This can be resolved by basic housekeeping and may not be a building repair or usage issue. In contrast, silicone sealant at windows would be included, as this is more likely to be related to repairs and usage due to humidity levels.

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 would be suitable - once definitions of "resolve" and what is to be included as "mould" have been clarified.

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

We feel we need more clarification around the definition, every case of damp and mould will be different, therefore timescale targets could be unrealistic and difficult to identify those completed right first time. The indicators should also be split between condensation, structural and those cases which have occurred due to tenant behaviours - organisations may need time to adjust systems to allow this information to be collated. There should be a more thematic approach to collating damp and mould data, similar to RACC.

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback