

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

Fife Council

Address

Fife House		
North Street		
Glenrothes, Fife		
Postcode KY7 5LT	Phone	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

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	Yes
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 – Agree that this is not really a feature of engagement and could be removed. Organisations should continue to monitor efficiency of the allocations process but this can be done in other ways.

Indicator 20 - agree with this being removed – it does not really add to the picture around demand for adaptations.

Indicators 23 & 24 – Don't believe that the focus should be removed from RSL contributions to addressing and resolving homelessness, but the current wording does make it difficult to effectively report performance through Common Housing Registers. The Fife response has to be qualified and narrated every year.

C3 - Agree with C3 being removed. The way the ARC Portal is configured, and internal systems calculate this doesn't always reconcile and needs to be adjusted.

C4 – agree with this being removed.

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 - It would be difficult to identify if repairs had been reported again. The narrative shown could vary and would make it difficult/impossible to identify repeat repairs.

Indicator 15

- In agreement that cases reported prior to the reporting period in question should be included, but perhaps there should be no restriction in terms of when a case was reported, as this may depend on locally agreed timescales within each Local Authority area.
- Clarification is welcomed regarding the proposed wording of Indicator 15 if it will no longer relate to the percentage of ASB cases reported and subsequently resolved within the reporting year. For example, will this now refer only to cases closed within the reporting period and whether they meet locally agreed timescales?
- In agreement that benchmarking would be useful. However more discussion/clarification is needed regarding the proposed new measure. For example, interpretation of definitions such as 'an ASB case' and 'resolution' differ between authorities and may therefore make the benchmarking process unhelpful, or misleading.

C2 - It is important to track trends in allocations performance to different needs groups (in terms of first-time applicants, transfers and homeless households). The availability of this information is used to benchmark performance across comparator landlords.

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 that there needs to be a separation between properties being managed as change of tenancies and those that are empty for other reasons, such as serious or structural repair, damage or lettings issues. Suggest it would be interesting for the breakdown to be further separated into these, or other relevant, categories.

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?

Indicator 11 - Agree regarding gas safety checks
Electrical Safety – Agree the proposal regarding EICR testing
Fire Safety - Agree the proposal regarding fire detection

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?

Agree with the position outlined regarding lifts etc.

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?

Agree with the proposals regarding damp performance.

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?

Would suggest median would be more appropriate.

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

With regards to the above indicator, clarity on the definition of "resolve would be useful. Cases can be addressed and resolved but may re-occur later for a variety of reasons and different ones.



Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback