

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

Renfrewshire Council

Address

Renfrewshire House

Cotton Street

PAISLEY

Postcode PA1 1JD

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 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?

Yes we agree with the proposal to remove these indicators

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, Right First Time: This indicator remains confusing and unless there is clearer guidance could become more difficult to collect. The guidance refers to the Calendar year but also a 12-month period for repairs to be recalled. This must be clarified before publication. A 12-month period for recall would be a very difficult indicator to monitor effectively.

Indicator 15, ASB: The first part of the indicator, will be fully comparable given each landlord is likely to have different locally agreed targets. We are comfortable with the second element of the indicator (cases per 100 units).

C2, Lets in the reporting year: we have no comment on this indicator as it relates to RSLs reporting 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?

We agree that this indicator should be collected.

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 that these indicators should be collected. That said we would appreciate precise clarity on the five year definition for Electrical testing. We agree with the proposed indicator for fire safety.

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 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?

We agree that there should be indicators relating to Damp and Mould. We would need further guidance on damp and mould definitions or will the briefing from ALACHO, CiH and SFHA be considered appropriate as a point of reference.

The proposed indicators may be difficult to report on due to the potential complexity of cases. They may require multiple stages of visits, use of external contractors, etc. Currently Our ICT systems are not designed to track cases end to end and will require significant work to monitor these on a case-by-case basis. We suggest it would be more meaningful to know how many properties have reported damp and mould and what % of the stock and maybe how many have reported more than once.

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?

It can be difficult to know when a case is resolved as it may require monitoring over a period. However, the median may be more appropriate as this would prevent figures being skewed by jobs that may take longer to resolve than normal.

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

Generally we would appreciate clearer guidance, The current definition advises to ignore 'no accesses' but a case could involve multiple visits, some of which may be no access, hard to then measure timescales. There is no reference of making use of specialist contractors, the complexity of some cases, and which definition should be used, SHQS or the briefing from landlord bodies.

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback