

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

Cameron Mitchell, South Lanarkshire Council

Address

Almada Street

Hamilton

Postcode ML3 0AA

Phone 01698 454862

Email

cameron.mitchell@southlanarkshire.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 to the removal of the indicators below: -

Indicator 14 - Percentage of tenancy offers refused during the year – we welcome the remove of this indicator as we consider there to be inconsistency with reporting due to variations of tenancy offers.

Indicator 20 - Total cost of adaptations completed in the year by source of funding – we welcome the removal of this indicator as we feel this does not take into account the level of workmanship within each individual adaptation.

Indicator 23 (Homelessness) – the percentage of referrals under Section 5, and other referrals for homeless households made by the local authority, that result in an offer, and the percentage of those offers that result in a let – this indicator is applicable to (RSLs only).

In relation to this Indicator 24 - Homelessness – the percentage of homeless households referred to RSLs under section 5 and through other referral routes, South Lanarkshire Council, in common with other Local Authorities, operate a common housing register and agree targets with our HomeFinder partners and the current indicator does not reflect this arrangement and we, therefore welcome the removal of the indicator.

Indicator C3 - Number of lets during the reporting year, split between 'general needs' and 'supported housing' – we welcome the removal of this indicator as we already report on the overall number of lets (Indicator C2).

Indicator C4 – Abandoned homes – we welcome the removal of this indicator as the information is already provided via another indicator.

- 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?

We would welcome the proposed amendment to the identified indicators but would highlight the importance of the Regulator allowing sufficient time for landlords to revise their collection and recording systems in advance of the date set for the introduction of revised indicators. The response notes comments on each of the proposals.

Indicator 10 - Percentage of reactive repairs carried out in the last year completed right first time – we agree with the proposal to amend this indicator, however clarification is required on the timescale between original repair to being reported again (timeframe). Also, further clarification would be required if a repair was reported towards the end of the financial year and raised again early in the new financial year.

Indicator 15 - Percentage of anti-social behaviour cases reported in the last year which were resolved – we agree with the proposal to amend this target, however we do not agree with reintroducing the locally agreed targets as to the variations in targets across landlords, this does not provide for effective comparison. Also, on the proposal of cases per 100 homes, clarification will be required if this is council stock or all homes within South Lanarkshire Council.

We strongly feel that by counting the number of cases received in the year against the number of cases resolved it still shows open cases as a 'failure', we would propose that Councils advise on the cases received and of them the % resolved and the % still open.

C2: Lets in the reporting year by source of let - We are proposing that RSLs report their lets to homeless households by local authority area. Stakeholders told us this was important to give an accurate picture as many RSLs house homeless applicants in multiple local authority areas. We are strongly supportive of this proposed indicator as it will give a clearer picture of an individual RSL's lets in each local authority 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 with the proposal to include a long-term voids indicator with clear and concise technical guidance and definition of a long-term void.

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?

The proposal to introduce two new indicators in relation to electrical safety and fire detection is welcomed, given the importance of tenant and resident safety and associated compliance requirements. At the same time the response highlights the need for clarification of the requirements in relation to the indicators to support consent and effective response

Electrical Safety: We would require clarification on the inspection date renewal if an inspection was carried out in advance i.e. where the original date stands if carried out for example a 2-month period of expiry date. This would give landlords more flexibility to programme inspections to meet timescales.

Additionally, we would suggest standard reasons and guidance for incidences where landlords did not meet the requirement this would provide consistent reporting for all landlords. We would suggest clear definition and classification of reporting fails and abeyances. This would provide consistent reporting across the sector.

Fire Safety: As above we would suggest standard reasons and guidance for incidences where landlords did not meet the requirement this would provide consistent reporting for all landlords.

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?

We welcome the proposed approach to collect landlords' performance in relation to tenant and resident safety within the Annual Assurance Statement. To promote consistency and clarity across the sector, it would be helpful if a standard format was developed to accompany this introduction.

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 with the introduction of three new indicators in relation to damp and mould.

It will be important that revisions to regulatory focus in relation to this area provide for the flexibility required to reflect the different scale and operating contexts of local authorities and RSLs.

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 would suggest that clear and specific guidance be provided for accuracy of reporting and also given the varying timescales to complete certain types of damp and mould repairs such as: -

1. Rising Damp - failed damp course
2. Penetrating damp - leaky roof
3. Traumatic Damp - leaky pipe in bathroom coming through kitchen ceiling

Due to the varying timescales for completion of the categories above using an average across all three categories may result in a false representation of results. Therefore, we would suggest reporting all three categories separately.

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

The council consider the new indicators to be clearly defined, however specific guidance would be required to ensure accuracy and consistency with reporting across landlords.

We would also hope that the comments above are considered and would suggest that further discussion with industry experts would be appropriate in advance of introduction.

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback