

Our regulation of social housing in Scotland

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 **15 December 2023**.

By email @: regulatoryframeworkreview@shr.gov.scot

Or post to: Scottish Housing Regulator
2nd floor , George House
36 North Hanover Street, G1 2AD

Name/organisation name

Trust Housing Association

Address

12 New Mart Road

Edinburgh

Postcode EH14 1RL

Phone 0131 444 1200

Email c@trustha.org.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

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. Do you agree with our proposed approach on specific assurance in Annual Assurance Statements?

In agreement with the proposal. However, a consultation mechanism to enable Landlords to influence specific assurance areas would be a positive addition. Previous assurance additions should be reviewed to ensure they remain relevant. Keen for AAS not to become unwieldy each year.

2. Do you agree with our proposal to initiate a comprehensive review of the Annual Return on the Charter which we will consult on next year?

We are supportive of the working group approach. However, whilst the proposals to review ARC measures are good, it is important that ARC is not considered in isolation with regards to asset matters, SHQS, Tolerable Standard, Requirements from Legislation etc should be considered as well.

3. Do you agree with our proposed amendments to strengthen the emphasis on landlords listening to tenants and service users to include a requirement that landlords: a. provide tenants, residents and service users with appropriate ways to provide feedback and raise concerns, and b. ensure that they consider such information and provide quick and effective responses?

We are supportive of the SHR's view on strengthening the Framework further on landlords listening to customers. However, we feel this is covered via the SPSO's Complaint Handling Procedure, as well as Anti-Social Behaviour Handling and Customer Satisfaction Surveying. Perhaps this could be emphasised as part of the Annual Assurance process for landlords instead. Promoting anonymous feedback can also make addressing specific issues challenging.

4. Do you agree with our proposed approach to Notifiable Events?

We feel that the current guidance and process works and we have a strong relationship with our regulation manager / team if we have doubt about whether something needs to be raised as an NE or not. However, further clarification and additions to section 6 "what we will do with the information you give us" appear to be helpful and do not raise any concerns.

5. Do you agree with our proposed approach to regulatory status?

We do not consider adding another compliance status is of value at this time and support the revised wording that makes it clearer that 'working towards compliance' is a non-compliant category.

6. Do you agree with our proposed approach to Significant Performance failures?

The revised content in this section is a significant improvement on the language used previously.

7. Do you agree with our proposed changes to the guidance on *Annual Assurance Statements*?

As per comments in Question 1. Otherwise, happy with proposed approach.

8. Do you agree with our proposed changes to the guidance on *Consultation where the Regulator is directing a transfer of assets*?

We agree with the proposed changes

9. Do you agree with our proposal to maintain *the Determination* at this time?

Happy with proposed approach.

10. Do you agree with our proposed changes to the guidance on *Determination of what is meant by a step to enforce a security over an RSL's land*?

Happy with proposed changes.

11. Do you agree with our proposal to maintain the guidance on *Financial viability of RSLs*?

Happy with this approach.

12. Do you agree with our proposed changes to the guidance on *Group structures*?

No comment.

Do you agree with our proposed changes to the guidance on *How to request an appeal of a regulatory decision*?

Happy with proposed minor track changes to document.

14. Do you agree with our proposal to maintain the guidance on *How to request a review of a regulatory decision*?

Happy with proposed approach.

15. Do you agree with our proposed changes to the guidance on *Notifiable events*?

Happy with proposed approach.

16. Do you agree with our proposed changes to the guidance on *Preparation of financial statements*?

Happy with proposed approach.

17. Do you agree with our proposal to maintain the guidance on *Section 72 reporting events of material significance*?

Happy with proposed approach.

18. Do you agree with our proposed changes to the guidance on *Tenant consultation and approval*?

Happy with proposed updates.

19. Would you like to give feedback on any aspect of our impact assessments? Are there other potential impacts that we should consider?

No comment