Our regulation of social housing in Scotland
Discussion questions

We welcome your general feedback on our proposals as well as answers to the specific questions we have raised. You can read our discussion 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 11 August 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

Louise Feely, Renfrewshire Council

Address

Renfrewshire House		
Cotton Street		
Paisley		
Postcode PA1 1JD	**Phone 03003000280**	**Email** louise.feely@renfrewshire.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 *x*   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. We believe that our regulatory priorities should be:
   - listening and responding effectively to tenants and service users
   - providing good quality and safe homes
   - keeping homes as affordable as possible
   - doing all they can to reduce the number of people who are experiencing homelessness

   We are keen to hear your feedback on these priorities. Are they the right ones?

   > The regulatory priorities outlined appear reasonable.

2. What are your views on amending the Statutory Guidance on Annual Assurance Statements to include provisions on specific assurance?

   > We agree that a provision for a requirement for explicit assurance may be required in certain circumstances. We welcome such an approach but would suggest that the assurance sought should not be prescriptive and that each landlord should provide appropriate assurance.

3. Do you think that we need to change any of the indicators in the ARC or add to these?

   > The ARC indicators generally remain useful and would suggest that it is possibly more appropriate to review indicators as part of a review of the Charter. That said we consider that Indicator 10, (Percentage of reactive repairs carried out in the last year completed right first time) serves a limited purpose. It may be more meaningful to split this indicator with two indicators: Percentage of reactive repairs completed within target and Percentage of reactive repairs that required more than one visit to complete. If there are proposals to alter any indicators, we would welcome the opportunity to participate in such discussions.

4. Are the proposed areas of focus for tenant and resident safety indicators the right ones, and what should those indicators be?

   > We agree that the priorities appear proportionate and reasonable, but would suggest that monitoring tenant and resident safety by indicators alone is not the most appropriate vehicle. Some of the areas regarding tenant and resident safety are considerably easier than others to meaningfully measure by way of indicators. We would welcome discussions on what any future indicators are likely to be. It may be more appropriate that some of the areas are reliant on the landlord providing assurance through other means, such as evidence of appropriate process and policies.

5. What do you think would be the most effective and appropriate way to monitor the effectiveness of landlords' approach to managing reports and instances of mould and dampness?

   > The Council has a policy on damp and mould with appropriate procedures. Our stock condition survey (100% over five years) will gather data on mould issues by property. Combined with appropriate policies and procedures on mould and dampness, we would suggest that these methods are an effective way to monitor damp and mould.

6. What are your views on strengthening the Framework further on landlords listening to tenants and service users?

   > We have methods for tenants and service users to provide feedback and consequently have no issue with these proposals. Our new Tenant Participation Strategy will increase the ways in which tenants and stakeholders can provide feedback

7. How do you think we could streamline the requirements for landlords in the Notifiable Events statutory guidance?

   > Notifiable events apply only to RSLs and consequently we will not comment here.

8. *Do you think there is value in using more direct language in* the working towards compliance *status, or in introducing an intermediary regulatory status between compliant and working towards compliance?*

> This appears to apply to RSLs only

9. Are there any changes we should make to the Significant Performance Failures approach, including how we define these?

> We publicise the SHR Significant Performance Failure leaflet, it is a useful route for tenants who do may want to raise issues directly with the landlord for particular reasons (for example whistleblowing). The Significant Performance Leaflet therefore compliments our established complaints process.

10. Are there any other changes to the Regulatory Framework and associated guidance that you would suggest?

> We look forward to the Scottish Government's EESSH Review Groups findings being published and would welcome an early indication of any changes to the standard to help inform investment decisions at as early a stage as possible.
>
> We are satisfied with the current Regulatory Framework and the approach to reporting and would welcome any future consultation on it.

Thank you for taking the time to give us your feedback!