

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

Wheatley Housing Group

Address

Wheatley House		
25 Cochrane Street,		
Glasgow		
Postcode G1 1HL	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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please publish my response, but not my name	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?

We agree that these priorities reflect the key issues for the sector and our tenants.

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

We support the proposed amendment to the Statutory Guidance and believe that it would further improve transparency and accountability to tenants and service users.

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

We do not consider any changes to ARC indicators to be necessary at this time and agree the current measures are relevant and appropriate.

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

Landlords will already be collecting the proposed indicators as part of their health and safety and compliance programmes. We would support the collection of such indicators and their publication would provide further transparency and accountability to tenants and service users. We would expect that any indicators will relate to legal and statutory duties where there are clearly defined requirements.

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?

Landlords across the sector will already be collecting information on damp and mould, including how many cases are reported and how they are resolved. We believe it will be important to have a way of monitoring which can be applied consistently across all landlords. As such we think a small number of measures, such as the number of instances reported, the proportion which have been fully resolved and the average time to resolve would be a reasonable starting point.

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

Listening to tenants and service users is a fundamental part of being a good landlord and we would support this being further emphasised in the Framework.

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

We believe the existing notifiable events guidance is clear and does leave some scope for landlords to interpret it proportionately.

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?*

We feel the current approach works well but recognise that the views of stakeholders also require to be taken into account. We would not have any reservations about the prospect of an additional category should it be considered to be of value.

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

No, we agree the current system is operating effectively and the definitions are appropriate.

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

We have no specific proposed changes at this stage, but look forward to seeing the revised Framework and providing further feedback at that time.

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