

SPSO decision report

Case: 201202714, Prospect Community Housing

Sector: housing associations

Subject: repairs and maintenance

Outcome: no decision reached

Summary

Mrs C had been decanted twice for work to be undertaken to her house after flooding. She complained that she had to be decanted a second time because the original works were not undertaken properly. Mrs C was concerned with the delay in undertaking the repairs. She also complained that the association were acting unreasonably in refusing to carry out work that she believed was necessary to ensure that the flooding problem would not return. Mrs C complained too that when she had been decanted the first time, the association had paid for redirecting her mail, as well as the gas and electricity in the decant house, but were refusing to do this for her current decant.

Mrs C told us that to resolve her complaint she wanted the works carried out by the association independently checked. We explained that we did not have the expertise to do this and it was not part of our role. However, as part of our investigation, we explored with the association whether they would be prepared to arrange for Mrs C's house to be checked independently. They agreed to this, and also that Mrs C could have a say in which firm would be used, and could be present when the property was checked. We decided that this would resolve the complaint. In coming to this decision, we took into account evidence we were given by the association that showed that Mrs C had signed a decant agreement, which confirmed that she would pay for gas and electricity, and that the disturbance allowance they gave her should be used to cover redirection of mail.