

SPSO decision report

Case: 201508816, Shettleston Housing Association Ltd
Sector: housing associations
Subject: policy/administration
Outcome: not upheld, no recommendations

Summary

Mr C complained that Shettleston Housing Association had unreasonably excluded him from grant funding, unreasonably charged him a £150 administration fee and unreasonably processed additional funding for 26 other home owners. Mr C said he was the owner of his home and had made a contribution to the works being carried out on his property, for which the association had informed him he was entitled to a rebate. The association had told him that work had been completed too late on his property for it to qualify for the highest level of rebate. Additionally, a second group of 26 properties had then been put forward for funding after the original deadline. Mr C had not been included in this group either. Mr C felt this was unfair, as he had received a smaller rebate than other property owners. Additionally, he disputed the dates provided by the association for completion of works on his property.

The association said that work on Mr C's property had not been completed in full until March 2013. Unexpectedly they had received a further offer of grant funding in April 2013, but had only been asked to submit 26 properties for consideration. The association emphasised that the funding for the rebate was provided as a grant by a third party and the administration of it lay outside the association's control. As a grant it was not an entitlement for residents but something the association sought to access on their behalf whenever possible. The association did not accept that Mr C had been treated unfairly.

We found evidence that Mr C's property was not ready for submission within the initial deadline due to additional work being carried out to treat rot within the property. The offer of an extended deadline was not under the association's control, nor was the restriction on the number of properties which could receive it. The association had sought to maximise grant funding for residents, but had not been able to achieve equal funding for all residents. The association's imposition of an administration charge had not been clearly explained, but was not of itself unreasonable. We therefore did not uphold Mr C's complaint.