

SPSO decision report

Case: 201608609, Thistle Housing Association Ltd
Sector: housing associations
Subject: policy/administration
Decision: some upheld, no recommendations

Summary

Mr C complained to the housing association that they were not responding to his complaint and that they would not let him keep a dog in his tenancy. Mr C asked for a variation to his tenancy agreement as he wanted a dog for therapeutic reasons to assist with an existing health condition. The association stated that they were not aware that he had any existing health condition and that, should he provide evidence of this, they would consider his request for a dog. The association did not respond to his stage one complaint due to staffing issues and referred his stage two complaint to their solicitors as they deemed the complaint to be of a detailed and complex nature. Following the final response to his stage two complaint, Mr C remained unhappy and brought his complaints to us.

Mr C told us that he had advised staff at the association of his health condition during a meeting. However, the association had no record of this meeting. As we could not determine if this meeting occurred due to a lack of evidence, we did not uphold Mr C's complaint that the association had unreasonably refused to allow him to keep a pet dog.

Regarding the way the association had responded to Mr C's complaints, we noted that incorrect timescales had been provided to Mr C and that the association's responses did not signpost to us. We upheld this aspect of Mr C's complaint. However, as the association had already apologised for not responding to Mr C's stage one complaint, we did not make any recommendations.