

SPSO decision report

Case: 201700446, Glasgow Housing Association
Sector: housing associations
Subject: complaints handling
Decision: some upheld, no recommendations

Summary

Mr C, who is a community activist who supports and acts on behalf of people in his local area, complained about the housing association's investigation of a complaint that he had made on behalf of a neighbour (Mr A) regarding a housing officer. The association confirmed that they had arranged a meeting between Mr A and the housing officer, during which the concerns which Mr C had raised were discussed. We considered that this was a reasonable response and we did not think that any further investigation was necessary. We did not uphold this complaint.

Mr C also complained that the association's communication with him was unreasonable. In particular, he considered that the area housing manager should have met with him after he requested a meeting to discuss the complaint mentioned above. He also complained that a letter from his MSP was not properly dealt with. After Mr C raised concerns about the area housing manager's failure to respond to his concerns in full, the area director responded to him. We considered it appropriate for matters to have been passed to the area director, and considered that the director's response to Mr C was reasonable. We noted that after Mr C's MSP contacted the association they arranged a meeting with the MSP and Mr C, but this was cancelled at Mr C's request. We considered the association's actions to have been reasonable and did not uphold this complaint.

Mr C also complained that the association had requested photographic identification with representation mandates. He said that he had never been asked for identification before and that he thought the association were trying to be obstructive. The association said that previous guidance to staff had confirmed that photographic identification was required, but advised Mr C that they had changed their process and apologised for any upset or inconvenience caused. The association provided us with a copy of the staff guidance in place at the time, showing that photographic identification was required. We did not uphold this complaint.