



**Notice of meeting of  
Customer Complaints Scrutiny Review Task Group**

**To:** Councillors Firth (Chair), Crisp and Gunnell

**Date:** Wednesday, 8 December 2010

**Time:** 2.00 pm

**Venue:** The Guildhall

**AGENDA**

**1. Declarations of Interest**

At this point Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on this agenda.

**2. Minutes** (Pages 3 - 6)

To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2010.

**3. Public Participation**

At this point in the meeting, members of the public who have registered their wish to speak regarding an item on the agenda or an issue within the Committee's remit can do so. The deadline for registering is by 5pm on Tuesday 7 December 2010.

To register please contact the Democracy Officer for the meeting, on the details at the foot of this agenda.

**4. Customer Complaints Review - Interim Report** (Pages 7 - 38)

This report presents information gathered to date in support of the Customer Complaints scrutiny review and asks Members to identify relevant consultees and any additional information required in support of this review.

**5. Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972**

Democracy Officer:

Name: Jayne Carr

Contact Details:

Telephone – (01904) 552030

Email – [jayne.carr@york.gov.uk](mailto:jayne.carr@york.gov.uk)

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting

- Registering to speak
- Written Representations
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

## About City of York Council Meetings

### Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

**A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088**

### Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

### Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন অর্ধাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোআবী সরবরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

*Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550*

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ مہیا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

*Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550*

### **Holding the Executive to Account**

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Executive (40 out of 47). Any 3 non-Executive councillors can 'call-in' an item of business from a published Executive (or Executive Member Decision Session) agenda. The Executive will still discuss the 'called in' business on the published date and will set out its views for consideration by a specially convened Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC). That SMC meeting will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Executive meeting in the following week, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

### **Scrutiny Committees**

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

### **Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?**

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- Public libraries get copies of **all** public agenda/reports.

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

MEETING	CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS SCRUTINY REVIEW TASK GROUP
DATE	19 NOVEMBER 2010
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS FIRTH (CHAIR), CRISP AND GUNNELL

---

**5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

**6. MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes from the last meeting, held on 4 November 2010, be approved as a correct record.

**7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the council's Public Participation Scheme.

**8. CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS REVIEW - INTERIM REPORT.**

Members considered a report that presented information gathered to date in support of the Customer Complaints scrutiny review. The report also asked Members to identify relevant consultees and any additional information required in support of the review.

Members discussed the following issues:

(i) Corporate Customer Feedback Policy

Further consideration was given to the proposed wording of the Corporate Customer Feedback Policy in respect of Stage 1 complaints. It was agreed that the following wording should be included "*The process for escalating a service request to Stage 1 of the complaints procedure is in the hands of the complainant who will indicate, either verbally to an officer or in writing, that they are not satisfied with the response to/outcome of their service request*".

(ii) Local Government Ombudsman (LGO)

Consideration was given to the Table of Complaints received by LGO in 2009/10 and to the LGO annual report detailing CYC complaints (Annexes A and B of the report).

Members agreed that although there were not an excessive number of complaints, there was room for improvement. The intention should also be to deal with any complaint as early as possible.

Members were concerned to note that the council's average response time had worsened and was significantly outside the target time of 28 days. Officers stated that the new corporate tracking system should ensure that complaints were dealt with in a timely basis and could be more effectively controlled. Members suggested that, as part of the flag system, the Chief Executive should be notified of any complaints that reached the red stage.

It was noted that each of the stages would be time limited and that data would be provided to ensure that management teams were aware of their progress. Members suggested that data on complaints should be presented to managers on a monthly basis. It was noted that managers and directors would also have access to the IT system to enable them to track the progress of a particular complaint.

Members requested that LGO forms were made more widely available in council buildings.<sup>1</sup>

(iii) Number and Type of Complaints Received by CYC since 1 January 2010

Consideration was given to the statistics in regard to Freedom of Information Requests (FOIs), complaints from the public, Councillor requests/enquiries and LGO referrals for 2010, as detailed in Annex C of the report.

Members were concerned to note the inconsistency between directorates in respect of the recording of complaints.

Members queried the accuracy of some of the figures, including those relating to the number of Stage 1 complaints in the Chief Executive's Office, although it was noted that some of these were then passed to the relevant department which may have resulted in double counts. They also queried why the cumulative totals for the two periods were significantly different. It was agreed that further information was required on these issues.

(iv) Members' Reporting of Complaints

It was noted that, partly because of the lack of confidence in the Members' Portal, Members were currently reporting complaints in a variety of ways, including contacting senior officers direct. Whilst it

was acknowledged that Members had been seeking to resolve problems as soon as possible, it was recognised that by not using a central point of contact, it was difficult to maintain accurate statistics in respect of the number of complaints or to track their progress. There needed to be a clear gateway in place to receive Members' complaints and for these to be recorded and speedily forwarded to the relevant officer.

(v) Training

Consideration was given to the information that had been provided in respect of the training offered by the LGO. Members agreed that one of the recommendations arising from the review would be to ensure that appropriate training on complaints was provided for staff and Members. They put forward the following suggestions in respect of the training:

- Relevant officers should attend the LGO training on the handling of complaints and could then cascade the information to other members of staff.
- Training requirements should be reviewed on an annual basis.
- Consideration should be given to sharing training opportunities and costs with other authorities; this could possibly involve the North Yorkshire Connect Partnership.

(vi) Social Care Complaints

It was noted that statutory procedures were in place in respect of the handling of complaints about social care. It was intended to use this example of best practice in developing processes for the handling of complaints about other aspects of the council's services. The experience and expertise of the team that handled the social care complaints would also be utilised.

(vii) Member Scrutiny of Complaints

Consideration was given as to how best there could be Member scrutiny regarding complaints processes and data. Members suggested that the data should be presented to a relevant committee on an annual basis.

(viii) Service Standards

At the request of Members, officers gave details of current service standards and proposed amendments that would be considered by CMT and Executive. Members suggested that, in the recording of complaints, a box should be included to indicate whether the complaint had escalated from a service request. It was noted that the new system should be a driver for service improvement and therefore it was important to identify how complaints had resulted in service improvements.

(ix) Ongoing Changes to New Corporate Customer Feedback Policy

Officers gave a verbal update on changes to the new Corporate Customer Feedback Policy. It was proposed that the draft policy would incorporate suggestions put forward by the Task Group and that it would form an annex to the final report. Members agreed that the draft revised policy should be considered by the Task Group at the meeting scheduled for 5 January 2011.

RESOLVED: That the Task Group's workplan be updated to reflect the following:

- (i) Officers from directorates to be requested to attend the next meeting to provide further information on the following issues:
  - Explanation of the complaints statistics for their directorate
  - Current procedures (including response timescales)
  - How the statistics have been used to drive service improvements
- (ii) The draft of the "New Corporate Customer Feedback Policy" to be considered at the meeting on 11 January 2011 with a view to this forming an annex to the final report.

REASON: To progress this review in line with scrutiny procedures, protocols and workplans.

Action Required

1. Check LGO forms are readily available

PS

Councillor P Firth, Chair

[The meeting started at 2.30 pm and finished at 3.45 pm].



---

## Meeting of Customer Complaints Task Group - Effective Organisation Overview & Scrutiny Committee

8 December 2010

### Customer Complaints Review - Interim Report

#### Purpose of Report

1. This report presents information gathered to date in support of the Customer Complaints scrutiny review and asks Members to identify relevant consultees and any additional information required in support of this review.

#### Background

2. At a meeting of the Effective Organisation Overview & Scrutiny Committee in September 2010, Members received a presentation on Customer Services from Assistant Director Customers & People. Having considered an overview of current services, performance and developments, the committee recognised that whilst there is a corporate policy in existence, currently each individual CYC Directorate has its own methods for recording and responding to complaints. And, an unknown proportion of complaints are dealt with as enquiries and therefore fall outside of any formal process.
3. As there is no corporate monitoring or management information of performance in this area, the Committee questioned whether the new Corporate Customer Feedback Policy and procedures are fit for purpose. In order to ensure its future effectiveness and in an effort to inform its design and priorities, the Committee agreed to form a Task Group to carry out a scrutiny review on their behalf, of customer feedback/complaints and resulting actions.
4. The Committee set a timeframe of within 3 months for completion of the review and agreed the following review remit:

#### Overall Aim

To inform the design and priorities within the new complaints function in order to ensure its future effectiveness, identifying any revisions required to the Feedback Policy.

#### Objectives

- i. Reduce the number of common or repeat complaints.
- ii. Reduce the number of complaints to the Ombudsman.
- iii. Contribute to possible further efficiency savings
- iv. Improve the customer experience (customer satisfaction to be measured and monitored).

5. At a meeting in early November 2010, the Task Group agreed the following workplan for the review.

Meetings Dates	Workplan
<p><u>Meeting 1</u> 4 November 2010 1:30 - 3pm</p>	<p>Scoping report providing information relating to the Customer Services Blueprint, and an overview of existing processes and the new structure/organisation/process</p>
<p><u>Meeting 2</u>  19 November 2010 2:30pm</p>	<p>Receive interim report presenting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information on national best practice regarding the handling of complaints etc by local authorities e.g. centralised or not?, and most recent annual Ombudsman Report.</li> <li>2. Directorate information on number and type of complaints received since 1 January 2010 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complaints from public</li> <li>• Councillor requests/inquiries</li> <li>• Complaints to Ombudsman</li> <li>• FOIs</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relevant consultees and any issues to be addressed through consultation at the next meeting</li> <li>• any additional information required</li> </ul>
<p><u>Meeting 3</u> 8 December 2010 2pm</p>	<p>Receive interim report and consult with relevant parties</p> <p>Based on information gathered, suggest any:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• possible further efficiency savings</li> <li>• further improvements to customer experience</li> </ul>
<p><u>Meeting 4</u> 5 January 2011 2pm</p>	<p>Consider draft final report containing suggested recommendations</p>
<p>11 January 2011</p>	<p>Presentation of final report to Effective Organisation O &amp; S Committee</p>

## Consultation

6. The Assistant Director Customers & People attended all the meetings of the Task Group to assist them in their work on this review.
7. Also, at a meeting on 19 November 2010, the Task Group agreed to meet with representatives from Directorates to discuss the complaint statistics shown at Annex A.

## Options

8. Having considered the information provided within this report and its associated Annexes, and to inform the next meeting of the Task Group on 8 December 2010, Members may choose to:
  - identify additional information required in support of this review
  - agree some recommendations relevant to the findings

## Findings to Date

9. At the meeting on 4 November, the Task Group considered the procedures within the Corporate Customer Feedback Policy and identified a number of issues relating to the different stages of the complaints process. It was also recognised that many of the 'complaints' received within Directorates are in fact service requests and not complaints, and therefore could be dealt with before the official 'stage 1' procedure is instigated.
10. Service Requests  
Members recognised that the public will need to understand the difference between a service request and a stage 1 complaint and that a clear definition of a service request would help.
11. Service requests will still need recording to track reoccurring issues within service areas and to enable service delivery teams to monitor their own performance and identify service improvements. However, they should not be fed into the customer complaints data analysis and reports. The process for escalating a service request to Stage 1 of the complaints procedure is in the hands of the complainant who will indicate either verbally to an officer, or in writing, that they are not satisfied with the response to/outcome of their service request. This will then become a Stage 1 complaint.
12. Stage 1  
The Task Group agreed the wording at Stage 1 of the procedure should be amended to read:

'At this stage the line manager of the service will deal with a complaint and the complainant should be advised of the outcome within 10 working days *or advised of any delay* and when they can expect a full response, and what they can do if they remain dissatisfied at the end of Stage 1'

13. Stage 2

It should not be necessary for a complainant to have to set out their complaint again at Stage 2 as it may be antagonistic to expect the complainant to provide information that they had already supplied at Stage 1 of the procedure.

14. Stage 3

A Director might choose to delegate the investigation of a complaint to an Assistant Director, but it was important that the procedure recognised that the responsibility for handling the complaint rested with the Director. With this in mind the Task Group agreed the following wording should be removed '*or a member of staff independent of the service acting on the Director's behalf*'.

15. Training

In regard to Councillors, the Task Group agreed they would all need full training on the use of the new Complaints IT portal and its full capabilities. Some Councillors may also be willing to participate in testing the new system before it goes live.

16. For staff, the Task Group recognised that front line staff have a crucial role to play in presenting the face of the authority to the public, particularly when dealing with service users when they have problems. They also play an important part in the early resolution of complaints, to the benefit of service users and the authority and Members agreed it was therefore essential they were appropriately trained in how to:

- properly identify and handle the type of enquiry being received e.g. the type of issues that can be resolved at first point of contact.
- maintain a corporate record of them using the processes and procedures in place
- provide appropriate feedback to customers

17. It was agreed that for key officers within the new corporate complaints team consideration should be given to the complaints training offered by the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO). It was noted that they run a range of one-day courses aimed at helping local authorities to improve their responses to complaints. All their courses are presented by experienced investigators who have genuine practical expertise in complaint handling, giving participants the opportunity to practise the skills needed to deal with complaints positively and efficiently. Those key officers could then disseminate the training to other in the complaints team.

18. Annual Ombudsman Review

Each year the LGO produces an annual review (previous called annual letters) for each local authority about their performance in dealing with complaints made about them to the Ombudsman. The aim is to provide councils with information to help them improve their complaint handling, and improve their services more generally, for the benefit of the public. The table at Annex A shows the number of complaints received by the LGO about City of York Council (CYC) in 2009/10, in comparison to other local authorities, and the LGO annual report detailing those complaints is shown at Annex B.

19. Members agreed that although the annual review showed there were not an excessive number of complaints made about CYC, there was room for improvement. In addition, they were concerned to note that the council's average response time had worsened and was significantly outside the target time of 28 days. Officers stated that the new corporate tracking system should ensure that complaints were dealt with in a timely basis and could be more effectively controlled. Members suggested that, as part of the flag system, the Chief Executive should be notified of any complaints that reached the red stage.
20. Number & Type of Complaints Received By CYC Since 1 January 2010  
At a meeting on 19 November 2010, the Task Group considered statistical data from each Directorate showing the number and type of complaints received since 1 January 2010 – see Annex C.
21. In regard to the complaints received by the Chief Executive's office, it was noted that they most often relate to services elsewhere in the council. Accordingly, they are not recorded as stage 1, 2 or 3 complaints within the Chief Exec's own service and may well represent double counts with complaint handling elsewhere in the organisation where these stages are recorded. Similarly, all Ombudsman letters received in the Chief Executive's office relate to other services - these are passed to the relevant department and are also likely to be accounted for elsewhere in the statistics data that the Task Group considered (as provided by each Directorate). There is also significant contact with Members in the Chief Executive's office, including for instance, direct communication between Councillors and the Chief Executive, but no data is kept to show this activity.
22. Members queried the figures provided by each Directorate, having taken account of the variance in volume post April 2010 resulting from the Organisation Review i.e. a reduction in the number of Directorates and the transfer of Legal, Civic, Democratic Services and Elections (which account for significant customer contact) from the Office of the Chief Executive to Customer & Business Support Services.
23. In acknowledging that each Directorate has its own methods for handling complaints, the Task Group were keen to meet with representatives from the Directorates to discuss:
  - the statistics provided in Annex C,
  - best practice in regard to timescales for responding to complaints
  - whether or not (and how) information derived from complaints was being used to identify service improvements.
24. The relevant officers representing the following Directorates have therefore been invited to attend this meeting:
  - 2:10pm - Adults, Children & Education
  - 2:30pm - Communities & Neighbourhoods
  - 2:50pm - Customer & Business Support Services
  - 3:10pm - City Strategy

25. Ongoing Changes to New Corporate Customer Feedback Policy

As a result of the work to date, a number of changes to the policy have already been identified as required. The Assistant Director Customers & People will provide a revised version which incorporates these changes at the next meeting on 5 January 2010. Consideration will also be given to ongoing scrutiny by the Effective Organisation Overview & Scrutiny Committee, of complaints and other customer feedback and relevant performance indicators, for regular monitoring purposes.

### **Suggested Recommendations To Date**

26. As a result of the findings to date from this review the following recommendations are suggested for members' consideration:

- To produce a revised 'Customer Complaints & Feedback Policy':
  - To assist the public, policy to include a definition of a service request and a stage 1 complaint (see paragraph 10)
  - Service requests to be recorded, tracked and monitored by Directorates to allow for early identification of required service improvements, without being fed into the customer complaints data analysis and reports (see paragraph 11)
  - Wording of policy at Stage 1 to be revised as per paragraph 12
  - Wording of policy at stage 2 to be revised to reflect that a complainant does not have to set out their complaint again at Stage 2, as per paragraph 13.
  - Removal of wording at Stage 3 – '*or a member of staff independent of the service acting on the Director's behalf*' as per paragraph 14
  - To include a flagging system for senior officers at each stage to include Chief Executive notification at the 'Red' stage, as per paragraph 19
- CYC to investigate and provide relevant training for the different stages of complaint handling/investigation for key officers within the corporate complaints team and Councillors (see paragraphs 15-17).
- To agree a mechanism for ongoing scrutiny by members of customer complaints and associated performance indicators (see paragraph 25).

27. The information gathered from the consultation carried out at this meeting will be included in the draft final report for the meeting on 5 January 2011, in order that Members may agree what if any further recommendations they wish to make.

### **Implications**

28. **Financial & HR** - More for York savings are associated with the centralisation of complaints teams. The cost of the LGO courses referred to in paragraph 17 depends on the number of delegates i.e. courses for up to 15 people - £1,025, Courses for up to 30 - £1,735. If a course was to be shared with other local authorities, the cost per delegate would be £130.

29. **Equalities** All proposals contained in the Customer Strategy have been fully consulted upon and the work is covered by an Equalities Impact Assessment.

- 30. **Legal** Improvement of complaints handling may contribute to less cases reaching the Ombudsman. Centralisation of Freedom of Information requests will aid compliance with legislation on this matter.
- 31. **Information Technology (IT)** Resources are committed to providing the technology necessary for the newly centralised team.
- 32. There are no Crime and Disorder, Property or other implications.

### **Corporate Strategy**

- 33. This review supports the Council's Effective Organisation priority around 'providing what customers want'.

### **Risk Management**

- 34. Improvement in the management of complaints and resulting service improvement will reduce the risk of negative publicity and the Ombudsman publicly criticising the council for maladministration. Improvement in the processing of Freedom of Information requests will minimise risks of the Information Commissioner imposing large fines on the organisation relating to its use of information.

### **Recommendations**

- 35. Members are recommended to:
  - i. Identify any further changes required to the Corporate Customer Feedback Policy
  - ii. Amend and/or agree the suggested recommendations listed at paragraph 26.

Reason: To achieve the objectives of this review, including reducing the number of complaints and contributing to any further efficiency savings beyond those identified by the More for York review.

### **Contact Details**

**Author:**

Melanie Carr  
Scrutiny Officer  
Scrutiny Services  
Tel No. 01904 552063

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Andrew Docherty  
Assistant Director Legal, Governance & ITT

**Report Approved**



**Date**

30 November 2010

### **Specialist Implications Officer(s)**

**Wards Affected:**

**All**



**For further information please contact the author of the report**

**Background Papers:**

Customer Strategy

Customer Services Blueprint

Corporate Customer Feedback Policy

**Annexes**

**Annex A** – Table of Complaints Received By LGO In 2009/10

**Annex B** – LGO annual report detailing CYC Complaints

**Annex C** – CYC Statistics since January 2010

## Local authorities: alphabetical

**LGO complaint decisions in 2009/10**  
**LGO Complaint Decisions 2009/10 For Local Authorities**

Authority	Total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints)		Maladministration and injustice reports		Local settlements		Maladministration reports		No maladministration reports		No maladministration without report		Ombudsman's discretion		Outside jurisdiction	
	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09
<b>Local authorities</b>																
Adur DC	9	9	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	2	4
Allerdale BC	4	19	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	7	2	5
Alnwick DC (former authority)	4	11	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	1	1
Amber Valley DC	13	11	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	3	2	2	1
Arun DC	12	20	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4	5	1	3
Ashfield DC	11	12	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3	4	3
Ashford BC	10	21	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	3	6	3	3
Aylesbury Vale DC	11	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	2	7	5	1
Babergh DC	8	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	3	2	1
Barking & Dagenham LB	71	73	0	0	23	21	0	0	0	0	19	27	22	13	7	12
Barnet LB	76	100	0	0	17	17	0	0	0	0	26	54	22	14	11	15
Barnsley MBC	42	44	0	0	10	11	0	0	0	0	18	21	8	7	6	5
Barrow-in-Furness BC	6	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	1	0	0
Basildon DC	38	39	0	4 *	10	15	0	0	0	0	18	14	4	3	6	3
Basingstoke & Deane BC	16	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	8	4	2	1	5	1
Bassetlaw DC	26	29	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	18	19	3	3	4	4
Bath & North East Somerset C	20	26	0	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	7	13	3	4	3	4
Bedford BC	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0
Bedford BC (former authority)	5	7	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	2
Bedfordshire CC (former authority)	6	29	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	7	2	6
Berwick-upon-Tweed BC (former authority)	4	12	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	5	0	0
Bexley LB	25	30	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	9	13	3	5	8	11
Birmingham City C	237	303	0	0	77	126	0	0	0	0	81	101	52	51	27	25
Blaby DC	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	1	2
Blackburn with Darwen BC	18	31	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	5	9	4	7	3	5
Blackpool BC	20	20	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	7	7	9	7	2	2
Blyth Valley BC (former authority)	6	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	3	0	0
Bolsover DC	11	12	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	1	4	1	2
Bolton MBC	44	48	0	0	10	8	0	0	0	0	21	28	8	11	5	1
Boston BC	6	4	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1
Bournemouth BC	28	26	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	18	10	5	8	3	4
Bracknell Forest C	6	15	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	1	5	0	0
Bradford City C	55	72	0	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	28	35	10	13	13	14
Braintree DC	7	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	6	1	0	1
Breckland DC	10	9	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	1	1	1
Brent LB	77	77	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	33	25	23	32	14	11
Brentwood BC	7	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	0	0	1
Bridgnorth DC (former authority)	3	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	1
Brighton & Hove City C	67	85	1	0	17	10	0	0	0	0	32	46	10	16	7	13
Bristol City C	96	120	0	30	19	11	0	0	0	0	42	37	17	23	18	19
Broadland DC	16	11	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	10	6	3	3	1	1
Bromley LB	58	57	0	0	17	16	0	0	0	0	25	23	4	9	12	9
Bromsgrove DC	20	13	1	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	8	4	1	0
Broxbourne BC	16	12	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	3	4	0	1

Authority	Total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints)		Maladministration and injustice reports		Local settlements		Maladministration reports		No maladministration reports		No maladministration without report		Ombudsman's discretion		Outside jurisdiction	
	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09
Broxtowe BC	14	9	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	6	2	2	4	2	1
Buckinghamshire CC	89	64	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	1	46	44	15	9	22	4
Burnley BC	10	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	5	2	2
Bury MBC	34	34	1	0	8	11	0	0	0	0	10	10	13	8	2	5
Calderdale MBC	31	26	2 *	0	10	8	0	0	0	0	6	11	5	4	8	3
Cambridge City C	20	10	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	8	4	6	0	3	0
Cambridgeshire CC	18	23	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	4	10	5	4	2	3
Camden LB	109	118	0	1	49	39	0	0	0	0	23	32	22	27	15	19
Cannock Chase DC	10	11	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3	0	2
Canterbury City C	19	28	1	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	11	5	6
Caradon DC (former authority)	14	35	0	4 *	3	11	0	0	0	0	5	11	5	8	1	1
Carlisle City C	5	11	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	1	1	0
Carrick DC (former authority)	10	17	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	3	1	3
Castle Morpeth BC (former authority)	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0
Castle Point BC	12	10	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	6	2	3	4	0	2
Central Bedfordshire C	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0
Charnwood BC	19	12	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	13	7	0	1	4	3
Chelmsford BC	10	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	1	1	0
Cheltenham BC	11	8	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	4	1	0
Cherwell DC	12	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	1	1	1	1
Cheshire CC (former authority)	17	38	1	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	4	26	6	4	2	2
Cheshire East C	41	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	18	0	3	0
Cheshire West & Chester C	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	7	0	2	0
Chester City C (former authority)	7	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	2	1	1
Chesterfield BC	12	20	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6	11	3	4	1	1
Chester-le-Street DC (former authority)	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	1	0	2
Chichester DC	14	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	5	2	1	1
Chiltern DC	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	1	2
Chorley BC	12	10	2 *	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	1	5	0	1
Christchurch BC	10	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	2	1	1
City of London Corporation	7	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	0	0
Colchester BC	21	27	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	10	12	6	12	1	1
Congleton BC (former authority)	4	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0
Copeland BC	3	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	2	0	2
Corby BC	15	21	1	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	8	5	2	6	0	2
Cornwall C	50	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	4	0	17	0
Cornwall CC (former authority)	12	38	0	1	4	15	0	0	0	0	7	15	0	5	1	2
Cotswold DC	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	2	0	2
Coventry City C	31	47	0	0	13	16	0	0	0	0	9	12	6	11	3	8
Craven DC	4	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2
Crawley BC	10	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	3	2	0	2
Crewe & Nantwich BC (former authority)	2	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	8	1	1
Croydon LB	96	90	2 *	3 *	23	31	0	0	0	0	37	32	18	10	16	14
Cumbria CC	33	23	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	9	7	13	10	6	3
Dacorum BC	17	18	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4	5	3	2
Darlington BC	21	27	0	1	7	11	0	0	0	0	8	6	3	5	3	4
Dartford BC	11	5	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	1	4	1
Daventry DC	10	8	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	1	1	0	1	3
Derby City C	50	37	0	0	27	17	0	0	0	0	11	10	9	8	3	2

Authority	Total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints)		Maladministration and injustice reports		Local settlements		Maladministration reports		No maladministration reports		No maladministration without report		Ombudsman's discretion		Outside jurisdiction	
	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09
Derbyshire CC	28	30	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	9	9	7	11	4	4
Derbyshire Dales DC	6	7	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	1	0	1
Derwentside DC (former authority)	6	16	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	5	0	1
Devon CC	38	26	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	15	13	10	2	9	5
Doncaster MBC	53	55	0	0	11	19	0	0	0	0	19	18	17	12	6	6
Dorset CC	15	23	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	8	9	6	6	1	2
Dover DC	15	17	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	7	9	5	2	1	2
Dudley MBC	46	55	0	0	17	12	0	0	0	0	17	22	5	10	7	11
Durham C, County of	36	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	7	0	9	0
Durham CC (former authority)	20	17	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	6	10	5	3	2	1
Durham City C (former authority)	8	16	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	2	0	1
Ealing LB	107	124	3	2	25	34	0	0	0	0	31	34	25	28	23	26
Easington DC (former authority)	1	24	0	3 *	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	2
East Cambridgeshire DC	10	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	1	1	1
East Devon DC	18	40	0	2 *	0	14	0	0	0	0	11	13	5	4	2	7
East Dorset DC	11	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	1	4	1
East Hampshire DC	12	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	1
East Hertfordshire DC	7	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	1	2	2
East Lindsey DC	20	28	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	9	16	5	5	3	2
East Northamptonshire DC	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	0
East Riding of Yorkshire C	62	70	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	0	29	34	14	17	9	6
East Staffordshire DC	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	1	1	0
East Sussex CC	27	39	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	12	19	8	12	2	4
Eastbourne BC	14	14	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	4	3	4
Eastleigh BC	12	11	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	1	3	3	3
Eden DC	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1
Ellesmere Port & Neston BC (former authority)	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	4	0	0
Elmbridge BC	10	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	3	8	1	1
Enfield LB	60	59	0	0	11	15	1	0	0	0	23	20	12	18	13	6
Epping Forest DC	8	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	0	2	1	3
Epsom & Ewell BC	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	3	1	1
Erewash BC	5	21	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	4	1	3
Essex CC	80	78	1	1	11	13	0	0	0	0	38	37	15	15	15	12
Exeter City C	17	18	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	10	9	2	4	3	3
Fareham BC	11	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	4	2	7	0	2
Fenland DC	13	8	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	9	5	1	1	1	0
Forest Heath DC	5	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	1	1
Forest of Dean DC	12	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4	4	2
Fylde BC	9	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	2	0
Gateshead MBC	26	40	0	0	7	18	0	0	0	0	12	14	2	2	5	6
Gedling BC	11	29	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	6	18	3	2	0	3
Gloucester City C	9	15	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	10	0	1	1	0
Gloucestershire CC	26	25	0	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	12	14	5	2	5	2
Gosport BC	19	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	9	1	3	1
Gravesham BC	13	12	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	2	0	1
Great Yarmouth BC	9	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	1	1	2	3
Greater London Authority	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
Greenwich LB	64	51	0	5 *	15	14	0	0	0	0	21	20	15	7	13	5

Authority	Total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints)		Maladministration and injustice reports		Local settlements		Maladministration reports		No maladministration reports		No maladministration without report		Ombudsman's discretion		Outside jurisdiction	
	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09
Guildford BC	14	8	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	0	1	3
Hackney LB	104	144	0	0	35	53	0	0	0	0	20	26	30	41	19	24
Halton BC	16	18	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	8	8	1	6	4	2
Hambleton DC	9	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	3	0	1
Hammersmith & Fulham LB	62	66	1	0	14	15	0	0	0	0	25	29	13	13	9	9
Hampshire CC	38	34	0	0	7	3	0	0	0	0	19	20	6	9	6	2
Harborough DC	9	11	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	3	1	0
Haringey LB	88	119	0	1	39	53	0	0	0	0	20	33	18	15	11	17
Harlow DC	19	15	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	8	3	2	4	2	2
Harrogate BC	18	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	4	2	3	5
Harrow LB	52	43	0	0	12	22	0	0	0	0	24	10	6	1	10	10
Hart DC	8	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	0	1	0
Hartlepool BC	10	11	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	3	1	2
Hastings BC	14	26	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	6	18	3	3	1	3
Havant BC	13	8	2 *	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	0	1	3
Havering LB	59	50	1	1	21	13	0	0	1	0	10	20	16	14	10	2
Herefordshire C	25	25	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	10	15	6	2	6	7
Hertfordshire CC	60	69	0	0	20	16	0	0	0	0	12	26	21	13	7	14
Hertsmere BC	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	0
High Peak BC	11	13	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4	2	0	2
Hillingdon LB	35	37	0	1	5	12	0	0	0	0	14	8	12	9	4	7
Hinckley & Bosworth BC	10	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	0	1	0
Horsham DC	10	9	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	5	1	0
Hounslow LB	86	117	1	0	29	24	0	0	0	0	26	24	14	52	16	17
Huntingdonshire DC	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	1	1	1
Hyndburn BC	7	6	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	1	1	1
Ipswich BC	10	10	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	2	3	1
Isle of Wight C	39	48	1	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	12	22	16	13	9	4
Isles of Scilly, Council for the	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Islington LB	80	101	0	1	23	39	0	0	0	0	26	30	11	18	20	13
Kennet DC (former authority)	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0
Kensington & Chelsea RB	41	63	0	0	10	11	0	0	0	0	15	34	11	8	5	10
Kent CC	120	125	1	0	29	35	0	0	0	0	52	43	22	34	16	13
Kerrier DC (former authority)	10	22	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	5	10	3	2	0	2
Kettering BC	6	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	3	3	0	0
King's Lynn & West Norfolk BC	15	18	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	9	5	4	6	0	4
Kingston upon Hull City C	72	57	0	0	22	15	0	0	0	0	34	29	11	7	5	6
Kingston upon Thames RB	28	25	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	8	6	9	6	4	6
Kirklees MC	60	94	2 *	1	20	21	0	0	0	0	11	32	25	29	2	11
Knowsley MBC	11	13	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	3	4	1
Lambeth LB	200	218	3	3 *	74	51	0	0	0	0	61	68	27	53	35	43
Lancashire CC	52	63	1	0	25	24	0	0	0	0	13	19	9	15	4	5
Lancaster City C	10	11	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	1	3
Leeds City C	176	203	0	0	44	64	0	0	0	0	84	80	31	31	17	28
Leicester City C	73	78	0	0	18	11	0	0	0	0	29	40	10	19	16	8
Leicestershire CC	29	38	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	20	16	3	9	4	12
Lewes DC	5	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	1	0	0
Lewisham LB	94	103	1	0	21	29	0	0	0	0	31	39	22	23	19	12
Lichfield DC	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	1	3	0	0

Authority	Total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints)		Maladministration and injustice reports		Local settlements		Maladministration reports		No maladministration reports		No maladministration without report		Ombudsman's discretion		Outside jurisdiction	
	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09
Lincoln City C	13	7	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	7	2	5	1	0	1
Lincolnshire CC	42	27	1	0	12	4	0	0	0	0	14	12	13	5	2	6
Liverpool City C	58	88	2	0	17	25	0	0	0	0	17	41	11	12	11	10
Luton BC	33	32	1	3	10	3	0	0	0	0	12	13	6	6	4	7
Macclesfield BC (former authority)	9	15	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	5	0	2
Maidstone BC	22	27	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	7	12	5	3
Maldon DC	4	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	1	3
Malvern Hills DC	9	8	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	1	3	0
Manchester City C	101	80	1	0	30	27	0	0	0	0	27	18	26	18	17	17
Mansfield DC	9	7	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	2	0	2
Medway C	60	62	8*	2	16	26	0	0	0	0	18	10	13	18	5	6
Melton BC	5	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	1	1	0
Mendip DC	28	10	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	23	4	2	5	0	0
Merton LB	33	33	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	15	13	10	10	5	5
Mid Bedfordshire DC (former authority)	5	12	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4	1	1
Mid Devon DC	12	15	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	8	1	2	2	1
Mid Suffolk DC	9	22	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	2	2	2	8
Mid Sussex DC	11	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	3	1	1	0
Middlesbrough BC	14	18	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	7	7	4	3	1	3
Milton Keynes C	24	33	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	11	16	3	3	8	7
Mole Valley DC	6	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	1	0	0
New Forest DC	19	15	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	3	6	3	1
Newark & Sherwood DC	7	26	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	3	11	1	2
Newcastle upon Tyne City C	51	62	0	0	9	11	0	0	0	0	26	27	11	14	5	10
Newcastle-under-Lyme BC	7	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	1	1	0
Newham LB	101	104	1	0	36	39	0	0	0	0	24	22	18	23	22	20
Norfolk CC	25	28	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	11	16	6	5	1	5
North Cornwall DC (former authority)	4	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	3	0	1
North Devon DC	17	25	0	5*	2	2	0	0	0	0	10	11	4	2	1	5
North Dorset DC	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
North East Derbyshire DC	15	19	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	3	6	3	4
North East Lincolnshire C	16	18	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4	6	2
North Hertfordshire DC	10	13	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	2	2	1	2
North Kesteven DC	5	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	2	1	0
North Lincolnshire C	19	9	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	11	4	1	1	4	2
North Norfolk DC	8	21	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	10	2	2
North Shropshire DC (former authority)	18	11	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	2	14	1
North Somerset C	51	33	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	29	18	9	2	7	4
North Tyneside MBC	44	28	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	19	11	8	9	10	2
North Warwickshire BC	4	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	1
North West Leicestershire DC	10	8	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	1	1	0
North Wiltshire DC (former authority)	1	19	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	1	7
North Yorkshire CC	28	40	0	0	3	13	0	0	0	1	17	17	7	7	1	2
Northampton BC	27	47	0	13	10	11	0	0	0	0	6	14	8	5	3	4
Northamptonshire CC	29	35	0	0	12	10	0	0	0	0	9	13	4	10	4	2
Northumberland C	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	0	2	0
Northumberland CC (former authority)	16	12	4*	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	2	1	4
Norwich City C	20	27	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	11	11	2	6	4	2
Nottingham City C	52	60	0	0	16	15	1	0	0	0	17	24	10	12	8	9

Authority	Total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints)		Maladministration and injustice reports		Local settlements		Maladministration reports		No maladministration reports		No maladministration without report		Ombudsman's discretion		Outside jurisdiction	
	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09
Nottinghamshire CC	34	36	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	12	8	11	10	6	8
Nuneaton & Bedworth BC	10	7	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	2	0
Oldby & Wigston BC	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	1	0
Oldham MBC	28	43	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	5	16	8	10	7	8
Oswestry BC (former authority)	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	1
Oxford City C	27	21	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	15	11	3	1	5	2
Oxfordshire CC	23	13	0	0	4	2	0	0	1	0	11	9	4	1	3	1
Pendle BC	27	9	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	0	3	2
Penwith DC (former authority)	6	30	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	0	6	0	4
Peterborough City C	24	24	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	12	8	6	9	2	1
Plymouth City C	48	59	0	1	11	6	0	0	0	0	25	33	5	9	7	10
Poole BC	23	50	0	1	3	6	0	0	1	0	12	21	5	11	3	11
Portsmouth City C	28	35	0	1	6	7	0	0	0	0	15	20	4	3	3	4
Preston City C	6	14	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	1	2
Purbeck DC	4	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	2	1
Reading BC	27	30	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	7	9	7	4	8	8
Redbridge LB	50	77	1	1	9	11	0	0	0	0	16	36	14	19	10	10
Redcar & Cleveland BC	22	20	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	10	4	2	4
Redditch BC	9	7	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	0	2
Reigate & Banstead BC	4	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	4	0	0
Restormel BC (former authority)	8	23	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	10	1	3
Ribble Valley BC	12	3	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	1	0	0
Richmond upon Thames LB	28	43	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	18	17	4	13	2	9
Richmondshire DC	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	1	0
Rochdale MBC	23	21	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	7	6	7	4	5	2
Rochford DC	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	1	2	0
Rossendale BC	32	16	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	27	1	2	8	0	5
Rother DC	12	18	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	2	3	2
Rotherham MBC	33	29	0	1	11	6	0	0	0	0	17	11	5	8	0	3
Rugby BC	9	5	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	2	1
Runnymede BC	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	5	2	1
Rushcliffe BC	7	9	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	2	0	0
Rushmoor BC	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	2
Rutland CC	4	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	2
Ryedale DC	2	10	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	1	0
Salford City C	34	50	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	0	11	24	9	7	4	6
Salisbury DC (former authority)	7	15	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	3	3	0
Sandwell MBC	53	80	1	0	10	20	0	0	0	0	23	32	11	9	8	19
Scarborough BC	14	26	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	3	5	6	5
Sedgefield DC (former authority)	7	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	2	1	3
Sedgemoor DC	16	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4	4	6	2
Sefton MBC	25	35	0	2	10	5	0	0	0	0	9	17	3	6	3	5
Selby DC	26	26	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	18	13	2	8	4	1
Sevenoaks DC	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	2	6	4	1
Sheffield City C	107	143	0	1	25	41	0	0	0	0	51	61	17	26	14	14
Shepway DC	6	19	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	12	2	1
Shrewsbury & Atcham BC (former authority)	4	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	2	1	1
Shropshire C	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	2	0	4	0

Authority	Total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints)		Maladministration and injustice reports		Local settlements		Maladministration reports		No maladministration reports		No maladministration without report		Ombudsman's discretion		Outside jurisdiction	
	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09
Shropshire CC (former authority)	12	18	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	4	2	1
Slough BC	22	39	0	1	5	13	0	0	0	0	9	13	3	9	5	3
Solihull MBC	28	30	0	0	9	9	0	0	0	0	9	15	7	5	3	1
Somerset CC	48	27	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	34	9	4	8	8	3
South Bedfordshire DC (former authority)	3	9	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	1	0
South Bucks DC	6	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	1
South Cambridgeshire DC	22	17	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	10	10	7	2	3	3
South Derbyshire DC	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	1	2	2	1
South Gloucestershire C	33	30	0	0	7	10	0	0	0	0	15	11	5	8	6	1
South Hams DC	11	8	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	1	1
South Holland DC	15	14	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	5	6	2	2
South Kesteven DC	9	12	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	1	1	5
South Lakeland DC	9	12	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	2	0	3
South Norfolk DC	12	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	6	1	8	2	4
South Northamptonshire DC	6	4	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0
South Oxfordshire DC	15	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	2	3	1	1	1
South Ribble BC	7	15	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	5	0	1
South Shropshire DC (former authority)	6	16	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	8	0	2
South Somerset DC	10	42	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	34	0	2	1	4
South Staffordshire DC	5	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	2	1	1
South Tyneside MBC	40	50	0	2 *	5	11	0	0	0	0	12	21	11	11	12	5
Southampton City C	28	27	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	8	9	7	11	6	1
Southend-on-Sea BC	19	31	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	1	7	12	3	4	5	4
Southwark LB	142	180	0	0	76	86	0	0	0	0	28	51	15	22	23	21
Spelthorne BC	9	5	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	1	0
St Albans City C	14	26	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	6	6	3	4	2	5
St Edmundsbury BC	6	12	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	2	1	0
St Helens MBC	15	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	8	8	5	4	1	3
Stafford BC	7	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	1	2	0	0
Staffordshire CC	40	35	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	19	20	8	8	7	1
Staffordshire Moorlands DC	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	1	1
Stevenage BC	8	10	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	1	1	2
Stockport MBC	50	47	0	0	11	8	0	0	0	0	17	17	12	16	10	6
Stockton-on-Tees BC	18	24	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	11	11	3	6	3	2
Stoke-on-Trent City C	35	37	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	19	19	9	10	1	3
Stratford-on-Avon DC	23	22	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	9	11	3	6	6	1
Stroud DC	13	9	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	2	1	0
Suffolk CC	35	30	1	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	10	11	11	9	7	6
Suffolk Coastal DC	7	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	3	1	0	0
Sunderland City C	30	34	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	9	14	15	7	4	2
Surrey CC	71	75	0	2	16	17	0	0	1	0	25	20	21	26	8	10
Surrey Heath BC	8	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	4	0
Sutton LB	22	34	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	10	12	7	10	3	2
Swale BC	12	14	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	3	1	1	4
Swindon BC	38	30	0	0	18	12	0	0	0	0	10	4	6	11	4	3
Tameside MBC	27	31	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	11	21	9	4	4	3
Tamworth BC	6	7	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	2	0	1
Tandridge DC	5	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	2	0	1
Taunton Deane BC	12	13	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	4	5	0

Authority	Total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints)		Maladministration and injustice reports		Local settlements		Maladministration reports		No maladministration reports		No maladministration without report		Ombudsman's discretion		Outside jurisdiction	
	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09
	Teesdale DC (former authority)	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1
Teignbridge DC	8	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	1	2	1
Telford & Wrekin C, Borough of	17	21	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	8	11	5	6	3	2
Tending DC	12	22	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	6	13	3	3	2	3
Test Valley BC	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	2	3	0	1
Tewkesbury BC	8	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	1	1	6
Thanet DC	37	29	0	0	21	6	0	0	0	0	9	16	1	5	6	2
Three Rivers DC	6	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	1	1
Thurrock BC	46	39	1	0	15	14	0	0	0	0	19	14	10	10	1	1
Tonbridge & Malling BC	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	1
Torbay BC	26	35	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	11	19	4	6	7	7
Torridge DC	12	20	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	6	14	2	2	3	0
Tower Hamlets LB	98	82	1	0	18	21	0	0	0	0	40	29	16	17	23	15
Trafford MBC	22	34	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	14	14	0	15	5	0
Tunbridge Wells RB	7	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3	0	5
Tynedale DC (former authority)	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0
Utlesford DC	7	10	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	1	2	1	0
Vale of the White Horse DC	9	11	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	2	4	2
Vale Royal BC (former authority)	4	11	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4	2	0
Wakefield City C	37	82	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	0	16	50	10	13	2	7
Walsall MBC	38	33	0	1	12	8	0	0	0	0	18	13	2	6	6	5
Waltham Forest LB	82	85	1	0	23	34	0	0	0	0	21	28	28	14	9	9
Wandsworth LB	57	64	0	0	18	17	0	0	0	0	20	20	9	11	10	16
Wansbeck DC (former authority)	4	14	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	2	0	3
Warrington BC	21	41	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	7	18	7	13	2	2
Warwick DC	13	16	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4	5	0	0
Warwickshire CC	28	32	1	0	7	10	0	0	0	0	12	15	5	5	3	2
Watford BC	6	17	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	6	1	3
Waveney DC	5	13	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	5	0	1
Waverley BC	12	17	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	1	3
Wealden DC	9	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	0	6	4	3
Wear Valley DC	5	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	1	1	2
Wellingborough BC	6	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	0
Welwyn Hatfield DC	7	20	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	12	0	0
West Berkshire C	13	32	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	7	17	4	8	1	4
West Devon BC	10	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	2	0
West Dorset DC	8	11	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	1	4	1	3
West Lancashire DC	7	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	5	2	3
West Lindsey DC	12	7	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	1	2	2
West Oxfordshire DC	6	9	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	2	0	0
West Somerset DC	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	1	0	1
West Sussex CC	53	45	0	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	19	12	19	19	6	5
West Wiltshire DC (former authority)	4	10	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	2	2
Westminster City C	84	131	0	0	23	43	0	0	0	0	19	38	21	24	21	26
Weymouth & Portland BC	6	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	2	1	2
Wigan MBC	45	39	0	0	11	5	0	0	0	1	15	25	14	7	5	1
Wiltshire C	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	4	0	1	0
Wiltshire CC (former authority)	8	17	0	2	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	3	2
Winchester City C	10	20	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	11	4	2	0	2

Authority	Total complaints determined (excluding premature complaints)		Maladministration and injustice reports		Local settlements		Maladministration reports		No maladministration reports		No maladministration without report		Ombudsman's discretion		Outside jurisdiction	
	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09	2009/10	2008/09
	Windsor & Maidenhead RB	18	25	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	7	6	2
Wirral MBC	166	43	0	1	9	11	0	0	0	0	19	16	132	9	6	6
Woking BC	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0
Wokingham C	35	21	0	0	9	5	0	0	0	0	15	11	5	3	6	2
Wolverhampton City C	43	51	0	0	10	11	0	0	0	0	23	27	3	3	7	10
Worcester City C	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	1	3	1
Worcestershire CC	38	46	0	1	9	21	0	0	0	0	23	19	2	1	4	4
Worthing BC	12	9	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	4	2	0	1
Wychavon DC	13	7	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	1	2	1
Wycombe DC	20	18	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	9	10	2	3	5	2
Wyre BC	9	19	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	3	4	2	2
Wyre Forest DC	11	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	1	2
York C, City of	25	30	1	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	13	12	3	7	4	4

This page is intentionally left blank

**The Local Government Ombudsman's  
Annual Review  
York City Council  
for the year ended  
31 March 2010**

Local Government Ombudsmen (LGOs) provide a free, independent and impartial service. We consider complaints about the administrative actions of councils and some other authorities. We cannot question what a council has done simply because someone does not agree with it. If we find something has gone wrong, such as poor service, service failure, delay or bad advice, and that a person has suffered as a result, we aim to get it put right by recommending a suitable remedy. We also use the findings from investigation work to help authorities provide better public services through initiatives such as special reports, training and annual reviews.

# Contents of Annual Review

<b>Section 1: Complaints about York City Council 2009/10</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Introduction.....	3
Enquiries and complaints received.....	3
Complaint outcomes.....	3
Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman.....	5
Training in complaint handling.....	5
Conclusions.....	5
<b>Section 2: LGO developments</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Introduction.....	6
New schools complaints service launched.....	6
Adult social care: new powers from October.....	6
Council first.....	6
Training in complaint handling.....	7
Statements of reasons.....	7
Delivering public value.....	7
<b>Appendix 1: Notes to assist interpretation of the statistics 2009/10</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Local authority report 2009/10</b>	

# Section 1: Complaints about York City Council 2009/10

## Introduction

This annual review provides a summary of the complaints we have dealt with about York City Council. We have included comments on the authority's performance and complaint-handling arrangements, where possible, so they can assist with your service improvement.

I hope that the review will be a useful addition to other information your authority holds on how people experience or perceive your services.

Two appendices form an integral part of this review: statistical data for 2009/10 and a note to help the interpretation of the statistics.

## Enquiries and complaints received

In 2009/10 we received 42 complaints and enquiries against your council, compared with 57 in 2008/09. Twelve were about adult care services, nine about housing, four about transport and highways, three were about planning and building control, two were about children and family services, one each about benefits and public finance, and ten about other areas, such as anti-social behaviour and environmental health.

We treated six of these complaints as premature and referred them to the council and in a further six cases advice was given, usually to make a complaint to the council direct. The remaining 30 complaints were forwarded to the investigative team, of which seven were premature complaints that had been resubmitted.

## Complaint outcomes

In 2009/10 we took decisions on 25 complaints. My predecessor issued a report in one case and in 13 cases we found no or insufficient evidence of maladministration. Four complaints were outside jurisdiction and in four cases the council agreed to settle the complaint locally. Using the Ombudsman's discretion, a further three cases were not investigated. Typically these are cases where, even though there may have been some fault by the council, there is no significant injustice to the complainant.

## Reports

When we complete an investigation, we generally issue a report. This year we issued one report about a planning matter. The council gave the complainant incorrect advice when they were renovating a Georgian terraced property. It said that planning permission was required for alterations to a front bay window, and that permission would only be granted for a square bay rather than the bow-shaped window that the complainant preferred, so that the house matched with the neighbouring property (which had a square bay window). But then the owner of the adjacent property carried out renovations to his property including a bow-shaped bay window at the front. The complainant was unhappy because they installed a window that they did not want on the basis of the council's advice, and now the property was the 'odd one out' with a square bay window.

We concluded that the council's advice had been incorrect and it was reasonable for the complainant to have relied on that advice. If the council had advised the complainant correctly they

would have been able to pursue the original plans of a bow-shaped bay window as permitted development.

We recommended that the council pay the reasonable costs of installing the bay window of the complainant's choice and also pay £250 for her time and trouble in pursuing her complaint. The council paid the compensation but it is disappointing that it took almost a year from issuing the report for it to authorise replacement of the window.

### **Local settlements**

A 'local settlement' is a complaint where, during the course of our investigation, a council takes or agrees to take some action that we consider to be a satisfactory response to the complaint. In 2009/10, 26.9% of all complaints the Ombudsmen decided and which were within our jurisdiction were local settlements. Of the complaints we decided against your authority four were local settlements (19.4%), and the council paid a total of £3,250 in compensation.

Two of the complaints the council settled were about adult care services. In one case the council delayed for four months in providing 24 hour care, seven days a week for the complainant's elderly and disabled father. It also failed to communicate adequately with the complainant and failed to assess the complainant's needs as a carer, or those of each of her parents. The council had already upheld the complaint in full but had only offered £500 compensation. After our involvement the council agreed to increase the compensation to £2,500 and compensate the complainant for loss of earnings. This sum represented £1,000 for the considerable anxiety caused to the complainant and her family, £250 for the failures in communication and £1250 in respect of the four months delay in providing the 24/7 at home care service for her father.

In the second complaint the council missed or severely delayed a number of home care calls which should have been made to the complainant over a four month period in 2009. These failures were exacerbated by the fact that the council had just made a series of recommendations following a complaint about earlier missed calls which should have resulted in the implementation of service improvements. The complainant was caused distress and inconvenience and the complainant's family were put to considerable time and trouble in pursuing the complaint. The council conducted an internal review and made the following recommendations:

- an apology to the complainant and family;
- guidelines for carers regarding meeting up at the start of a shift to be extended to agency workers as well as council staff;
- rotas to be checked by two team leaders each week to ensure they are accurately transferred into the rota diary;
- all managers and staff to be as honest as possible with customers when mistakes are made;
- team leaders on call or care staff on duty to have access to customer contact details in the event of delays to planned calls; and
- written guidance to be issued about seeking medical advice if medication is not administered at the appropriate time for example doses of medications which may react with each other if too close together or too far apart.

The council also agreed to schedule a review to make sure the changes were being complied with and paid the complainant £250 for their time and trouble in pursuing the complaint.

In another settled case about housing repairs the council delayed for ten weeks in completing repairs to the heating and hot water system causing inconvenience to the complainant. The council agreed to pay the complainant £200 compensation.

In the fourth settled case about anti-social behaviour and excessive noise from a neighbour, the

council had delayed for three months in acting on the complaints. During this period it could have carried out an investigation and referred the case to the Environmental Protection Unit who would then have been able to take enforcement action at an earlier stage. The complainant and their family suffered disturbance and difficulty at an especially critical time for the family, as they had a new-born baby. The council apologised and paid £300 compensation.

I am grateful to the council for its help in settling these complaints.

### **Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman**

We made formal enquiries on eight complaints in 2009/10. In the annual review for 2008/09 my predecessor commented that at 35.3 days the council's average response times was still significantly outside our target time of 28 days. I am concerned to report that this has worsened significantly to 47.6 days. The problem this year has been exacerbated by the time taken to respond to two complaints about adult care services. In one the council took 140 days to respond and in the other 63 days. These figures are clearly unacceptable and I hope the council will take immediate steps to improve its performance in this area. If I discount these figures the average is brought down to 29.7 days only marginally outside our target time and I note there has been a particular improvement in the response time to planning and building control complaints (17.5 days) for which I am grateful.

### **Training in complaint handling**

I would like to take this opportunity to remind the council that part of our role is to provide advice and guidance about good administrative practice. We offer training courses for all levels of local authority staff in complaints handling and investigation. All courses are presented by experienced investigators. They give participants the opportunity to practise the skills needed to deal with complaints positively and efficiently. We can also provide customised courses to help authorities to deal with particular issues and occasional open courses for individuals from different authorities.

I have enclosed some information on the full range of courses available together with contact details for enquiries and bookings.

### **Conclusions**

I welcome this opportunity to give you my reflections about the complaints my office has dealt with over the past year. I hope that you find the information and assessment provided useful when seeking improvements to your authority's services.

**Dr Jane Martin  
Local Government Ombudsman  
The Oaks No 2  
Westwood Way  
Westwood Business Park  
Coventry  
CV4 8JB**

**June 2010**

## Section 2: LGO developments

### Introduction

This annual review also provides an opportunity to bring councils up to date on developments in the LGO and to seek feedback.

### New schools complaints service launched

In April 2010 we launched the first pilot phase of a complaints service extending our jurisdiction to consider parent and pupil complaints about state schools in four local authority areas. This power was introduced by the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act 2009.

The first phase involves schools in Barking and Dagenham, Cambridgeshire, Medway and Sefton. The Secretary of State no longer considers complaints about schools in these areas. In September the schools in a further 10 local authority areas are set to join the pilot phase.

We are working closely with colleagues in the pilot areas and their schools, including providing training and information sessions, to shape the design and delivery of the new service. It is intended that by September 2011 our jurisdiction will cover all state schools in England.

A new team in each office now deals with all complaints about children's services and education on behalf of the Ombudsman. Arrangements for cooperation with Ofsted on related work areas have been agreed.

For further information see the new schools pages on our website at [www.lgo.org.uk/schools/](http://www.lgo.org.uk/schools/)

### Adult social care: new powers from October

The Health Act 2009 extended the Ombudsmen's powers to investigate complaints about privately arranged and funded adult social care. These powers come into effect from 1 October 2010 (or when the Care Quality Commission has re-registered all adult care providers undertaking regulated activity). Provision of care that is arranged by an individual and funded from direct payments comes within this new jurisdiction.

Each Ombudsman has set up a team to deal with all adult social care complaints on their behalf. We expect that many complaints from people who have arranged and funded their care will involve the actions of both the local authority and the care provider. We are developing information-sharing agreements with the Care Quality Commission and with councils in their roles as adult safeguarding leads and service commissioners.

### Council first

We introduced our Council first procedure in April last year. With some exceptions, we require complainants to go through all stages of a council's own complaints procedure before we will consider the complaint. It aims to build on the improved handling of complaints by councils.

We are going to research the views of people whose complaints have been referred to councils as premature. We are also still keen to hear from councils about how the procedure is working, particularly on the exception categories. Details of the categories of complaint that are normally treated as exceptions are on our website at [www.lgo.org.uk/guide-for-advisers/council-response](http://www.lgo.org.uk/guide-for-advisers/council-response)

### **Training in complaint handling**

Demand for our training in complaint handling has remained high, with 118 courses delivered over the year to 53 different authorities. Our core Effective Complaint Handling course is still the most popular – we ran some of these as open courses for groups of staff from different authorities. These are designed to assist those authorities that wish to train small numbers of staff and give them an opportunity to share ideas and experience with other authorities.

The new Effective Complaint Handling in Adult Social Care course, driven by the introduction of the new statutory complaints arrangements in health and adult social care in April 2009, was also popular. It accounted for just over a third of bookings.

Over the next year we intend to carry out a thorough review of local authority training needs to ensure that the programme continues to deliver learning outcomes that improve complaint handling by councils.

### **Statements of reasons**

Last year we consulted councils on our broad proposals for introducing statements of reasons on the individual decisions of an Ombudsman following the investigation of a complaint. We received very supportive and constructive feedback on the proposals, which aim to provide greater transparency and increase understanding of our work. Since then we have been carrying out more detailed work, including our new powers. We intend to introduce the new arrangements in the near future.

### **Delivering public value**

We hope this information gives you an insight into the major changes happening within the LGO, many of which will have a direct impact on your authority. We will keep you up to date through LGO Link as each development progresses, but if there is anything you wish to discuss in the meantime please let me know.

Mindful of the current economic climate, financial stringencies and our public accountability, we are determined to continue to increase the efficiency, cost-effectiveness and public value of our work.

**Dr Jane Martin  
Local Government Ombudsman  
The Oaks No 2  
Westwood Way  
Westwood Business Park  
Coventry  
CV4 8JB**

**June 2010**

## Appendix 1: Notes to assist interpretation of the statistics 2009/10

### Table 1. LGO Advice Team: Enquiries and complaints received

This information shows the number of enquiries and complaints received by the LGO, broken down by service area and in total. It also shows how these were dealt with, as follows.

**Premature complaints:** The LGO does not normally consider a complaint unless a council has first had an opportunity to deal with that complaint itself. So if someone complains to the LGO without having taken the matter up with a council, the LGO will either refer it back to the council as a 'premature complaint' to see if the council can itself resolve the matter, or give advice to the enquirer that their complaint is premature.

**Advice given:** These are enquiries where the LGO Advice Team has given advice on why the LGO would not be able to consider the complaint, other than the complaint is premature. For example, the complaint may clearly be outside the LGO's jurisdiction.

**Forwarded to the investigative team (resubmitted premature and new):** These are new cases forwarded to the Investigative Team for further consideration and cases where the complainant has resubmitted their complaint to the LGO after it has been put to the council.

### Table 2. Investigative Team: Decisions

This information records the number of decisions made by the LGO Investigative Team, broken down by outcome, within the period given. **This number will not be the same as the number of complaints forwarded from the LGO Advice Team** because some complaints decided in 2009/10 will already have been in hand at the beginning of the year, and some forwarded to the Investigative Team during 2009/10 will still be in hand at the end of the year. Below we set out a key explaining the outcome categories.

**MI reps:** where the LGO has concluded an investigation and issued a formal report finding maladministration causing injustice.

**LS (local settlements):** decisions by letter discontinuing our investigation because action has been agreed by the authority and accepted by the LGO as a satisfactory outcome for the complainant.

**M reps:** where the LGO has concluded an investigation and issued a formal report finding maladministration but causing no injustice to the complainant.

**NM reps:** where the LGO has concluded an investigation and issued a formal report finding no maladministration by the council.

**No mal:** decisions by letter discontinuing an investigation because we have found no, or insufficient, evidence of maladministration.

**Omb disc:** decisions by letter discontinuing an investigation in which we have exercised the LGO's general discretion not to pursue the complaint. This can be for a variety of reasons, but the most common is that we have found no or insufficient injustice to warrant pursuing the matter further.

**Outside jurisdiction:** these are cases which were outside the LGO's jurisdiction.

### **Table 3. Response times**

These figures record the average time the council takes to respond to our first enquiries on a complaint. We measure this in calendar days from the date we send our letter/fax/email to the date that we receive a substantive response from the council. The council's figures may differ somewhat, since they are likely to be recorded from the date the council receives our letter until the despatch of its response.–

### **Table 4. Average local authority response times 2009/10**

This table gives comparative figures for average response times by authorities in England, by type of authority, within three time bands.

**LGO Advice Team**

Enquiries and complaints received	Adult care services	Children and family services	Housing	Benefits	Public Finance inc. Local Taxation	Planning and building control	Transport and highways	Other	Total
Formal/informal premature complaints	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	6
Advice given	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	6
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted premature)	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	7
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	8	1	5	1	0	1	3	4	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>42</b>

**Investigative Team**

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
2009 / 2010	1	4	0	0	13	3	4	25

**Average local authority resp times 01/04/2009 to 31/03/2010**

Response times	FIRST ENQUIRIES	
	No. of First Enquiries	Avg no. of days to respond
1/04/2009 / 31/03/2010	8	47.6
2008 / 2009	20	35.3
2007 / 2008	20	35.3

Types of authority	<= 28 days %	29 - 35 days %	> = 36 days %
District Councils	61	22	17
Unitary Authorities	68	26	6
Metropolitan Authorities	70	22	8
County Councils	58	32	10
London Boroughs	52	36	12
National Parks Authorities	60	20	20

This page is intentionally left blank

### Number & Type of Complaints Received By CYC Since 1 January 2010

	FOI Requests	Complaints			Ombudsman	Councillor Enq's	MPs Enq's	Feedback / Enquiries
		Stages						
		1	2	3				
<b>Jan 2010 to 31 Mar 2010 - Totals</b>	195	4211	8	4	16	355	43	1451
Chief Execs	21	3878			11		5	
City Strategy	12	2	0	0	1	127		147
Neighbourhood Services	24	273	0	0	0	159		1211
HASS	52	50	7	4	4	68	37	78
LCCS	30	5	1	0		1	1	1
Resources	35	3						14
Veritau (including cross - directorate)	21							
<b>1 Apr 2010 to 31 Oct 2010 - Totals</b>	430	700	30	14	31	4387	29	6484
Adults, Children and Education	143	91	25	11	10	130	19	251
Chief Execs	32	90			16		10	
City Strategy	42	0	5	1	4	1229		86
Communities and Neighbourhoods	80	513	0	2	1	3026		6119
Customer & Business Support Services	91	6				2		28
Veritau (including cross - directorate)	42							
<b>Totals inc directorate changes - 1 Jan to Oct 2010</b>	625	4911	38	18	47	4742	72	7935

This page is intentionally left blank