

**The Local Government Ombudsman's
Annual Review
London Borough of Camden
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

Section 1: Complaints about the London Borough of Camden 2009/10.	3
Introduction.....	3
Enquiries and complaints received.....	3
Complaint outcomes.....	3
Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman.....	9
Training in complaint handling.....	10
Conclusions.....	10
Section 2: LGO developments.....	11
Introduction.....	11
New schools complaints service launched.....	11
Adult social care: new powers from October.....	11
Council first.....	11
Training in complaint handling.....	12
Statements of reasons.....	12
Delivering public value.....	12
Appendix 1: Notes to assist interpretation of the statistics 2009/10.....	13
Appendix 2: Local authority report 2009/10	

Section 1: Complaints about the London Borough of Camden 2009/10

Introduction

This annual review provides a summary of the complaints we have dealt with about the London Borough of Camden. 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 there were 185 enquiries and complaints about your Council, compared to 218 in the previous year. Thirty two complaints were premature (because the Council had not yet had an opportunity to deal with the matter itself) and 31 enquirers were given advice.

As previously, there were many more contacts about housing (70) than for any other service area, although there were contacts across the range of the Council's services. Transport and highways received 17 contacts and planning and building control 16. There were also 42 enquiries and complaints in our 'other' category, which includes anti social behaviour and environmental health.

Over a third (46) of the 122 complaints forwarded to the investigative team to consider were about housing. About half of these (22) concerned housing repairs, and 10 were about housing sales/leaseholds. The next largest group was in our 'other' category: there were 29 of these, of which 18 related to anti social behaviour. Transport and highways came next, generating 13 complaints. Most of these (10) were about parking.

Complaint outcomes

This year I came to a decision on 109 complaints against your Council.

I exercised my discretion not to pursue investigations into 22 complaints, including cases where the level of injustice was insufficient to justify expending further resources on investigating the matter, or the claimed injustice did not flow from any fault on the part of the Council. Seven of these concerned parking issues. I also closed 23 complaints because there was either no or insufficient evidence of fault to warrant further investigation.

During the course of one of these, a successful appeal against the refusal of a place in a school's infant class, was referred to. At the appeal hearing, the parents' case against the offered place and to support the case for admission to their choice of school, had included the need for an early start for the child and the difficulties in getting to the offered school, from the parent's place of work, within a reasonable time in an emergency. These issues did not appear to satisfy the legal requirement for a successful appeal, which talks of a decision to refuse admission being "perverse" and "beyond the range of responses open to a reasonable decision maker". I therefore asked the Council to consider additional training for appeal panel members. Another case, concerning parking tickets and bailiffs' action was largely outside my jurisdiction. But it did draw attention to

inconsistencies in the operation of debt recovery charges, and the Council agreed to make improvements for the future.

A further 15 complaints were outside my jurisdiction, generally because there was an alternative remedy which it was reasonable to have expected the complainant to pursue. Many of these concerned housing issues or parking tickets.

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 94 complaints within my jurisdiction which we decided, 52.1% (49) resulted in local settlements. This is significantly higher than both the national average and the level against your Council during the previous year (33.1%). The settlements we agreed resulted in the Council paying £26,119 compensation (nearly three times more than the previous year), as well as changing procedures and, importantly, apologising for failings.

Complaints by subject area

Housing

I decided a total of 42 housing complaints. There were two homelessness cases; I found no fault in one and concluded the other was outside my jurisdiction because there was a right of appeal to the courts which it was reasonable to pursue. I received one complaint about private housing repair notices which I could not investigate because the complainant had already appealed to the Residential Property Tribunal.

Housing repairs

I came to a decision on 23 disrepair complaints. I concluded that one was outside my jurisdiction because the matters dated back too far for me reasonably to consider, and I exercised my discretion not to pursue two: one because there was insufficient injustice to justify an investigation and the other because it did not appear the complainants had made clear to the Council what their outstanding concerns were. I found there had been no fault by the Council in one case.

I agreed local settlements in all of the remaining 19 cases. This is over 80 per cent of those complaints which were within my jurisdiction and is more than in the previous year (which was itself a higher figure than normal).

A number of these complaints concerned significant delay in resolving water leaks. In one case the Council delayed for two years in properly investigating and addressing the issue: it agreed to pay £1,500 in recognition of this. In another there was also a two year delay in addressing a water leak with a further year's delay in carrying out other repairs: the Council agreed to pay £1,350 here. And in another case the Council failed to properly deal with a flooding incident which damaged a complainants property. It did not begin to address the disrepair issues arising from the flooding until around ten weeks after the incident and there was then further delay in doing the works that had been agreed. £750 was paid here. There was also delay in addressing disrepair caused by water leaks in five other cases, for which the Council agreed total compensation of £2,050.

Another significant settlement concerned subsidence first reported by the complainant in 2003. The Council did take some action, but there was considerable delay in resolving the matter. While there were legitimate reasons for some of this, there were inexplicable periods when no action was taken. However, as a result of the investigation I welcomed the Council's proposal to arrange for the substantial remedial works to be done and to pay £1,550 compensation for the delay, disturbance and distress.

In a number of complaints the failure by the Council to take action had a significant impact on the ability of tenants to enjoy their properties. In one case, delay in repairing a boiler meant the complainant (who had serious health issues) was without heating or hot water for ten weeks over the winter period: the Council agreed to pay £750 in recognition of injustice here. In another, it did not take effective action to deal with mice infestation at the complainant's property; it said it would fill in the holes that seemed to be the cause of the problem, but did not do so. It agreed to pay compensation and complete the work.

In one case the complainant was unable to move into the property she had been allocated because the Council had failed to install a working toilet. Following my involvement it agreed to provide temporary accommodation for the complainant and pay compensation for the delay in carrying out the work.

A number of cases related to failure by the Council to carry out action that had previously been agreed with the complainant. With one complaint, it had failed to do repairs that had been agreed four years earlier. And although the Council's response to the complaint was swift, even after my involvement there was then further delay in carrying out the work. Another long delay concerned repairs to the complainant's property which should have been completed in March 2007, but which were only carried out following the complaint to me. These repairs were of a relatively minor nature, but the Council agreed to pay the complainant £500 in recognition of the inconvenience caused.

There were also examples of the Council failing to carry out settlements of complaints that had been agreed with me. In one case it had previously agreed to carry out an inspection of the complainant's property, so there would be a shared understanding of what work needed to be done. But there was a delay of over a year in doing so. This error was then compounded by the Council wrongly promising to move the complainant while any necessary works were carried out. The Council agreed to pay £1,000 in recognition of the delay in carrying out an inspection, and to honour its commitment to offer an alternative property.

The Council agreed with me to carry out work to another complainant's home, but then failed to do so within a reasonable timescale. Following a further complaint, it agreed to pay the complainant £250 together with a further £50 for each month the works remained outstanding. While I welcomed the proactive approach the Council has taken to resolving matters, many problems could have been avoided if the Council had kept to its agreement.

A previous complaint to me, about a leak into the complainant's garage, was addressed by its agreement to pay £10 per week until a repair was made, but the Council stopped making the payment because it offered what it felt was a suitable alternative garage. But the complainant argued their disability meant the replacement was inappropriate. Medical evidence supported this view and, following my intervention, the Council agreed to resume payments until a suitable alternative could be offered.

In my annual review last year, I said the disrepair cases I had seen did not suggest the Council's housing performance had improved. Disappointingly, the complaints this year do not reflect any improvement in the service. I would therefore be grateful for any observations the Council may have on this service area and how it might be improved.

Housing allocations

I decided seven housing allocation complaints. I found no fault in two and exercised my discretion not to pursue one because, while there had been some fault by the Council, this had not adversely affected the complainant's housing application.

I agreed local settlements in the remaining four cases. In one the Council had prevented the complainant carrying out a home swap because of concerns about under occupation of the property she wanted to move to. However, it accepted it had not acted in accordance with policy in doing so and agreed to pay £500 compensation and arrange a like for like home swap as soon as possible.

In the other three cases the Council provided inaccurate information to the complainants. In the first this related to their housing application registration date; the matter was resolved with its agreement to backdate this. In the second the complainants were wrongly informed they had been successful in bidding for a property when this was not the case (though the matter was corrected the next day) and the Council also failed to attend a property viewing. The Council had already offered compensation for this but also agreed to apologise to the complainants and committed itself to act more sensitively in its dealings with them in future. In the final case the Council had provided confusing information over the number of points the complainant's application had been awarded; there was also then delay in addressing the complaint they made about this. The Council agreed to pay them £100 to address the injustice caused.

Housing sales / leaseholds

I decided seven complaints in this area. I found no fault in one and concluded that three were outside my jurisdiction because the complainant had alternative appeal rights to the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal and it was reasonable to expect them to use these rights. I exercised my discretion not to pursue one because there was insufficient injustice to justify doing so.

I agreed two local settlements. In one case there was delay by the Council in addressing water leaks into the complainant's property from the flat above. Although as a leaseholder the complainant had an alternative remedy for these matters, I exercised my discretion to consider them because of the length of time the problems had been ongoing and because of the Council's apparent failure to follow up on matters raised through its complaints procedure. Following my intervention the Council agreed to take action to stop the leaks and carry out repairs. It also agreed to pay the complainant £500.

In the other case the issues related to payments made by the complainant towards their service charges. But even though the Council had not allocated these in the way the complainant had expected, they owe the Council money which they agreed to pay.

Managing tenancies

I decided two complaints in this area: both were local settlements. In one case the complainant had been temporarily rehoused due to a fire in a neighbouring property. They sought repayment of some of the additional costs incurred as a result. Although they did not have receipts, the Council agreed to pay £100 as a goodwill gesture.

In the other case a leaseholder was concerned the Council was not enforcing a tenancy condition which required suitable floor coverings to be laid in their properties, and was suffering noise problems as a result. The Council accepted there had been delay in dealing with this matter and agreed to pay the complainant £500 together and outlined the action it now proposed to take.

Adult care services

I decided eight complaints about adult care services. I concluded the Council was not at fault in three. One case was outside my jurisdiction because the complainant had an alternative court remedy which it was reasonable for them to use. I exercised my discretion not to pursue the remaining two complaints: in one case this was because, although there had been some delay by

the Council, this had not caused significant injustice to the complainant; and in the other there was ongoing action by the Council which it seemed might resolve matters.

There were two local settlements. In one case the complainant had to move from supported accommodation at short notice, but there were significant disrepair problems with the new housing. The Council delayed unreasonably in addressing the issues raised by the complainant but, when the matter came to me, the Council had already thoroughly investigated matters and I was satisfied its proposed apology and compensation of £5,300 was an appropriate remedy.

The other local settlement related to the Council's decision to describe a complainant as vexatious when it had not properly considered whether this was so. I was satisfied the Council's apology for this and its agreement to consider changes to its procedures was an appropriate way of addressing this issue.

Children's and family services

I came to a decision on four complaints in this area. I concluded the Council was not at fault in one case and agreed three local settlements. All three involved, at least in part, issues of poor record keeping by the Council.

In the first case the Council failed to inform the complainant they had the right to refuse the accommodation being provided for their daughter under the Children Act, did not seek formal consent for this placement, and did not keep proper records. I felt the payment of £2,000 the Council had already agreed here was reasonable but, following my intervention, the Council also agreed to pay for mediation between the complainant and their daughter. I also welcomed its agreement to produce a new leaflet explaining relevant procedures, and to remind social workers of the need to keep proper records.

In another case the Council had met with the complainant to discuss serious and proven concerns about an assault on their son. But despite the important nature of the meeting no record was kept of this. The Council agreed to place the complainant's record of the meeting on file and pay them £250.

In the third case the Council had already accepted significant fault in relation to very poor social work practice affecting a complainant which dated back many years, including loss of records. While too long had passed for me to consider the substantive issues, I did consider whether the proposed remedy was appropriate. It did not seem to fully reflect the distress and inconvenience caused to the complainant, the lost opportunities for action to be taken and the injustice caused by the loss of records. As a result, the Council agreed to increase the compensation offered. This was a very unusual case, and discussions are ongoing between my staff and the Council to see what lessons can be learnt.

Education

I decided four education cases. One was outside my jurisdiction because the complainant had a right of appeal to the Special Educational Needs and Disability Tribunal which it was reasonable for them to use. In two school admissions cases there was no evidence of fault by the Council.

I agreed a local settlement of one complaint, about alleged failure by the Council to assess entitlement for tuition fees. While there was no fault in the initial assessment there was some delay by the Council in reviewing matters: I felt the Council's award of £600 of discretionary assistance to the complainant was a reasonable way of addressing the inconvenience caused by this.

Planning and building control

I decided seven complaints about planning and building control matters. Three related to planning applications, three more were about enforcement and one was about building control.

In three cases I found no fault by the Council and I exercised my discretion not to pursue a further three. In all of these (two of which were from the same complainant) this was because there was insufficient injustice to justify doing so.

I agreed one local settlement. This related to the Council's decision on whether to take enforcement action against unauthorised development. While I felt the decision was entirely reasonable, the Council failed properly to deal with a complaint about this. It agreed to pay £50 to address this injustice.

Transport and highways

I came to a decision on 12 complaints in this area. Most concerned parking. Three were outside my jurisdiction because the complainants had an alternative right of appeal to the Parking and Traffic Appeals Service; I would generally expect complainants to make use of this remedy.

In five cases I exercised my discretion not to pursue the matter. In one case this was because I could not resolve the difference of view between the Council and complainant about what had occurred when a penalty charge notice (PCN) was issued. In another there was a dispute over whether the complainant had received notification of the PCN; however the appropriate way to resolve this was for them to make a witness statement. In the remaining three cases there was insufficient injustice to the complainant to justify me considering the matter further.

I agreed one local settlement, about a PCN which the complainant believed was wrongly issued. The complainant only found evidence in support of this view after they had paid the fine. The complainant contacted the Council about this, but had received no response for six months. The Council agreed to pay £60 in recognition of injustice arising from this fault. As this was the amount the complainant was seeking to recover, I saw no grounds to pursue matters further.

The remaining complaints were about highways and traffic management. I found no fault in one and exercised my discretion not to pursue a further two; in one case because the matter concerned a policy decision which the Council was entitled to reach and in the other because there was insufficient injustice to the complainant to warrant me doing so.

Public finance

During the year I received seven complaints in this area; all but one related to local taxation. One was outside my jurisdiction because the complainant had an alternative right of appeal to the Valuation Tribunal which I considered they could reasonably pursue. I found no fault in one and exercised my discretion not to pursue a further two; in both cases because there was insufficient injustice to justify doing so.

I agreed two local settlements. In both cases this was because the Council had issued a summons for non payment of council tax when this should not have taken place; in both the Council was quick to agree my proposed remedy.

The other complaint related to public finance and was not something I could consider because it related to matters that had already been considered by the courts.

Other

This category covers a range of issues, but the ones which generated most complaints related to anti social behaviour (15), and environmental health (4).

Anti social behaviour

Of the 15 cases I considered, I found no fault in five. I exercised my discretion not to pursue one because the claimed injustice did not flow from fault by the Council.

I agreed local settlements in the remaining nine cases. Five related to noise nuisance which seemed to be caused or exacerbated by an absence of sound absorbing floor coverings: often wood floors had been laid. There was delay by the Council in carrying out visits to establish the position, and in some cases problems in then taking action to address identified issues. Following my intervention the Council took further action and compensation totalling £1,650 was paid. The Council also accepted fault in a case where it had received a complaint but taken no action; it agreed to pay £50 to the complainant here.

In another case the Council had agreed to take steps which would prevent improper use of the communal areas and 'design out' nuisance from individuals congregating near the complainant's door. But there was delay in doing so for which it agreed to pay £600 compensation, with a further £50 per month until the access issues were addressed.

In the other two cases the Council agreed to take action which I considered a reasonable way of addressing the complaint; in one by installing noise monitoring equipment to assess the nature and extent of the problem caused and in the other by changing a communal door which was causing noise disturbance to the complainant.

Environmental health

I found no fault in two complaints in this area and agreed local settlements in the other two.

One complaint was about fly tipping. I did not find fault in the way the Council had responded to the issues raised by the complainant, but it agreed to provide a specific officer who the complainant could approach about issues. This was a reasonable settlement of the complaint made to me.

The other complaint was about noise nuisance. Here, there had been delay by the Council in considering the matter, but I did not believe this had affected the decision it reached. Nevertheless communication with the complainant should have been better and the Council said it would pay £100 in recognition of this; as there was delay in making this payment it agreed to pay a further £10 for each month the amount remained unpaid.

Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman

We ask councils to respond to our enquiries within 28 days. The Council's average response time was 30.5 days, a welcome improvement on the previous year, although still outside my target.

Housing was the area on which I made most inquiries and I note that there has also been an improvement in its average response time since last year. But there was a wide range: from two to 95 days (on a repairs case). Response times for adult care services (where one response which took 86 days spoilt the performance), benefits and education complaints were all significantly higher than my target. I am sure that with improvements in these service areas it will be possible to meet my target in the coming year.

As in previous years there are many positive comments about the assistance provided by the

Central Complaints Unit and the excellent attitude of officers to resolving complaints quickly and effectively. I note however that there do appear to have been some difficulties in those officers obtaining speedy responses from other council departments.

I am pleased that three of your officers were able to attend one of our seminars on *Making experience count* for adult social care complaints officers, and trust they found it useful.

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.

Tony Redmond
Local Government Ombudsman
10th floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

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/

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

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.

Tony Redmond
Local Government Ombudsman
10th floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

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	Education	Housing	Benefits	Public Finance inc. Local Taxation	Planning and building control	Transport and highways	Other	Total
Formal/informal premature complaints	3	2	1	12	0	3	7	1	4	33
Advice given	0	3	0	12	2	0	2	3	9	31
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	1	0	1	3	1	2	2	1	2	13
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	5	4	3	43	2	7	6	12	27	109
Total	9	9	5	70	5	12	17	17	42	186

Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
2009 / 2010	0	49	0	0	23	22	15	109

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	63	30.5
2008 / 2009	60	33.2
2007 / 2008	48	29.8

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