

**The Local Government Ombudsman's
Annual Review**

Southampton 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

| | |
|--|----------|
| Section 1: Complaints about Southampton City Council 2009/10..... | 3 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Enquiries and complaints received..... | 3 |
| Complaint outcomes..... | 3 |
| Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman..... | 4 |
| Training in complaint handling..... | 4 |
| Conclusions..... | 5 |
| Section 2: LGO developments..... | 6 |
| 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 |
| Appendix 1: Notes to assist interpretation of the statistics 2009/10..... | 8 |
| Appendix 2: Local authority report 2009/10 | |

Section 1: Complaints about Southampton City Council 2009/10

Introduction

This annual review provides a summary of the complaints we have dealt with about Southampton 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 53 enquiries and contacts relating to the council. A total of 15 of these were about housing, eight about public finance, seven about education, and six about planning and building control. The remainder covered a range of other services including highways and transport, adult care services and services for children and families.

A total of 38 were passed to the investigative team (33 new complaints and five resubmitted premature complaints). We treated eight complaints as premature and either referred them to the council or advised the complainant to make a complaint direct. In a further seven cases we gave the complainant advice.

This compares with 59 complaints and enquiries in 2008/09, 24 of which were forwarded to the investigative team. We expect to see slight fluctuations of this kind over time.

Complaint outcomes

We decided 28 complaints against the council during the year. In eight cases we found no evidence of maladministration, and six complaints were outside our jurisdiction. In a further seven cases we exercised discretion not to investigate further. Typically these are cases where even though there may have been some fault by the council there is no significant injustice to the complainant. The council agreed to remedy the other seven complaints by local settlement.

Reports

When we complete an investigation, we generally issue a report. This year we issued no reports against your council.

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 seven were local settlements, representing 31.8% of complaints decided. We recommended that the council should pay a total of £4525 in compensation in 2009/10. In this letter I shall deal with some of the more

noteworthy examples.

Children and family services

We found that the council had failed to properly assess the needs of a young lady with learning disabilities on reaching the age of 16 including significant delays in the process.

My predecessor welcomed the council's agreement to treat the young lady as a 'former relevant child', but considered that the council could reasonably have made that decision sooner as it had all the relevant information before it during the statutory complaints process. The council agreed to pay £3,000 to the young lady and to finalise a pathway plan promptly.

The council also agreed to pay £500 to the complainant for his considerable time and trouble in pursuing the complaint.

Housing sales/leaseholds

The complainant's flat was in a block of flats owned by the council. When the roof was replaced her flat was damaged by rainwater penetrating into the property. There was a four month delay in the council arranging for an inspection of the flat to assess any repairs needed which resulted in distress and inconvenience to the complainant. Following our enquiry the council agreed to pay £200 compensation.

Local taxation

Three local taxation cases were settled. All concerned maladministration in enforcement action taken by the council for council tax arrears. The council paid the three complainants a total of £775.

In one complaint, the council issued a summons for non-payment when council tax had been received but not processed by the council. Seasonal postal delays at Christmas and New Year delayed receipt of the payment by the council and this was followed by delay in processing the payment. The council promptly agreed to apologise and pay compensation.

In the other two cases, the account was up to date but the summons issued, and bailiff letters threatening removal of goods caused considerable distress to the complainants. We recommended £350 compensation in each case.

Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman

We made formal enquiries on 19 complaints this year. In the annual review for 2009, my predecessor congratulated the council on its consistently good response times to our enquiries in recent years. In 2009/10 the council took an average of 21.4 days to reply to our enquiries, which continues the council's excellent record. Our time target of 28 days was only exceeded once – an education complaint which was three days overdue. I commend the average 14.5 days response time achieved in public finance cases.

Training in complaint handling

My predecessor mentioned in last year's Annual Review that in previous years we have provided training in Effective Complaint Handling to staff from your authority. We have extended the range of courses we provide and 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/

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.

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 | Education | Housing | Benefits | Public Finance inc. Local Taxation | Planning and building control | Transport and highways | Other | Total |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Formal/informal premature complaints | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Advice given | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Forwarded to investigative team (new) | 2 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 33 |
| Total | 2 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 53 |

Investigative Team

| Decisions | MI reps | LS | M reps | NM reps | No mal | Omb disc | Outside jurisdiction | Total |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| 2009 / 2010 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 28 |

| Response times | FIRST ENQUIRIES | |
|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| | No. of First Enquiries | Avg no. of days to respond |
| 1/04/2009 / 31/03/2010 | 19 | 21.4 |
| 2008 / 2009 | 17 | 21.1 |
| 2007 / 2008 | 19 | 24.8 |

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

| 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 |