

18 July 2018

By email

Angie Ridgwell
Interim Chief Executive
Lancashire County Council

Dear Angie Ridgwell,

Annual Review letter 2018

I write to you with our annual summary of statistics on the complaints made to the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO) about your authority for the year ended 31 March 2018. The enclosed tables present the number of complaints and enquiries received about your authority and the decisions we made during the period. I hope this information will prove helpful in assessing your authority's performance in handling complaints.

Complaint statistics

In providing these statistics, I would stress that the volume of complaints does not, in itself, indicate the quality of the council's performance. High volumes of complaints can be a sign of an open, learning organisation, as well as sometimes being an early warning of wider problems. Low complaint volumes can be a worrying sign that an organisation is not alive to user feedback, rather than always being an indicator that all is well. So, I would encourage you to use these figures as the start of a conversation, rather than an absolute measure of corporate health. One of the most significant statistics attached is the number of upheld complaints. This shows how frequently we find fault with the council when we investigate. Equally importantly, we also give a figure for the number of cases where we decided your authority had offered a satisfactory remedy during the local complaints process. Both figures provide important insights.

I want to emphasise the statistics in this letter reflect the data we hold, and may not necessarily align with the data your authority holds. For example, our numbers include enquiries from people we signpost back to the authority, some of whom may never contact you.

In line with usual practice, we are publishing our annual data for all authorities on our website, alongside an annual review of local government complaints. The aim of this is to be transparent and provide information that aids the scrutiny of local services.

It is essential that councils respond to our requests for information about complaints made against them and do so in a timely way. Our records note the Council responded to our requests promptly most of the time. However, there were a few cases where we experienced problems in getting the level of detail we had requested. This included a case where the

Council sent a summary when we had asked for case notes and two cases where it did not answer the questions we had asked directly which led us to need to ask further follow-up questions.

In another case, about the support provided to special guardians we found fault causing injustice, I was concerned to see after having agreed to carry out our recommendations, the Council failed to complete them all. This has resulted in a further investigation and we will report on our findings in due course.

This year I issued two public reports about your Council.

My first report concerned a man who was not provided with a suitable chair to meet his needs after an occupational therapy assessment. The Council's delays left the complainant's husband without a suitable chair for the last few months of his life. This caused discomfort and indignity, with the husband sliding onto the floor from his unsuitable chair and his wife lifting him back up. He had to spend the last few weeks of his life in bed which caused unnecessary distress to them both. The Council responded positively to our report. It apologised to the wife and paid her £750 for distress. It also took action to ensure officers manage their work effectively and without delay, and produced a schedule for filling Occupational Therapist vacancies.

The second report concerned the Council's failure to find suitable long-term accommodation for a young man with severe learning difficulties. An emergency respite placement at a short breaks service lasted over two years. The Council delayed finding suitable accommodation. There was confusion and a lack of consistency over what living arrangement was suitable. It also failed to cease or amend his Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan when he could no longer attend college. The Council made a payment to the young man. It also apologised and made a payment to his representative, as agreed. It carried out a review of his EHC plan, which it then ceased. But the priority was to find him suitable long-term accommodation. The Council identified a property at the time we published the report in November. We had some concerns the situation was drifting which the Council explained was due to snagging issues at the property and the need to recruit and train suitable staff through the care provider. However, the complainant moved into his long-term property in March and the Council advised in April that he was very settled and appeared to be enjoying life in his new home. I am pleased there was a positive outcome.

On a positive note, I wrote to you earlier this year to express our thanks appreciation at the way the Council addressed the findings we made on one of our investigations regarding a Disabled Facilities Grant. Having agreed to our recommendations, your Council carried out extensive work to improve understanding and collaboration with district councils in Lancashire. This will hopefully avoid future problems and improve the experience for residents. It demonstrates a willingness to learn from mistakes and to put in place practical solutions.

Future development of annual review letters

Last year, we highlighted our plans to move away from a simplistic focus on complaint volumes and instead turn focus onto the lessons that can be learned and the wider improvements we can achieve through our recommendations to improve services for the many. We have produced a new [corporate strategy](#) for 2018-21 which commits us to more comprehensively publish information about the outcomes of our investigations and the occasions our recommendations result in improvements to local services.

We will be providing this broader range of data for the first time in next year's letters, as well as creating an interactive map of local authority performance on our website. We believe this will lead to improved transparency of our work, as well as providing increased recognition to

the improvements councils have agreed to make following our interventions. We will be seeking views from councils on the future format of our annual letters early next year.

Supporting local scrutiny

One of the purposes of our annual letters to councils is to help ensure learning from complaints informs scrutiny at the local level. Sharing the learning from our investigations and supporting the democratic scrutiny of public services continues to be one of our key priorities. We have created a dedicated section of our website which contains a host of information to help scrutiny committees and councillors to hold their authority to account – complaints data, decision statements, public interest reports, focus reports and scrutiny questions. This can be found at www.lgo.org.uk/scrutiny. I would be grateful if you could encourage your elected members and scrutiny committees to make use of these resources.

Learning from complaints to improve services

We share the issues we see in our investigations to help councils learn from the issues others have experienced and avoid making the same mistakes. We do this through the [reports](#) and other resources we publish. Over the last year, we have seen examples of councils adopting a positive attitude towards complaints and working constructively with us to remedy injustices and take on board the learning from our cases. In one great example, a county council has seized the opportunity to entirely redesign how its occupational therapists work with all of its districts, to improve partnership working and increase transparency for the public. This originated from a single complaint. This is the sort of culture we all benefit from – one that takes the learning from complaints and uses it to improve services.

Complaint handling training

We have a well-established and successful training programme supporting local authorities and independent care providers to help improve local complaint handling. In 2017-18 we delivered 58 courses, training more than 800 people. We also set up a network of council link officers to promote and share best practice in complaint handling, and hosted a series of seminars for that group. To find out more visit www.lgo.org.uk/training.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M King', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael King
Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman
Chair, Commission for Local Administration in England

Local Authority Report: Lancashire County Council
For the Period Ending: 31/03/2018

For further information on how to interpret our statistics, please visit our website:
<http://www.lgo.org.uk/information-centre/reports/annual-review-reports/interpreting-local-authority-statistics>

Complaints and enquiries received

Adult Care Services	Benefits and Tax	Corporate and Other Services	Education and Children's Services	Environment Services	Highways and Transport	Housing	Planning and Development	Other	Total
80	1	3	85	2	31	1	0	2	205

Decisions made

Decisions made				Detailed Investigations			
Incomplete or Invalid	Advice Given	Referred back for Local Resolution	Closed After Initial Enquiries	Not Upheld	Upheld	Uphold Rate	Total
11	1	64	62	14	39	74%	191

Notes

Our uphold rate is calculated in relation to the total number of detailed investigations.
 The number of remedied complaints may not equal the number of upheld complaints. This is because, while we may uphold a complaint because we find fault, we may not always find grounds to say that fault caused injustice that ought to be remedied.

Complaints Remedied

by LGO	Satisfactorily by Authority before LGO Involvement
33	3