



The Commission for  
Local Administration in England

**The Local Government Ombudsman's  
Annual Letter  
Warwick District Council  
for the year ended  
31 March 2007**

**The Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) investigates complaints by members of the public who consider that they have been caused injustice through administrative fault by local authorities and certain other bodies. The LGO also uses the findings from investigation work to help authorities provide better public services through initiatives such as special reports, training and annual letters.**

## **Annual Letter 2006/07 - Introduction**

This annual letter provides a summary of the complaints we have received about your authority. Where possible, we comment on the authority's performance and complaint-handling arrangements to assist with your service improvement.

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

Two attachments form an integral part of this letter: statistical data covering a three year period and a note to help the interpretation of the statistics.

## **Complaints received**

### ***Volume & Character***

This year the number of complaints received by my office fell from 34 to 25. That is welcome but of no particular significance, being within the range of variations that can occur for no obvious reason. What is worth noting is the fall in the number of complaints about planning, from 15 to seven.

## **Decisions on complaints**

### ***Reports and local settlements***

A 'local settlement' is a complaint that is resolved by the Council taking, or agreeing to take, action which we consider is a satisfactory response to the complaint so that the investigation can be discontinued. In 2006/07 27.7% of complaints dealt with by the three Local Government Ombudsmen (excluding premature and those outside jurisdiction) were resolved by local settlement. When we complete an investigation we must issue a report.

I have not issued any reports against the Council during the year. In four cases my staff saw the need to seek some form of settlement. None of these merit specific mention in this letter although I am pleased to report that the staff involved were generally positive about the way that the Council dealt with the complaints. I am also pleased to record that when asked to look at its procedures in the light of any comments we are able to rely on the Council to respond positively and properly.

### ***Other findings***

23 complaints were decided by my staff with a rather high total of those (nine) being premature – ie getting to me without the Council having first been given the opportunity to put the complaint through its own procedure.

Two of the complaints decided were outside my jurisdiction, and in one case my Investigator exercised discretion not to pursue the complaint. In the seven other cases no fault was found.

## **Your Council's complaints procedure and handling of complaints**

I hesitate to make too much of the figure for premature complaints, but it *might* indicate that the Council needs to look at the way staff and the public are advised about its own complaints procedure. Please see the section on training in complaint handling below.

## **Training in complaint handling**

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. The feedback from councils that have taken up the training is very positive.

The range of courses is expanding in response to demand and in addition to the generic Good Complaint Handling (identifying and processing complaints) and Effective Complaint Handling (investigation and resolution), we can run open courses for groups of staff from smaller authorities and also customise courses to meet your Council's specific requirements.

All courses are presented by an experienced investigator so participants benefit from their knowledge and expertise of complaint handling.

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

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

My thanks to the Council for providing satisfactory responses on two points raised in last year's annual letter.

The Council took on average about 32 days to respond to our enquiries. Our target is 28 days and the Council came close but there are a couple of points concealed by the bare average. One response took 76 days and another 44. These times (especially the first) are not acceptable. I appreciate that the first case was complex and an involved officer was off sick but the Council's systems should be robust enough to account for such problems. I trust that there will be no repetition.

Working relations between our offices remain good.

## **LGO developments**

You may be interested in the development of our initiative to improve the first contact that people have with us. A new Access and Advice Service will provide a gateway to our services for all complainants and enquirers. It will encourage telephone contact but will also deal with email, text and letter correspondence. We will let you have further details about how it will operate and the expected timescales and discuss with you the implications for the Council.

I hope you have received our latest special report about telecommunications masts. It draws on our experience of dealing with complaints about planning applications for masts which can be highly controversial. We recommend simple measures that councils can adopt to minimise the chances of maladministration occurring.

In July we will be publishing a special report about the difficulties that can be encountered with complaints when local authorities deliver services or discharge their functions through partnerships. *Local partnerships and citizen redress* provides advice and guidance on how these problems can be overcome by good governance arrangements that include an effective complaints protocol.

## **Conclusions and general observations**

I welcome this opportunity to comment on our experience of complaints about the Council over the past year. I hope that you find the information and assessment provided useful when seeking improvements to your Council's services.

**Anne Seex  
Local Government Ombudsman  
Beverley House  
17 Shipton Road  
York  
YO30 5FZ**

**June 2007**

Enc: Statistical data  
Note on interpretation of statistics  
Leaflet on training courses (with posted copy only)

Complaints received by subject area	Benefits	Housing	Other	Planning & building control	Public finance	Transport and highways	Total
01/04/2006 - 31/03/2007	3	6	6	7	3	0	25
2005 / 2006	1	8	5	16	2	2	34
2004 / 2005	1	9	6	15	1	2	34

Note: these figures will include complaints that were made prematurely to the Ombudsman and which we referred back to the authority for consideration.

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Premature complaints	Total excl premature	Total
01/04/2006 - 31/03/2007	0	4	0	0	7	1	2	9	14	23
2005 / 2006	0	6	0	0	15	3	3	7	27	34
2004 / 2005	0	3	0	0	10	9	2	6	24	30

See attached notes for an explanation of the headings in this table.

Response times	FIRST ENQUIRIES	
	No. of First Enquiries	Avg no. of days to respond
01/04/2006 - 31/03/2007	10	31.9
2005 / 2006	19	24.4
2004 / 2005	15	26.7

Average local authority response times 01/04/2006 to 31/03/2007

Types of authority	<= 28 days %	29 - 35 days %	>= 36 days %
District Councils	48.9	23.4	27.7
Unitary Authorities	30.4	37.0	32.6
Metropolitan Authorities	38.9	41.7	19.4
County Councils	47.1	32.3	20.6
London Boroughs	39.4	33.3	27.3
National Park Authorities	66.7	33.3	0.0