

**The Local Government Ombudsman's  
Annual Review  
Milton Keynes Council  
for the year ended  
31 March 2009**

The Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) provides 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, the Ombudsmen aim to get it put right by recommending a suitable remedy. 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 reviews.

# Contents of Annual Review

<b>Section 1: Complaints about Milton Keynes Council 2008/09</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
Council First.....	6
Statement of reasons: consultation.....	6
Making Experiences Count (MEC).....	6
Training in complaint handling.....	6
Adult Social Care Self-funding.....	7
Internal schools management.....	7
Further developments.....	7
<b>Appendix 1: Notes to assist interpretation of the statistics 2008/09</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Local authority report 2008/09</b>	

# Section 1: Complaints about Milton Keynes Council 2008/09

## Introduction

This annual review provides a summary of the complaints we have dealt with about Milton Keynes 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 2008/09 and a note to help the interpretation of the statistics.

## Changes to our way of working and statistics

A change in the way we operate means that the statistics about complaints received in 2008/09 are not directly comparable with those from 2007/08. Since 1 April 2008 the new LGO Advice Team has been the single point of contact for all enquiries and new complaints. The number of calls to our service has increased significantly since then. It handles more than 3,000 calls a month, together with written and emailed complaints. Our advisers now provide comprehensive information and advice to callers at the outset with a full explanation of the process and possible outcomes. It enables callers to make a more informed decision about whether putting their complaint to us is an appropriate course of action. Some decide to pursue their complaint direct with the council first.

It means that direct comparisons with some of the previous year's statistics are difficult and could be misleading. So this annual review focuses mainly on the 2008/09 statistics without drawing those comparisons.

## Enquiries and complaints received

Last year our Advice Team dealt with a total of 58 enquiries and complaints about your Council. Of these, 22 related to complaints that were deemed to be premature and so were referred back to the Council for investigation. Our Advice Team forwarded 26 complaints to the investigative team, including seven which had previously been referred to the Council to consider and which had then been resubmitted to my office. Housing generated the largest number of enquiries and complaints (15) and the largest number forwarded to the investigative team (8).

## Complaint outcomes

### 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. This can include such things as reconsideration of a decision, repairs carried out, policies reviewed, benefit paid, an apology or other action. In addition I may ask the Council to pay compensation. In 2008/09, 27.4% of all complaints the Ombudsmen decided and which were within our jurisdiction were local settlements. This year of the complaints I decided against your authority, which were within my jurisdiction, just under 27% were local settlements. These involved the payment of over £7,000 compensation.

## **Complaints by service area**

### ***Housing***

Two local settlements involved housing complaints. In the first of these a secure council tenant approached the Council for assistance because of domestic violence within the home. The Council did not consider properly if she was homeless even though the police supported her case and the perpetrator was charged and subsequently convicted. The complainant lived in the parental home for about seven months and then in unsuitable privately rented accommodation for a further 20 months. In investigating the complaint my staff noted a poor standard of record keeping.

As soon as the complainant made a formal complaint to the Council, it offered permanent re housing. The Council responded to my enquiries about the matter by offering to pay the amount of compensation I considered appropriate. I asked it to pay £3,000. The Council also agreed to review its record keeping. The prompt settlement of this complaint was achieved with the assistance of the Council's Information and Customer Liaison Manager.

The second settlement involved three months delay in placing an order to replace kitchen and bathroom tiles. The Council agreed to pay nominal compensation.

I did not find fault in the case of a related complaint about housing allocations. But, I was concerned about the Council's decision, in implementing its new allocations scheme, to destroy files. As the papers had not been electronically scanned, this meant that relevant records were no longer available. The Council agreed, therefore, to also review its policy on file destruction.

### ***Children and Family Services***

One settlement involved Children and Family Services. A prospective adoptive parent of a child with significant special needs complained about delay over several years in concluding the adoption agreement and, in particular, in finding and adapting suitable accommodation for the needs of the child concerned. The complainant did not consider that measures taken by the Council following the conclusion of its own consideration of the complaint had been sufficiently thorough or far reaching. The Council agreed to pay compensation of £3,000 to be used for the complainant's benefit and that of the child. I was pleased that the Council agreed promptly to my proposals, and that it also undertook to appoint a senior officer as the lead officer to prevent similar delays and disruptions in the future.

### ***Education***

Two complaints involved educational matters. One was about school transport. The Council failed to put in place effective procedures to enable contract bus drivers transporting children with special needs to and from school to report incidents of disruptive behaviour. Disruptive behaviour involving the complainant's son during his journeys to and from school was reported inappropriately. In addition the complainants' concerns were not responded to through the Council's complaints procedure. The Council readily agreed to pay the complainant £50 for the time and trouble they were put to in pursuing the matter and has revised the procedures by which school transport drivers report concerns and/or incidents.

The second complaint concerned special educational needs. The Council delayed for four months in arranging an appointment for the complainant's child with a specialist ICT (Information and Communications Technology) teacher. The ICT specified in the child's statement of special educational needs was not provided for that period of time. Again the Council readily agreed to settle the complaint by paying compensation of £400.

## **Other**

I agreed two other local settlements in the year. One complaint concerned the Council's administration of the user clauses in the leases for two corner shops, resulting in unfair competition. The Council agreed to apologise, to pay compensation of £500, to abate the complainant's rent and to review its policies and procedures. It also agreed to use its best endeavours to modify both leases.

The second settlement concerned delay in reaching a decision about whether a bollard, which prevented the complainant from parking outside his home, could be removed. The Council falsely raised the complainant's expectations that the bollard could be removed when in fact it could not. The Council agreed to pay £200 compensation.

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

The average time taken by the Council to reply to our written enquiries was 23.5 days. This represents a significant improvement over last year's figure of 29.9 and that of the previous year of 31.7 days.

During the year I decided five complaints that had previously been referred to the Council to consider through its own procedures and had then been resubmitted to me. I note that I did not uphold any of these. This suggests that the Council's own complaints procedure is working effectively.

I am pleased to note that the Council's Information and Customer Liaison Manager continues to provide high quality information in response to my staff's enquiries and to be proactive in resolving complaints.

## **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. 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.

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 Council's services.

**Tony Redmond**  
**Local Government Ombudsman**  
**10<sup>th</sup> Floor, Millbank Tower**  
**Millbank**  
**London SW1P 4QP**

**June 2009**

## Section 2: LGO developments

### Introduction

This annual review also provides an opportunity to bring councils up to date on developments – current and proposed – in the LGO and to seek feedback. It includes our proposal to introduce a ‘statement of reasons’ for Ombudsmen decisions.

### Council First

From 1 April 2009, the LGO has considered complaints only where the council’s own complaints procedure has been completed. Local authorities have been informed of these new arrangements, including some notable exceptions. We will carefully monitor the impact of this change during the course of the year.

### Statement of reasons: consultation

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 made provision for the LGO to publish statements of reasons relating to the individual decisions of an Ombudsman following the investigation of a complaint. The Ombudsmen are now consulting local government on their proposal to use statements of reasons. The proposal is that these will comprise a short summary (about one page of A4) of the complaint, the investigation, the findings and the recommended remedy. The statement, naming the council but not the complainant, would usually be published on our website.

We plan to consult local authorities on the detail of these statements with a view to implementing them from October 2009.

### Making Experiences Count (MEC)

The new formal, one stage complaint handling arrangement for adult social care was also introduced from 1 April 2009. The LGO is looking to ensure that this formal stage is observed by complainants before the Ombudsmen will consider any such complaint, although some may be treated as exceptions under the Council First approach. The LGO also recognises that during the transition from the existing scheme to the new scheme there is going to be a mixed approach to considering complaints as some may have originated before 1 April 2009. The LGO will endeavour to provide support, as necessary, through dedicated events for complaints-handling staff in adult social care departments.

### Training in complaint handling

Effective Complaint Handling in Adult Social Care is the latest addition to our range of training courses for local authority staff. This adds to the generic Good Complaint Handling (identifying and processing complaints) and Effective Complaint Handling (investigation and resolution), and courses for social care staff at both of these levels. Demand for our training in complaint handling remains high. A total of 129 courses were delivered in 2008/09. Feedback from participants shows that they find it stimulating, challenging and beneficial in their work in dealing with complaints.

### **Adult Social Care Self-funding**

The Health Bill 2009 proposes for the LGO to extend its jurisdiction to cover an independent complaints-handling role in respect of self-funded adult social care. The new service will commence in 2010.

### **Internal schools management**

The Apprenticeship, Skills, Children and Learning Bill (ASCL) 2009 proposes making the LGO the host for a new independent complaints-handling function for schools. In essence, we would consider the complaint after the governing body of the school had considered it. Subject to legislation, the new service would be introduced, in pilot form, probably in September 2010.

### **Further developments**

I 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 local 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.

**Tony Redmond**  
**Local Government Ombudsman**  
**10<sup>th</sup> Floor, Millbank Tower**  
**Millbank**  
**London SW1P 4QP**

**June 2009**

# Appendix 1: Notes to assist interpretation of the statistics 2008/09

## Introduction

This year, the annual review only shows 2008/09 figures for enquiries and complaints received, and for decisions taken. This is because the change in the way we operate (explained in the introduction to the review) means that these statistics are not directly comparable with statistics from previous years.

### 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.

**Formal/informal prematures:** 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 usually refer it back to the council as a 'premature complaint' to see if the council can itself resolve the matter. These are 'formal premature complaints'. We now also include 'informal' premature complaints here, where advice is given to the complainant making an enquiry that their complaint is premature. The total of premature complaints shown in this line *does not include* the number of resubmitted premature complaints (see below).

**Advice given:** These are enquiries where the LGO Advice Team has given advice on why the Ombudsman would not be able to consider the complaint, other than the complaint being premature. For example, the complaint may clearly be outside the Ombudsman's jurisdiction. It also includes cases where the complainant has not given enough information for clear advice to be given, but they have, in any case, decided not to pursue the complaint.

**Forwarded to the investigative team (resubmitted prematures):** These are cases where there was either a formal premature decision, or the complainant was given informal advice that their case was premature, and the complainant has resubmitted their complaint to the Ombudsman after it has been put to the council. *These figures need to be added to the numbers for formal/informal premature complaints (see above) to get the full total number of premature complaints. They also needed to be added to the 'forwarded to the investigative team (new)' to get the total number of forwarded complaints.*

**Forwarded to the investigative team (new):** These are the complaints that have been forwarded from the LGO Advice Team to the Investigative Team for further consideration. The figures may include some complaints that the Investigative Team has received but where we have not yet contacted 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 2008/09 will already have been in hand at the beginning of the year, and some forwarded to the Investigative Team during 2008/09 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 Ombudsman 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 Ombudsman'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 Ombudsman'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 2008/09

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	2	0	0	5	1	3	3	0	8	22
Advice given	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	10
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	0	2	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	7
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	0	0	5	6	2	0	1	1	4	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>58</b>

## Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
01/04/2008 / 31/03/2009	0	7	0	0	16	3	7	33

## Average local authority response times 01/04/2008 to 31/03/2009

Response times	FIRST ENQUIRIES	
	No. of First Enquiries	Avg no. of days to respond
1/04/2008 / 31/03/2009	15	23.5
2007 / 2008	18	29.9
2006 / 2007	19	31.7

Types of authority	<= 28 days %	29 - 35 days %	> = 36 days %
District councils	60	20	20
Unitary authorities	56	35	9
Metropolitan authorities	67	19	14
County councils	62	32	6
London boroughs	58	27	15
National park authorities	100	0	0