

**The Local Government Ombudsman's
Annual Review
Corby Borough 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 Corby Borough 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.....	5
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 Corby Borough Council 2009/10

Introduction

This annual review provides a summary of the complaints we have dealt with about Corby Borough 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 20 complaints and enquiries about your council, compared with 28 in 2008/09. Five were about housing, three about planning and building control, two about benefits and one each about public finance and transport and highways. Four concerned other areas, such as anti-social behaviour and environmental health.

We treated six of these complaints as premature and referred them to the council and in a further four cases advice was given, usually to make a complaint to the council direct. The remaining 10 complaints were forwarded to the investigative team, of which four were premature complaints that had been resubmitted.

Complaint outcomes

In 2009/10 we took decisions on 15 complaints. In eight cases we found no or insufficient evidence of maladministration. In four cases the council agreed to settle the complaint locally and we exercised discretion not to investigate a further two cases. Typically these are cases where even though there may have been some fault by the council there is no significant injustice to the complainant.

Reports

When we complete an investigation, we generally issue a report. This year we issued one report against your council. This concerned the actions of the council following the settlement of a previous complaint from the same person in March 2008. My predecessor found the council had failed to provide the apology promised as part of the agreed settlement to the previous complaint, had failed to respond to correspondence and further complaints, and had alleged the complainant was causing nuisance to her neighbour, without any factual evidence to substantiate this view. He recommended that the council should apologise for the failings identified in both the previous and current investigations and pay the complainant £1,000 compensation. He also recommended that the council take further independent legal advice on the complainant's claim that she had a right of access to cross council land and inform us of the outcome of the council's review of its internal communications that it had said it was carrying out as a result of the investigation.

I am pleased that the council has now addressed the issue at the heart of this complaint, as a result of which it has been possible to reach agreement on action to satisfy the report recommendations.

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 four were local settlements (26.7%), and the council paid a total of £400 in compensation.

In one of these cases, about planning, the council had failed to carry out a proper investigation into the complainant's allegations since 2007 that his neighbour was running a car repair business from his residential address. He said this resulted in an excessive number of cars in the road along with noise and disturbance during evenings and weekends. The council agreed to visit the complainant to find out when the repairs were taking place and then to carry out visits to his neighbour (out of hours if necessary) to establish if this was the case and to take appropriate action if there was evidence of business activity.

In a second case, about rights of way, the council delayed for two years in telling the complainant that the footpath in front of his house had not been extinguished and retained full highway rights. The council had previously told the complainant incorrectly that it had been extinguished. In fact another part of the path had been extinguished but not the part about which the complainant was concerned. The complainant experienced avoidable frustration and uncertainty and lost the opportunity to approach the highways authority and the police regarding nuisance parking on the path. The council agreed to apologise and to pay the complainant £200.

In a third case we re-opened a complaint about enforcement where the council had failed to implement the agreed local settlement. The council had failed to advise the complainant's neighbour to apply for planning permission to make changes to the exterior of a building, which was council-owned and in a conservation area, with a mix of tenants and leaseholders. The neighbour was then refused retrospective planning permission for the changes. As part of the settlement the council agreed to investigate the case for enforcement action and to keep in touch with the complainant but failed to do so. The council agreed to pay £150 compensation.

The fourth settled complaint was resolved very promptly. In this case the council had issued a fixed penalty notice to a complainant for smoking next to his taxi. This was not an offence and the notice was significantly flawed giving no details of the complainant's statutory right to request a court hearing. The complainant lost the opportunity to go to court and was caused avoidable confusion and uncertainty. The council accepted that no offence had been committed and cancelled the notice. It had alerted staff to the limits on the council's powers in this area and changed the wording on its notices. It also agreed to apologise and pay the complainant £50 for his time and trouble. Additionally it agreed to check if anyone else had actually paid a penalty charge for this non-existent offence and if so to reimburse them. I am pleased to say the council accepted the settlement proposal within one day of our request.

I am grateful to the council for its willingness to settle complaints but would take this opportunity to highlight the importance to complainants of the council quickly carrying out agreed actions to demonstrate its commitment to remedy complaints effectively to mutual satisfaction.

Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman

We made formal enquiries on eight complaints in 2009/10. In the annual review for 2008/09 my predecessor commented that the council's response times had worsened significantly at 61.5 days compared to the previous year. I am pleased to report that the council's performance in this area has improved considerably, and that the average response time during 2009/10 was 33.5 days. I

thank the council for its efforts in this area and am grateful for its commitment to take further steps to reduce the response time over the coming year to bring it within the target time of 28 days.

To this end my Assistant Ombudsman has agreed to contact the council directly to alert them to any delayed responses so that immediate action can be taken.

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.

**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	Housing	Benefits	Public Finance inc. Local Taxation	Planning and building control	Transport and highways	Other	Total
Formal/informal premature complaints	3	1	0	0	0	2	6
Advice given	2	1	1	0	0	0	4
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	2	0	0	1	0	1	4
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	2	0	0	2	1	1	6
Total	9	2	1	3	1	4	20

Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
2009 / 2010	1	4	0	0	8	2	0	15

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	8	33.5
2008 / 2009	13	61.5
2007 / 2008	10	32.1

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