

**The Local Government Ombudsman's
Annual Review
Shropshire 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 Shropshire 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 Shropshire Council 2009/10

Introduction

This annual review provides a summary of the complaints we have dealt with about Shropshire 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.

I have also taken the opportunity to comment on complaints received against the former Shropshire County Council, Bridgnorth District council, Oswestry District council, North Shropshire District Council, South Shropshire District Council and Shrewsbury & Atcham District Council. Complaints about these former councils are now dealt with by Shropshire Council, the successor authority.

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

During 2009/10 we received 49 complaints and enquiries concerning the new unitary authority. Of these, 19 concerned planning and building control, six education, five children and family services, four public finance including local taxation, three transport and highways, two housing and two benefits. The remaining eight related to other matters.

We treated 13 of these complaints as premature and advice was given on five more. The remaining 31 were referred to the investigative team, of which nine were premature complaints which had been resubmitted.

Our advice team also dealt with complaints and enquiries regarding the six former councils. A total of 21 complaints and enquiries were received, of which 10 related to planning and building control and three to education matters. The remaining eight were spread across other council functions. We treated one of these complaints as premature and gave advice on three more. The remaining 17 were referred to the investigative team, of which four were premature complaints which had been resubmitted.

The aggregate of 70 complaints received in respect of the new council and the six former councils compares with a total of 122 received in 2009/08 for the six former councils.

Complaint outcomes

In 2009/10 we made decisions on 18 complaints against Shropshire Council. In 11 cases we found no or insufficient evidence of maladministration. Four complaints fell outside my jurisdiction and one was settled locally. We exercised discretion not to investigate a further two complaints. Typically, these are cases where, even though there may have been some fault on the council's part, there is no significant injustice caused to the complainant.

We made 43 decisions on complaints against the six former councils. We found no or insufficient evidence of maladministration in 14 cases, and 18 complaints fell outside my jurisdiction. Seven

complaints were settled locally and we exercised discretion not to pursue the remaining four.

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 the new council, one was settled locally. In this case, the council had disclosed to a third party that the complainant had made allegations against him. The third party contacted the complainant, who felt threatened as a result. The complainant sought advice from the police and, on their advice, installed security equipment at a cost of £200. In settlement of the complaint, the council apologised and paid £200 to cover the cost of the security measures, with a further £250 compensation for the distress and anxiety the complainant had been caused.

Turning to the former councils, four complaints against the former Shropshire County Council were locally settled. All four related to children and family services, although they concerned different aspects of the council's functions and there were no particular similarities between them. In total, the council agreed payments of £3,500 in settlement.

Two complaints against the former North Shropshire District Council were settled locally. One related to the delay in reaching a decision in respect of unauthorised development, causing the complainant an unnecessary degree of uncertainty. In the other case, the council had failed to notify the complainant of a planning application, thereby denying him the right to make objections. Although the council's omission made no difference to the outcome of the application, we found that the complainant had been unreasonably denied an opportunity to make representations. The total payment agreed in these two cases was £350.

One complaint against the former South Shropshire District Council was settled locally. This resulted from the premature imposition of a planning condition requiring a higher standard of construction in advance of the formal adoption of a policy to this effect. In settlement, the council paid the complainants £500 in recognition of the time and trouble to which they had been put, and agreed to reconsider whether to seek an affordable housing payment from them.

Liaison with the Local Government Ombudsman

We made formal enquiries on eight complaints against the new council in 2009/10. The average time the council took to respond was 28.3 days, which is in line with the 28 day target we ask councils to aim for. Given the fact that this was the first year of the council's existence, this is very positive, and I hope that the council can maintain this level of performance in the coming year.

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	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	1	0	1	3	3	1	2	13
Advice given	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	5
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	9
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	0	5	2	1	1	8	2	3	22
Total	5	6	2	2	4	19	3	8	49

Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
2009 / 2010	0	1	0	0	11	2	4	18

Response times

	FIRST ENQUIRIES	
	No. of First Enquiries	Avg no. of days to respond
1/04/2009 / 31/03/2010	8	28.3

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

LGO Advice Team

Enquiries and complaints received	Adult care services	Children and family services	Education	Planning and building control	Transport and highways	Other	Total
Formal/informal premature complaints	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Advice given	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	1	1	1	1	0	1	5
Total	2	1	3	1	1	1	9

Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
2009 / 2010	0	4	0	0	6	0	2	12

Response times	FIRST ENQUIRIES	
	No. of First Enquiries	Avg no. of days to respond
1/04/2009 / 31/03/2010	2	48.0
2008 / 2009	11	31.1
2007 / 2008	6	29.5

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

LGO Advice Team

Enquiries and complaints received	Benefits	Total
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	1	1
Total	1	1

Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
2009 / 2010	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3

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
2008 / 2009	4	53.3
2007 / 2008	4	50.0

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

LGO Advice Team

Enquiries and complaints received	Housing	Planning and building control	Total
Advice given	1	0	1
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	0	1	1
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	0	4	4
Total	1	5	6

Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
2009 / 2010	0	2	0	0	1	1	14	18

Response times

	FIRST ENQUIRIES	
	No. of First Enquiries	Avg no. of days to respond
1/04/2009 / 31/03/2010	2	31.5
2008 / 2009	7	15.3
2007 / 2008	8	12.9

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

LGO Advice Team

Enquiries and complaints received	Benefits	Total
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	1	1
Total	1	1

Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
2009 / 2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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
2008 / 2009	3	29.3
2007 / 2008	7	28.4

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

LGO Advice Team

Enquiries and complaints received	Planning and building control	Total
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	2	2
Total	2	2

Investigative Team

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

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	1	49.0
2008 / 2009	4	30.3
2007 / 2008	6	30.2

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

LGO Advice Team

Enquiries and complaints received	Planning and building control	Total
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	1	1
Forwarded to investigative team (new)	1	1
Total	2	2

Investigative Team

Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total
2009 / 2010	0	1	0	0	3	2	0	6

Response times

	FIRST ENQUIRIES	
	No. of First Enquiries	Avg no. of days to respond
1/04/2009 / 31/03/2010	1	29.0
2008 / 2009	8	56.1
2007 / 2008	2	37.5

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