



## ADJUDICATION & REVIEW COMMITTEE

4 February 2015

Subject Heading:

**STAGE THREE COMPLAINTS – Update**

**CMT Lead:**

**Andrew Blake-Herbert** – Director of  
Communities & Resources

**Report Author and contact details:**

Grant Soderberg, Committee Officer  
01708 433091

[grant.soderberg@onesource](mailto:grant.soderberg@onesource)

**Policy context:**

The Council's Corporate Complaints  
Process.

**Financial summary:**

None directly associated with this report

### The subject matter of this report deals with the following Council Objectives

Clean, safe and green borough	<input type="checkbox"/>
Excellence in education and learning	<input type="checkbox"/>
Opportunities for all through economic, social and cultural activity	<input type="checkbox"/>
Value and enhance the life of every individual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
High customer satisfaction and a stable council tax	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### SUMMARY

In order to ensure that all members of the Committee are acquainted with activity at Stage Three of the Corporate Complaints process, this report provides a brief summary of the number of cases initiated and their outcomes, whether discontinued or reviewed and determined by a panel.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee:

1. Note the report
2. Decide whether to change the format, style or content for future reports

**REPORT DETAIL**

- 1 This is the first time such a report has been presented to Members and is very much an initial proposal which the Committee could, if it chose, modify.

**Cases since 1 April 2014 to date:**

- 2 The table in the appendix contains complaints initiated after 1 April 2014. This report will differ from future updates in that this contains historic information and future reports will only carry current and on-going material.
- 3 The Committee is invited to consider the information provided in the accompanying table and decide whether it is content with it as presented or would like to see it either presented differently or with different information.
- 4 The Committee is asked to note that a number of complaints considered at Stage Three were referred to the Council by the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) and whilst that ought not to have had any effect other than alerting the service that the Ombudsman had been notified about the complaint, clearly the interest of a third party who was aware of the matter and could scrutinise its response would have had an influence on the response provided by the service involved.
- 5 Members will see that in the first case in the list, the LGO not only referred the matter back to the Council for it to continue through the Corporate Complaints process, but after the panel had given its decision, the complainant returned to the Ombudsman and the LGO decided to pursue the matter by way of her own investigation. This is currently on-going.
- 6 The Committee may find it interesting to see that of the 16 cases presented in the table, six were discontinued because the complainant did not respond either to the Member Review form or (at the outset) to a chase letter which offered additional time.
- 7 None of the five cases considered by Members were upheld – though in one case the Panel did consider that the process had been so badly administered that it awarded compensation to the complainant for the delay experienced.
- 8 Currently there are three cases pending a Member Review and one awaiting a response from the complainant.

**IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**Financial implications and risks:**

There are no adverse implications and risks associated with these proposals as they are either procedural changes or designed to ensure greater cost-efficiencies are obtained.

**Legal implications and risks:** There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

**Human Resources implications and risks:** There are none associated with this report.

**Equalities implications and risks:** There are none associated with this report

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

**Appendix**

<b>Subject of Complaint</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>LGO involvement</b>
Complainant unhappy with treatment she received by the PSL team	Romford Town	Not Upheld by IAP	Yes 14 001 209 Referred to Council @ S2 currently also an investigation after the IAP's decision
Complainant alleged that the Council had broken the law in respect of his C/Tax allowances.	Rainham & Wennington	Not Upheld by IAP	No
Complainant did not accept Head of Planning's reasons why the garage conversion did not break planning rules.	South Hornchurch	Process Discontinued - No response from Complainant	No
Complainant claimed a CCTV car was illegally parked when issuing a ticket	Pettits	Process Discontinued - No response from Complainant	No
Complainant alleged that the attitude of the Civil Enforcement Officer he received a PCN from was offensive.	Havering Park	Process Discontinued - No response from Complainant	No
Complainant claimed she had to place her dog in kennels whilst her kitchen was being repaired & had been refused the £600 she said it cost her. The work was also not completed in a reasonable time nor to a good enough standard	Cranham	Not Upheld by IAP	No
Complainant dissatisfied with responses received concerning a review of a controlled parking zone.	Romford Town	Process Discontinued - No response from Complainant	Yes: 14 009 259/PM Enquiry only
Complainant had difficulty with her neighbour concerning a dropped kerb in front of her property	Hacton	Not Upheld by IAP	No
Complainant claimed that the Council tried to evict her when it changed her lock, causing her distress and concern for her infant daughter	Gooshays	Not Upheld by IAP	Yes 13 003 945/KN Referred to Council @ S2
Complainant claimed that interference from Council staff drew attention to her car parked outside her brother's by putting a "Council Aware" sticker on it when it had not been abandoned. It was stolen shortly after.	Gooshays	Not Upheld by IAP	No
Complainant claimed that he had been excluded from the Housing Register & had only limited access due to discrimination	O/S Borough	Process Discontinued - No response from Complainant	Yes 14 008 849/LP Referred to Council @ S2
Complainant considered that the Council was being unreasonable to charge him for a disabled badge (which he used to get free) as he did not receive the higher rate assessment	O/S Borough	Process Discontinued - No response from Complainant	No
Complainant is in dispute with the Council about her property (PSL) & is claiming that the Council is acting illegally	O/S Borough	<b>With Service</b>	No
Complainant has a number of issues he claims Housing has not addressed - either paying him promised sums for decorating or not doing work as needed	Heaton	<b>With Service</b>	No

**Adjudication & Review Committee, 4 February 2015**

Complainant claims the Council has still not addressed aspects surrounding loss of property or asbestos issues	Gooshays	<b>With Service</b>	No
Complainant claims that neighbour nuisance (Council tenant) has been going on for years & the Council has done nothing effective to stop it.	Gooshays	<b>Form Sent</b>	Yes 14 012 117/KN Referred to Council @ S2