

Appendix 4Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman and Housing Ombudsman Service (Resolution and Learning) 2024-25

Service Area	Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman Upheld Complaints	Resolution – Remedy and /Learning
Children & Families Service (Corporate Scheme)	Ms X complained her child did not receive a full-time education for two academic years. The Ombudsman partially upheld the complaint, finding the Council did not respond properly when learning of the child's absences from school in September 2022. As a result there was some loss of education provision and distress caused to Ms X.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apology</li> <li>• Compensation</li> <li>• Staff Training / Advice</li> </ul>
Children & Families Service (Corporate Scheme)	Miss N complained the Council failed to deliver the special educational provision in her child, Z's Education Health and Care Plan and provide them with a suitable education. The Ombudsman found fault causing injustice, in failing to: make sure Z received all the special education provision in their Plan and properly investigate Z's circumstances when they were struggling to attend school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apology</li> <li>• Compensation</li> <li>• Procedures review</li> <li>• Review information and guidance to parents</li> </ul>
Children & Families Service (Corporate Scheme)	Miss A complained the Council had not dealt properly with her son Y's Special Educational Needs. The Council had not completed annual reviews for her son's Education Health and Care Plan. Miss A suffered avoidable distress and her son missed special educational needs provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apology</li> <li>• Compensation</li> <li>• Review of SEND annual review process.</li> </ul>

## Appendix 4

Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman and Housing Ombudsman Service (Resolution and Learning) 2024-25

Children & Families Service (Corporate Scheme)	Miss G complained the Council failed to protect her grandchild, Y. Miss G said the Council delayed sharing information about Y being subject to child protection planning with her. The Council was at fault which put Y at risk of harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensation</li> <li>• Reimbursement for bought equipment</li> <li>• Service Improvements</li> </ul>
Children & Families Service (Statutory Scheme)	Ms Y complained the Council did not consider her complaint about Special Guardianship and foster payments for a child she cares for through the children's statutory complaint procedure. The Council was at fault for failing to consider Ms Y's complaint through the children's statutory complaint procedure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apology</li> <li>• Compensation</li> <li>• Begin a stage 2 complaint investigation under statutory procedure.</li> <li>• Review how CYPFS screens complaints and ensure they get put into the correct procedure</li> </ul>
Children & Families Service (Statutory Scheme)	Miss H complained the Council failed to act on her complaint, under the statutory children's complaints procedure, into its handling of child protection proceedings involving her children. The Council was at fault for its consideration of parts of Miss H's complaint and had failed to properly remedy the impact of its failings on Miss H.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apology</li> <li>• Compensation</li> <li>• Develop a specific action plan for its approach to members of families it is working with who are victims of domestic abuse.</li> </ul>
Children & Families Service (Statutory Scheme)	Mr Z complained about the way the Council dealt with safeguarding concerns. He also complained about issues with the complaint handling and poor communication. Mr Z said this frustrated and distressed him. The Ombudsman found fault in the way the Council did not follow safeguarding statutory guidance, did not consider all evidence, did not communicate with Mr Z regarding the assessment fully and did not follow its complaint policy. Mr Z's son was placed at risk of harm due to this fault. Mr Z was distressed and frustrated by the Council's actions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apology</li> <li>• Compensation</li> <li>• Staff Training / Advice</li> </ul>

## Appendix 4

Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman and Housing Ombudsman Service (Resolution and Learning) 2024-25

Planning & Development	<p>Mr D complained the Council harassed and intimidated business owners. He referred to planning applications he had made. He also referred to his wife being harassed over a planning enforcement issue for signage on a business property.</p> <p>The Ombudsman declined to investigate the complaint about the actions of the Council on planning and enforcement matters. The Ombudsman stated that Mr D had a right to appeal against refusals of planning permissions or any enforcement notices. The Council had already apologised for failing to follow the enforcement process correctly. It had arranged for further training for the officer.</p> <p>As the Council had upheld the complaint during its process, the Ombudsman therefore also upheld it.</p>	Injustice remedied during the Council's complaint process. No further action required.
<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Housing Ombudsman Service Upheld Complaints</b>	<b>Resolution – Remedy and /Learning</b>
Housing (HOS)	<p>Miss J complained about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The accuracy of information provided to the resident about her current property when it was offered to her.</li> <li>The landlord's handling of the Miss J's repair reports, specifically the removal of the previous tenant's personal belongings from the loft area and the damaged fence.</li> <li>The landlord's handling of and response to Miss J's reports of an overgrown rear garden.</li> <li>The landlord's handling of Miss J's request for adaptations to the property.</li> <li>The landlord not providing a decorating allowance.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensation</li> <li>• Apology</li> <li>• Lower guardrail</li> <li>• Provide resident with key to shed and back gate</li> <li>• Complete a review of practices</li> </ul>

## Appendix 4

Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman and Housing Ombudsman Service (Resolution and Learning) 2024-25

	<p>f. The landlord not providing a key to the back gate and garden shed.</p> <p>g. The landlord's complaint handling has also been investigated.</p> <p>h. This investigation has also considered the landlord's record keeping</p> <p>The Ombudsman determined that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There was service failure by the landlord in relation to its response to Miss J's repair reports.</li> <li>2. There was a service failure by the landlord in relation to its response to Miss J's adaptation request.</li> <li>3. There was a service failure by the landlord in relation to its response to Miss J's request for a key to the shed.</li> <li>4. There was a service failure by the landlord in relation to its handling of the complaint.</li> <li>5. The investigation has also found a service failure in respect of the landlord's record keeping standard.</li> </ol>	
Housing (HOS)	<p>Miss A Complained about the landlords handling of a request to install a new kitchen.</p> <p>The Ombudsman determined that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There was maladministration in respect of the landlord's handling of the resident's request for a new kitchen. The landlord made decisions around the major kitchen works which were not supported by policy. This meant that the resident was not given an opportunity to understand if the decision making was fair. It did not consider the impact of the poor</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apology</li> <li>• Compensation</li> <li>• New survey of the Kitchen</li> <li>• Training on escalation of complaints and complaint handling to appropriate staff.</li> </ul>

Appendix 4Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman and Housing Ombudsman Service (Resolution and Learning) 2024-25

	<p>communication on the resident and the recommendations made in relation to the kitchens condition by its contractor, or its own rechargeable repairs policy when making decisions. These were failings. It was unreasonable to expect the resident to be responsible for replacing the kitchen when it reached the end of its life.</p> <p>2. There was maladministration in the landlord's complaint handling. The landlord failed to act in line with the Ombudsman's Complaint Handling Code and its own policy. This was a failing, and the landlord failed to comply with a key element of the Code.</p>	
--	---	--