

COUNCIL 25TH SEPT ITEM 8 - ANNEXE 'A'

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN

COMPLAINT DECISIONS 2013/14

Category	Summary of Decision	Decision			
		Upheld (following investigation)	Advice Given	Closed after initial enquiries	Referred back for local resolution
Corporate & Other Services	Complainant believed the Council may have taken part of his land following refurbishment work at a neighbouring Council property. LGO did not investigate because it is outside the Ombudsman's jurisdiction. It is a legal dispute and only the courts can determine these issues.			✓	
Planning & Development	LGO decided not to investigate a complaint about how the Council considered objections to a planning application because it was more than 12 months old. The LGO also considered there was insufficient evidence of fault by the Council to investigate an associated complaint that the house, as built, deviated from the approved plans.			✓	
Housing	Complaint that Council workmen had demolished a brick outbuilding attached to the complainant's property without asking permission and had damaged a boundary wall. LGO did not investigate because claims about damage to property can only be resolved by insurers or the courts.			✓	
Housing	LGO had discontinued her investigation into a complaint about a transfer application as the complainant had withdrawn her complaint.			✓	
Planning & Development	Complaint regarding a Tree Preservation Order referred back to the Council for consideration through its own complaints procedure.				✓
Housing	Complainant raised various issues about repairs which the Ombudsman considered needed to be raised directly with the Council.				✓
Not Applicable to LGO	No details given, but this may be because the complainant has been advised to contact another complaints handling organisation or advice agency		✓		
Planning & Development	LGO decided the Council should have published a plan showing changes to a proposed development near the complainant's home that affected her privacy. LGO stated Complainant would have doubts about whether the Council's decision may have been different if she had seen and objected to the plan. Council agreed to pay £150 to complainant as redress for this uncertainty and to take steps to alter reporting to prevent a similar error occurring in the future. However, it should be noted that the LGO did not find the Council would have refused permission if the complainant had objected.	✓			

