

Corporate Complaints – Directorate for Children & Young People

April – June 2013

Received	Details	Response Date	Outcome /Decision	Date of Stage 2	Committee Decision/Outcome
11/02/13	Complaint regarding the management of a child's behaviour towards another during a residential trip	04/03/13	Explanation provided.	12/06/2013	Not Upheld
03/04/13	Inadequate assessments carried out by children's social care on the complainants Grandchildren.	04/06/13	Explanation of actions taken to address complaint. No further action taken	N/A	
08/04/13	Concerns regarding welfare of sister-in-law's children	29/04/13	Assurances given that concerns will be looked into. No further action.	N/A	
24/04/13	Refusal to be allowed to foster 3 siblings.	29/04/13	Discussions held regarding reasons behind decision, matter resolved	N/A	
01/05/13	Complaint regarding the actions of a parent partnership officer	20/05/13	Explanation of actions provided.	N/A	
02/05/13	Grandfather unhappy at the time given to parent of CLA to prepare for court proceedings	14/05/13	Explanation of actions and apology provided.	N/A	
08/05/13	Complaint regarding travel expenses	14/05/13	Remedy provided	N/A	
20/05/13	Complaint from LCC Foster Carer regarding change in practice	04/06/13	Apology provided	N/A	
24/05/13	Concerns from Great Aunt regarding family member.	14/06/13	Explanation and re-assurances provided.	N/A	

April – June 2014

Received	Details	Response Date	Outcome /Decision	Date of Stage 2	Committee Decision/Outcome
02/04/14	Inadequate provision of IDSS services	04/04/14	Explanation and apology provided	N/A	
22/04/14	Complaint received following earlier correspondence regarding Statement and transition. Acknowledgement sent same day with initial response providing a copy of complaints procedure as requested, with further letter rec'd 25/04/14.	02/05/14	A full reply was sent covering all previous correspondence accepting some delay in transition but confirming efforts to provide acceptable resolution by IDSS and the school. There are now more robust transition arrangements in place.	N/A	
08/05/14	Failure to provide financial payments for emergency placements	16/06/14	Explanation, back payment and apology provided	N/A	
19/05/14	Son's non attendance at school and apparent lack of support from IDSS to find a more suitable placement which followed several earlier emails	21/05/14	Full reply sent by service manager reiterating all previous replies that placement fit for purpose with further letters to and from parents to try and seek acceptable solution. SEN Code of Practice Procedures had been correctly followed as had management	N/A	

			of complaint within timescales.		
09/06/14	Concerns about son's Statement and handling of case when presented to panel	11/06/14	Full reply with copy of corporate complaints procedure sent 11/06/14. SEN Code of Practice Procedures had been correctly followed	N/A	
19/06/14	Inadequate response by duty desk to adoption enquiry	Due 24/07			

Corporate Complaints - **Environment** 1/4/13 – 30/6/13

Date Received	Subject Matter	Response Date	Response	Outcome Stage 1	Referred to Stage 2	Outcome Stage 2
9.4.13	Unhappy with meeting to discuss location of bus shelter in Fleetwood as an officer requested police presence unbeknown to the complainant	30.4.13	Explained that Officer attending previous site visit with complainant had felt intimidated. LCC had duty of care towards its staff and it was felt helpful for all concerned that police be requested to attend			
25.4.13	Failure to stop flooding at complainants property despite alleged promises from officers to do so, and the inadequate drainage systems serving the property	17.5.13 & 6.6.13	LCC had conducted comprehensive drainage investigation works around the property and repaired main carrier drain. Matter was a private riparian owner issue between the complainant and her neighbour Complainant not satisfied with the response given and raised additional points. Explained LCC had fulfilled its responsibilities under legislation. Highway drainage network around the	Not satisfied	Yes Cttee 15.7.13	Not upheld

			property was functioning. Advised complainant to seek legal advice.			
Date Received	Subject Matter	Response Date	Response	Outcome Stage 1	Referred to Stage 2	Outcome Stage 2
14.5.13	Problems with payment arrangements for bus pass and LCC not considering individual circumstances when contacting customers	31.5.13	Apologised and agreed that a 'Final Notice' should not have been sent. Accepted the complainants point about failing to consider individual circumstances when contacting customers and agreed would review systems.			
11.6.13	Lack of response and unprofessionalism from officers re concerns raised with regard to public access at Lever Park, Rivington	26.6.13	Complainant had received substantive replies explaining the situation and what actions had been taken and why. The officer had provided assistance on many occasions and had shown care in continuing to provide substantive answers despite the frequency of correspondence. Explained that complainants concerns re access were negligible and	Not satisfied	Yes Cttee 16.9.13	Not upheld

Date Received	Subject Matter	Response Date	Response	Outcome Stage 1	Referred to Stage 2	Outcome Stage 2
			did not warrant action.			
14.6.13	Dissatisfaction with the action taken by LPS concerning a PCN which the complainant alleged he never received.	8.7.13 & 11.7.13	PCN was correctly issued and all the statutory documentation was sent to the address supplied by the DVLA.	Not satisfied however not appropriate to escalate to Stage 2		
17.6.13	Dissatisfaction with the action taken by LPS concerning a second PCN despite the first one being cancelled, and questioning the quality of the line markings	15.7.13	PCN cancelled and remedial work to the lines undertaken.			
24.6.13	Lack of action in stopping unlawful work taking place on common land and the wasted funds that LCC are giving the Local Access Forum which is	11.7.13 & 2.8.13	The works on the common were considered minor and the harm caused by them constituted a low priority especially as there had been no other complaints therefore satisfied that officers acted appropriately. Explained LAF aims.	Not satisfied	Yes Cttee 16.9.13	Not upheld – however recommended review of role of LCC and other agencies in

	unrepresentative of the residents of Lancashire					protecting common land
Date Received	Subject Matter	Response Date	Response	Outcome Stage 1	Referred to Stage 2	Outcome Stage 2
24.6.13	Unhappy with the way in which a land dispute/adoption issue had been handled by LCC and being asked to remove his caravan from the road	18.7.13	Complainant could not provide any evidence to show that he owned the land. LCC had adopted the land and requested that the caravan was removed as was causing obstruction. Apology offered for minor administrative issues.	Not satisfied	Yes Cttee 14.10.13	Not upheld

Environment 1/4/14 – 30/6/14

Date Received	Subject Matter	Response Date	Response	Outcome Stage 1	Referred to Stage 2	Outcome Stage 2
7.4.14	The verbally aggressive behaviour of an operator who was working on the highway outside complainants her property	25.6.14	Witness statements showed complainant had parked where the operatives were working, causing a traffic tailback and potential health and safety hazard to herself	Satisfied		

			and others. Operative admitted that he shouted and used hand gestures but no evidence could be found to suggest that he swore or was abusive towards the complainant but evidence suggested that it was the other way round. Concluded that the operative could have dealt with the matter more appropriately and calmly and will undergo further customer care training.			
10.4.14	The rude and dismissive behaviour of an officer when attending a site visit at a waste transfer station,	13.5.14	Reviewed accounts from both officers who were present at the meeting. Conversation become heated on both sides and officer was subjected to a number of comments, some inaccurate, personal and unacceptable, and decision made to withdraw from the situation. Decided that the officer will no longer be actively involved in investigating the site.			
9.6.14	Failure to replace a bollard outside	26.6.14 & 27.6.14	Numerous attempts made to contact the complainant.			

	complainant's property (damaged bollard was removed over a year ago) and also the failure to respond to a number of telephone messages and emails		Bollard had not been replaced due to budget pressures. Due to budget changes now able to replace bollard and order placed.			
11.6.14	Process of fitting SpIDs during the last 12 months, particularly the performance of a palm pilot device which was purchased on parish's behalf. Officers have failed to address the equipment's performance		Pending			
1.5.14	Failure to maintain the verges, hedges and trees to a reasonable standard in Skelmersdale town centre and roads leading to it and lack of response to email.	11.6.14	Apologised for the delay in responding. Explained that the complainants initial enquiry was mistakenly forwarded to West Lancashire Borough Council as it maintained the verges on behalf of	Not satisfied	To be arranged	

			LCC. Explained that as funding is limited, works only take place to ensure safety is not compromised and that a minimum regime of treatment is provided. LCC do not have the resources to undertake the level of works that the complainant is requesting			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--