

<b>SUSTAINABLE GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b>	<b>Agenda Item No. 7</b>
<b>6 MARCH 2012</b>	<b>Public Report</b>

## **Report of the Executive Director of Strategic Resources**

**Contact Officer(s)** – Mark Sandhu, Head of Customer Services – Tel: 296321  
Belinda Evans, Customer Service Manager - Tel: 296324

### **COMPLAINTS MONITORING REPORT 2010 - 11**

#### **1. PURPOSE**

- 1.1
- To provide a summary of formal complaints monitored between 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011 which fall under the Corporate Complaints' Policy.
  - To comment on the annual report from the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) about the council's performance on complaints.

#### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 Members to note the information presented in this report regarding complaints received between 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010 and the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011.

#### **3. LINKS TO THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

- 3.1 The effective management of complaints is important to ensure action is taken when customers express dissatisfaction about the delivery of any of our services. Failure to do so could impact upon any of the priorities in the Sustainable Community Strategy:-
- Creating opportunities – tackling inequalities;
  - Creating strong and supportive communities;
  - Creating the UK's environmental capital; and
  - Delivering substantial and truly sustainable growth.

#### **4. BACKGROUND**

- 4.1 The Scrutiny Committee requested this item at its first meeting on 16 June 2003 and it is agreed that they will continue to receive regular monitoring reports.

#### **5. KEY ISSUES**

- 5.1 Although this year saw an increased number of recorded complaints (366 to 416) it was pleasing to note that almost 90% of all complaints received were resolved at the first opportunity ie stage one of the process.

The most common cause for complaint continued to be delayed or failed service although a reduction in complaints due to staff attitude/conduct was seen.

Speed of response to Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) enquiries improved from 29 days to 22 days and no findings of maladministration were found against the council throughout the year. The LGO upheld the council's decision in every one of the 11 cases that had been subject to a stage 3 investigation.

Information about the number of compliments received is included for the first time and positive to report the number of compliments exceeded the number of recorded complaints.

## **6. IMPLICATIONS**

### **6.1 Customer Service**

Customer service and perception of the council will improve if complaints are processed quickly and effectively. If complaints are resolved at the earliest opportunity this ultimately saves time by more senior officers when complaints are escalated. If service improvements are identified and acted upon this will lead to fewer complaints in the future and improve the Council's reputation.

### **Financial**

The report contains no financial implications

## **7. CONSULTATION**

7.1 The report has been shared with Directors and Heads and comments have been included.

## **8. NEXT STEPS**

8.1 Any comments and suggestions from Committee will be considered and incorporated in subsequent complaints reports.

## **9. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

9.1 • Local Government Ombudsman Annual Review 2010-11

## **10. APPENDICES**

10.1 Appendix 1 - Complaints Monitoring Report 2010-11

## Appendix 1

### 1. COMPLAINTS MONITORING REPORT 2010-11

1.1 This report will analyse the performance of the council's formal Corporate Complaints Procedure between 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011. It is important to note that this report does not include complaints that fall outside the Corporate Complaints Policy, for example, complaints relating to schools, Statutory Children Social Care and Adult Social Care.

1.2 The Corporate Complaints Policy has three-stages:

- Stage One (First Contact Complaint)
- Stage Two (Service Review)
- Stage Three (Independent Person Review)

Stage	Action	Timescale
1	The council aims to settle the majority of complaints quickly and satisfactorily through the 'front line' employees who provide the service or the relevant manager. The complaint may be resolved informally by way of an apology, by providing the service required, or providing an explanation to the customer.	10 Working Days *
2	If the customer is not happy with the decision at Stage 1, he/she can appeal to the Central Complaints Office, who asks the relevant Head of Service or Assistant Director to investigate the complaint fully and provide a written response to the customer.	15 Working Days
3	If the customer is not happy with the decision at Stage 2, he/she can appeal to the Chief Executive who will appoint an independent person to investigate the complaint fully and provide a written report to the customer.	30 Working Days

Note: \*Stage 1 complaints can be responded to in various ways depending on how the customer contacts the council and the complexity of the complaint. For example, it is hoped that the majority of complaints will be resolved without delay on the telephone or in person, but those that are sent in by letter should be responded to within the corporate standard of 10 working days.

### 2. STAGE ONE COMPLAINTS (FIRST CONTACT COMPLAINTS)

2.1 The table below shows the number of Stage 1 complaints received for each department during 2010/11 including those that were received and logged by the Central Complaints Office (CCO). The data for the previous year is included to allow comparisons to be made.

2.2 The data below illustrates an increase in the number of Stage 1 complaints overall.

Department	2009/2010		2010/2011	
	Total complaints received	Logged by CCO	Total complaints received	Logged by CCO
Chief Executive's Dep't	2	2	12	6
Children's Services	3	3	4	4
City Services	87	54	63	46
Operations	151	81	166	83
Strategic Resources	123	55	171	49
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>188</b>

2.3 We have continued to collect more detailed data from departments. This allows us to analyse all stage 1 complaints received by the council. The next two tables show the category and outcomes for all stage 1 complaints.

2.4 All complaints are classified into a category, the table below shows the breakdown by category for all stage 1 complaints logged between 2010/11 (examples of each category are given in table 19 in Section 10).

<b>Table 3: Department</b>	<b>Not To Standard</b>	<b>Poor Facility/Building</b>	<b>Broken Promise/Appointment</b>	<b>Staff Attitude Conduct</b>	<b>Breach Of Confidentiality</b>	<b>Denial/Withdrawal Of Service</b>	<b>Delayed/Failed Service</b>	<b>Lack Of/Incorrect Info About A Service</b>	<b>About Legislation</b>	<b>About Policy</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Chief Executives</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>
Communications	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
Democratic Services	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	6
Human Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Strategic Resources</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>171</b>
Customer Services	1	1	0	27	1	1	33	1	0	0	0	65
Revenues and Benefits	1	0	2	1	4	1	43	0	10	8	33	103
Corporate Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shared Transactional Services	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
<b>Childrens Services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
Learning & Skills	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Family & Communities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commissioning & Performance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Operations</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>166</b>
Planning Delivery Services	0	0	0	3	0	1	22	0	2	11	3	42
City Centre Operations	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	7	11
Environment, Transport & Engineering	3	3	0	5	0	0	9	1	0	0	51	72
Neighbourhood Services	1	0	0	8	0	1	20	3	2	2	4	41
<b>City Services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>63</b>
Street Scene and Facilities	0	1	0	3	0	0	42	0	1	5	9	61
Recreation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
<b>Overall</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>416</b>

2.5 Delayed/failed service remains the most common category with 44% of the total number of stage 1 complaints. The second most common category is Other with 26%, the majority of which were from two service areas (Revenues & Benefits and Environment, Transport & Engineering). The Central Complaints team will work with these departments to establish if in these type of complaints could be recorded under any of the existing categories.

We have seen a reduction in the number of stage 1 complaints about staff attitude with 12% (51) of complaints falling into this category compared to 16% (58) last year.

2.6 To put the number of complaints received into perspective an exercise has been undertaken for a number of services to calculate the number of complaints as a percentage of total contacts. For example the number of telephone calls and face to face interviews completed during the year by customer services was in excess of 563,000 which would equate to one recorded complaint for every 8,661 contacts. Likewise if we were to undertake a similar exercise for revenues and benefits using the total number of council tax payers, business rates payers and benefit customers it would equate to approximately 1 complaint for every 951 service users. Further thought is being given to whether a different calculation may be more appropriate and meaningful for these services and others.

2.7 Table 4 shows the outcomes for all stage 1 complaints registered between 2010/11.

<b>Table 4: Department</b>	<b>Upheld</b>	<b>Not Upheld</b>	<b>Partially Upheld</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Chief Executives Department</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>
Communications	2	1	0	3
Legal Services	2	1	0	3
Democratic Services	4	0	2	6
Human Resources	0	0	0	0
<b>Strategic Resources</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>171</b>
Customer Services	32	14	19	65
Revenues and Benefits	9	72	22	103
Corporate Services	0	0	0	0
Shared Transactional Services	0	2	1	3
<b>Childrens Services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
Learning & Skills	0	2	1	3
Family & Communities	0	0	0	0
Resources	0	0	0	0
Commissioning & Performance	0	0	1	1
<b>Operations</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>166</b>
Planning Delivery Services	7	32	3	42
City Centre Operations	1	7	3	11
Environment, Transport and Engineering	45	17	10	72
Neighbourhood Services	13	25	3	41
<b>City Centre Services</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>63</b>
Street Scene and Facilities	30	24	7	61
Recreation	0	2	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>416</b>

2.8 35% of stage 1 complaints were upheld, 48% not upheld and 17% as being partially upheld. These figures are similar to last year where we upheld 37.9%, did not uphold 43.7% and partially upheld 18.3%.

### 3. STAGE TWO COMPLAINTS (SERVICE REVIEW)

3.1 Table 5 breaks down Stage 2 complaints by department, we have seen a significant drop in the number of Stage 2 complaints. The Operations Department appear to have made the biggest impact on this figure having seen the biggest drop.

<b>Table 5: Stage Two Complaints By Dept</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
Chief Executive's Department	2	3
Children's Services	0	1
City Services	6	5
Operations	38	23
Strategic Resources	14	12
<b>Overall</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>44</b>

3.2 Table 6 gives greater detail of the business units who have had Stage 2 complaints during 2010/11 as well as which category the complaint fell into.

<b>Table 6: Department</b>	<b>Not To Standard</b>	<b>Poor Facility/Building</b>	<b>Broken Promise/Appointment</b>	<b>Staff Attitude Conduct</b>	<b>Breach Of Confidentiality</b>	<b>Denial/Withdrawal Of Service</b>	<b>Delayed/Failed Service</b>	<b>Lack Of/Incorrect Info About A Service</b>	<b>About Legislation</b>	<b>About Policy</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Chief Executives</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
Communications	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Democratic Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	3
Human Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Strategic Resources</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>
Customer Services	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Revenues and Benefits	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	2	0	7
Corporate Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shared Transactional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Childrens Services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Learning & Skills	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Family & Communities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commissioning & Performance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Operations</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>
Planning Delivery Services	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	8
City Centre Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environment, Transport & Engineering	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	4
Neighbourhood Services	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	0	2	1	11
<b>City Services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>
Street Scene and Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Recreation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>Overall</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>44</b>

3.3 Delayed failed service is the most common category with 40% of the stage 2 complaints falling into this category, followed by lack of or incorrect information about a service with 20% of stage 2 complaints falling into this category.

3.4 Table 7 shows the outcomes for all stage 2 complaints registered between 2010/11. 23% of the complaints were upheld, 23% partially upheld and 52% were not upheld. These figures were similar to last year when 22% were upheld, 22% were partially upheld and 56% were not upheld.

	Upheld	Not Upheld	Partially Upheld	Overall
<b>Table 7: Department</b>				
<b>Chief Executives Department</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
Communications	0	0	0	0
Legal Services	0	0	0	0
Democratic Services	2	1	0	3
Human Resources	0	0	0	0
<b>Strategic Resources</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>
Customer Services	1	1	2	4
Revenues and Benefits	0	3	4	7
Corporate Services	0	0	0	0
Shared Transactional Services	0	0	1	1
<b>Childrens Services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Learning & Skills	0	1	0	1
Family & Communities	0	0	0	0
Resources	0	0	0	0
Commissioning & Performance	0	0	0	0
<b>Operations</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>
Planning Delivery Services	3	5	0	8
City Centre Operations	0	0	0	0
Environment, Transport and Engineering	1	3	0	4
Neighbourhood Services	1	7	2	10*
<b>City Centre Services</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>
Street Scene and Facilities	2	1	1	4
Recreation	0	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>44</b>

\* 1 complaint was withdrawn

3.5 Table 8 shows that 95.5% of stage two complaints were acknowledged within 2 working days, a slight decrease from last year. Unlike stage 1 complaints all stage 2 complaints are logged and monitored by the Central Complaints Office and are directed to the relevant Head of Service for a response. It is important to acknowledge all complaints promptly but very occasionally there is a delay whilst trying to establish which department needs to investigate.

<b>Table 8: Stage Two Acknowledgement Times</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
The percentage of Stage 2 complaints acknowledged within 2 working days	98.30%	95.50%

3.6 During 2010-11, 81% of all stage two complaints were responded to within 15 working days this was also the percentage of stage 2 complaints that were responded to during 2009-10.

	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>
Chief Executive's Dep't	50%	66.7%
Children's Services	N/A	0%
City Services	100%	100%
Operations	78.9%	90.9%
Strategic Resources	85.7%	71.4%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>81.70%</b>	<b>81.80%</b>

#### **4. STAGE THREE COMPLAINTS (INDEPENDENT PERSON REVIEW)**

4.1 Complaints at stage 3 are investigated by the Compliance and Ethical Standards Team. The investigators are asked to investigate and prepare a report within 20 working days. This is then provided to the Chief Executive or her nominated representative so that it can be considered and a final response is sent to the complainant within a further 10 working days. Sometimes the complexity of cases requires the 20 day investigation period to be extended.

4.2 During 2010-11, the council received 21 stage three complaints, compared to 16 during 2009-10. 100% of these were acknowledged within 2 working days

Of the 21 complaints registered at stage 3, 19 were escalated from stage 2. 3 of these complaints were withdrawn during the stage 3 process and an investigation was therefore not carried out.

The outcome following the stage 3 investigation remained the same for 14 cases, of these 14 cases 5 were planning complaints, 3 were highways complaints, 3 were neighbourhood complaints, 2 were for Legal & Democratic and 1 was a cleansing complaint.

The outcome changed for 2 cases from both being not upheld at stage 2 to partially upheld at stage 3, 1 was a benefits complaint and 1 was a neighbourhoods complaint.

2 complaints went straight in at stage 3. 1 case was not upheld, and 1 case was withdrawn prior to the commencement of an investigation, both these cases involved the Operations Department.

We find that complaints are withdrawn for a number of reasons, such as an early resolution being found during the stage 3 process, or customers deciding not to pursue their complaint.

4.3 Table 10 breaks down the stage 3 complaints by directorate.

	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>
Chief Executive's Dep't	0	2
Children's Services	1	0
City Services	1	1
Operations	11	16
Strategic Resources	3	2
<b>Overall</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>21</b>



- 4.4 Operations continue to have the highest number of stage 3 complaints, 7 of which were neighbourhood complaints, 5 were planning matters and 4 were about highways issues.
- 4.5 Tables 11 & 12 break down the stage 3 complaints received during 2010/11 by category and final outcome (examples of each category are given in table 19 in Section 10)

<b>Table 11 : Stage 3 Category Breakdown</b>	<b>No.</b>
Not to standard	1
Poor Facility/Building	0
Broken Promise/Appointment	1
Staff Attitude Conduct	0
Breach Of Confidentiality	1
Denial/Withdrawal Of Service	0
Delayed/Failed Service	7
Lack Of/Incorrect Info About A Service	4
About Legislation	0
About Policy	6
Other	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>

<b>Table 12: Stage 3 Outcome Breakdown</b>	<b>No.</b>
Upheld	2
Not Upheld	11
Partially Upheld	4
Withdrawn	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>

- 4.6 **Although 52% (11) of cases at stage 3 were later referred to the LGO their findings did not differ to those of the council.**

## **5. THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN (LGO)**

- 5.1 In July each year the LGO provide an annual review to the Council.

For 2010/11 the LGO received 37 complaints and enquiries relating to Peterborough City Council, compared to the 45 that were raised the previous year.

Some enquiries will result in general advice being given to the customer or with the LGO asking the customer to use the Council's own complaints policy before they will become involved.

The LGO proceeded to investigate 25 of these complaints about the Council, one more case than last year.

- 5.2 The table below outlines the number and types of decisions the Ombudsman made during the last two years.

<b>Table 13 : Ombudsman's Decisions</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>
Maladministration	1	0
Local Settlement	5	4
No or Insufficient Evidence of Maladministration	8	12
Ombudsman Discretion	9	6
Outside Jurisdiction	1	2
<b>Overall</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>

- 5.3 This year the LGO changed the way the complaints were categorised. Table 14 shows the new categories and how the complaints for our council were classed.

<b>Table 14: Category</b>	<b>2010/11</b>
MI REPS	0
LS	3
M REPS	0
NM REPS	0
NO MAL	12
OMB DIS	6
OUTSIDE JUR	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>

<b>Table 15 : Outcome Category</b>	<b>Description</b>
MI REPS	Reports: maladministration & injustice
LS	Local settlement (no report)
M REPS	Reports: maladministration no injustice
NM REPS	Reports: no maladministration
NO MAL	No Maladministration
OMB DIS	Ombudsman discretion (no report)
OUTSIDE JUR	Outside jurisdiction

- 5.4 The annual review highlights that the Ombudsman made no decisions against the Council last year. This is an encouraging sign as it shows that the Council's own complaint investigations are robust and that the Ombudsman is agreeing with the Council's findings in a high percentage of cases.

<b>Table 16: Ombudsman Enquires</b>	<b>2007- 08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
Number of enquires received	10	18	16	24
Average response times	33 days	32 days	29 days	22 days

The LGO made written enquiries about 24 complaints in the year, 8 more cases than last year. Nevertheless our average response time to them was 22 days well under the 28 days we are allocated.

Looking back of the last few years, this is the first year Peterborough has achieved the average target response time expected by the LGO. The procedure previously discussed and agreed with scrutiny committee whereby cases approaching the target response date are escalated to Head of Service/Director is still in place and has contributed to this year's significant improvement.

## 6 COMPLIMENTS

- 6.1 Following suggestions from Committee members last year the CCO have captured compliment data from each service area from April 2010.

As can be seen from table 17 we have recorded both internal and external compliments. External compliments are compliments received by members of the public or external organisation and internal compliments are from Councillors or from one department to another.

<b>Table 17: Compliments</b>	<b>External</b>	<b>Internal</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Chief Executives Department</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>65</b>
Communications	0	0	0
Legal Services	6	5	11
Democratic Services	21	14	35
Human Resources	2	17	19
<b>Strategic Resources</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>164</b>
Customer Services	158	2	160
Revenues and Benefits	3	0	3
Corporate Services	0	0	0
Shared Transactional Services	1	0	1
<b>Childrens Services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Learning & Skills	0	0	0
Family & Communities	0	0	0
Resources	0	0	0
Commissioning & Performance	0	0	0
<b>Operations</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>518</b>
Planning Delivery Services	182	40	222
City Centre Services	3	0	3
Environment, Transport and Engineering	64	7	71
Neighbourhood Services	196	26	222
<b>City Services</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>47</b>
Street Scene and Facilities & Recreation	42	5	47
<b>Overall</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>794</b>

- 6.2 This is the first year that compliments have been formally recorded and whilst it is pleasing to note that the number of compliments has exceeded the number of recorded complaints further work needs to be undertaken to fully establish what has prompted the compliment.

## 7 OTHER USEFUL INFORMATION

- 7.1 Table 18 shows how complaints are received, at the moment this data is only available on complaints received by the CCO. However we are now looking at ways to capture this data on all complaints across the Authority so that a clearer picture can be reported in the future.

<b>Table 18 : How Received</b>	<b>2009-10</b>		<b>2010-11</b>	
	%	Number	%	Number
Chief Exec's Office	4.9%	12	3.6%	8
Email/Online Form	40.9%	101	42.2%	95
Fax	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
In Person	4.0%	10	4.9%	11
In Writing	18.2%	45	23.1%	52
Ombudsman	6.1%	15	7.1%	16
Telephone	25.5%	63	18.7%	42
Through a representative	0.4%	1	0.4%	1

7.2 Email or our online complaints form continues to be the method used by a majority of our customers when raising concerns.

7.3 Table 19 show some examples of the types of complaints that fall under the different categories.

<b>Table 19: Complaint Category</b>	<b>Examples (UPDATE)</b>
Not to standard	Correspondence not being responded to in accordance to Customer Service Standards
Poor facility/building	Inadequate facilities at public toilets
Broken promise/appointment	Appointment cancelled without explanation
Staff attitude/conduct	Rudeness from a member of staff
Breach of confidentiality	Releasing information to the wrong party
Denial/withdrawal of service	Department no longer providing pre-paid envelopes for council tax payments
Delayed/failed service	Delay in processing benefit claim
Lack of/incorrect information about service	Incorrect information at a bus stop
About legislation	Concerns regarding actions taken in relation to smoke nuisance complaint
About policy	Unhappy about being charged for pre-application advice regarding a planning matter
Other	Concerns about the road closures

## 8. **SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS**

8.1 The table below lists some service improvements following complaints that have been made.

<b>Table 20: Service Improvements Arising From Complaints</b>	
Department	Service Improvement
Various	Training needs identified for staff
City Services	Alternative refuse collection considered following problems with collections
Transport & Engineering	Review how consultations are carried out and ensure that it is clear how residents should object within the specified consultation period
Planning	Letter templates amended following concerns about the layout
Housing	Reminder issued to staff to ensure customers understand decisions made and options available to them

## 9 VIVACITY

- 9.1 In May 2010, management of Peterborough City Council's Key Theatre, Museum and Art Gallery, public libraries and sports centre's transferred into a specially created culture and leisure trust called Vivacity.

The table below details the complaints for Vivacity during 2011/11.

Table 21: Department	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total
Sports Services	8	3	3	5	19
Libraries	7	6	1	3	17
Total	15	9	4	8	36

## 10. PERSISTENT COMPLAINANTS

- 10.1 The complaints policy contains provision to restrict customer's access in exceptional circumstances.

Complainants can sometimes pursue their complaints in a manner which can impede an investigation or can cause a significant resource issue for the council. In these circumstances, the behaviour of the complainant may be defined as unreasonably persistent. The council defines an unreasonably persistent complainant as:-

***'those complainants who, because of the frequency or nature of their contacts with the council, hinder the council's consideration of their, or other people's, complaints.'***

During 2010-11 this was applied to one customer and their access was formally restricted.

This page is intentionally left blank