

Complaints received – Quarter 3 2025 comparative information

	Total	Chief Executive	Deputy Chief Executive	Executive Director	Monitoring Officer	Liberty Leisure Ltd
Number of Stage One complaints	110	88	4	18	0	0
No. of complaints concluded under Stage Two	22	20	2	0	0	0
No. of complaints determined by the Ombudsman	3	3	0	0	0	0

The above table highlights the complaints received in quarter 3 2025 for comparison purposes to the quarter 3 2026 complaint submissions.

Complaints received – Quarter 3 2026

	Total	Chief Executive	Deputy Chief Executive	Executive Director	Monitoring Officer	LLeisure
Number of Stage One complaints	96	62	8	24	0	2
No. of complaints concluded under Stage Two	22	21	0	1	0	0
No. of complaints determined by the Ombudsman	3	3	0	0	0	0

Breakdown of complaints and compliments by department and section**Chief Executive's department**

Service Areas	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Development Control	3	2	0	0
Housing and Income	9	3	0	0
Housing Repairs	24	6	1	5
Housing Operations	20	6	2	7
Housing Strategy	5	3	0	0
Environmental Health	1	1	0	0
Total	62	21	3	12

Deputy Chief Executive's Department

Service Areas	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Customer Services	0	0	0	0
Capital Works	0	0	0	0
Revenues	8	0	0	0
Total	8	0	0	0

Executive Director's Department

Service Areas	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Communications	0	0	0	2
Environment	0	0	0	2
Waste and Recycling	23	1	0	0
Bereavement	1	0	0	5
Total	24	1	0	9

Monitoring Officer's Department

Service Areas	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Democratic Services	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0

Liberty Leisure Ltd

Service Area	Stage 1 Complaints	Stage 2 Complaints	Ombudsman Complaints	Compliments
Bramcote Leisure Centre	1	0	0	0
Chilwell Leisure Centre	1	0	0	0
Total	2	0	0	0

STAGE 1 - FORMAL COMPLAINTS TO THE SERVICE DEPARTMENT**Time taken to acknowledge receipt of stage one complaints:**

	Total	Chief Executive	Deputy Chief Executive	Executive Director	Monitoring Officer	Liberty Leisure
Time taken to acknowledge complaints – 1 to 5 days	96	62	8	24	0	2
Time taken to acknowledge complaints - more than 5 days	0	0	0	0	0	0

Time taken to respond to stage one complaints:

	Total	Chief Executives	Deputy Chief Executive	Executive Director	Monitoring Officer	Liberty Leisure Ltd
Less than 10 working days	76	42	8	24	0	2
Over 10 working days	20	20	0	0	0	0

Directorate / Section	Chief Executive	
	Number responded to outside of 10 working days	Number of complaints where an was extension sort
Housing Operations	9	9
Housing Repairs	10	10
Housing Strategy	1	1
TOTAL	20	20

Stage 2 - Formal Complaints

22 formal complaints have been responded to in the third quarter; all of which were acknowledged within the 5 working day timescale, and 100% were responded to within the 20 working day timescale.

Time taken to respond to stage two complaints:

	Total	Chief Executives	Deputy Chief Executive	Executive Director	Monitoring Officer	Liberty Leisure Ltd
Less than 20 working days	22	21	0	1	0	0
Over 20 working days	0	0	0	0	0	0

Planning**1. Complaint against Planning**

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld**Complaint**

The complainant contacted the Council and complained regarding the erection of a fences at a neighbouring property which were considered to be a breach of planning, and the subsequent lack of any response to their emails by the Planning Enforcement Team.

Council's response

It was determined that there had been delays in communication and a lack of response being issued to the complainant regarding the planning enforcement case.

Furthermore, the Council recognised that there had been a delay in the Planning Enforcement Team concluding the planning enforcement case.

The Planning Enforcement Team determined that a section of the fence was a breach of planning regulations. This section of fence was removed, at the request of the Planning Enforcement Team, and no further action is now required.

An apology was offered to the complainant.

Assistant Director Comments

It is recognised that an appropriate level of service was not provided. The Planning Team recognises the importance of good communication especially when delays are likely.

2. Complaint against Planning

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Planning Team did not provide the Planning Committee with all the relevant information to determine a planning application.

Council's response

It was determined that all the relevant information was included in the report which was subsequently reviewed by the Planning Committee.

Furthermore, the Planning Committee visited the proposed development and determined that the original plans did not protect the complainant's amenity enough. This was subsequently altered at the Planning Committee to impose a condition to erect screening to protect their privacy. This condition was approved and the screening has since been erected.

The complainant addressed the Planning Committee under the Council's public speaking to raise their concerns regarding the application.

The Planning Committee considered this information, the information provided as part of the report and site visit and determined that the application was acceptable subject to condition to erect a screen to protect their privacy.

Assistant Director Comments

The Planning Team had correctly including all the relevant information in the reports.

Housing Repairs

1. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Housing Repairs did not repair a sewage leak in a timely manner.

Council's response

It was determined that while the Housing Repairs Team had acknowledged the complaint in the correct timeframe, the response exceeded the 10 working day timeframe.

It was noted that as part of the stage 1 complaint, the complainant was offered £250 compensation in recognition of the delays in the complaint response being issued.

There was no evidence to suggest that the Housing Repairs Team acted inappropriately when dealing with the drain blockage.

The Housing Repairs Team attended and cleared the blockage on the same day it was reported. It had been identified that the blockage was the responsibility of Severn Trent by two external contractors. However, the works were completed by the Housing Repairs Team despite this.

The Housing Repairs Team acted appropriately to clear the blockage, cleaned the complainant's property and offer them alternative accommodation while the works were undertaken.

The £250 compensation was re-offered and accepted.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience caused by not responding to the complaint in a timely manner.

All works were correctly undertaken to remove the blockage and leak.

Complaint Team Recommendations/actions

- The Housing Repairs Team has been reminded of their responsibility to effectively communicate with individuals where complaints are delayed.
- The Housing Repairs Team has been reminded to their responsibility to effectively deal with complaints within the correct timeframes.

2. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that their property was let to them in a poor standard.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the property was let in a sub-standard condition.

While works were completed before the property was let, the works were not completed to an acceptable standard.

This resulted in the property having several outstanding repairs and substandard decorating.

The works to repair the property and bring it up to standard have since been completed.

An apology and £500 compensation was offered and accepted.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience caused by letting the property in a poor standard. All subsequent works have since been completed to a satisfactory standard.

Complaint Team Recommendations/actions

- The Housing Repairs Team has been reminded to appropriately review properties before they let.
- The Housing Repairs Team has been reminded to book and complete all necessary works before the properties are let.

3. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that an issue of damp and mould had not been rectified at their property.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Housing Repairs Team correctly removed the damp and mould when reported.

The Council recognises that delays occurred in the damp and mould being identified at the property in 2023. This issue had previously been concluded and compensation was awarded at this stage.

The current damp and mould issues the complainant was encountering was caused by condensation at the property. This had been identified by two separate specialist contractors.

As part of the complainant's disrepair claim, the contractor identified that the damp and mould was caused by condensation. This was identified as the Council as being not liable for this issue.

All works relating to the damp and mould had been undertaken promptly. However, access could not be gained to the property to complete a mould wash.

Following further reports of damp and mould, the Council arranged for a contractor to review the issues at the property.

It was identified that an internal wall required a damp proof course. However, this works is not linked to the condensation at the property due to the location of the wall and areas that are affected by the condensation.

The work to install a damp proof course has not been scheduled at the complainant's request as they requested the works to be completed after the holiday period.

Assistant Director Comments

The Housing Repairs Team take all reports of damp and mould seriously. All works were completed in a timely manner when reported and have been reviewed by specialist contractors.

4. Complaint against Housing Repairs/Capital Works

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that an issue of a crack at the their property had not been correctly investigated.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the Council had failed to undertake a survey at the property to review any potential structural issues.

While this work was passed to the appropriate Department within the Council, due to an oversight, this survey had not taken place.

The survey was booked and subsequently undertaken.

An apology and £250 compensation was offered and accepted.

Assistant Director Comments

It is recognised that distress has been caused by the survey not being booked correctly. This was subsequently prioritised and regular communication is being issued to the complainant.

Complaint Team Recommendations/actions

- The Capital Works Team have been reminded to book works in an appropriate timeframe. Where these cannot met, the Capital Works Team have been reminded to communicate with residents to ensure that delays are fully explained.

5. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that an issue of a sink leak causing damage to their flooring was not correctly handled.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the repairs to kitchen plinths following the leak was not undertaken correctly.

As the plinths were not repaired correctly in the first instance this delayed the overall repair.

An apology was offered for this issue.

The Housing Repairs Team attended the leak in a timely manner and repairs were undertaken on the same day.

There was no information to suggest that the Council has acted inappropriately when repairing the leak. It was understood that this leak may have occurred for a period of time in which the flooring had been damaged.

As the Housing Repairs Team were unaware of the leak, repairs could not be undertaken to prevent further damage to the flooring until it was reported.

Furthermore, the flooring is none standard and would not be repaired by the Housing Repairs Team.

The complainant was advised to make an insurance claim either through their own insurer or the Council's.

Assistant Director Comments

It is recognised that the distress has been caused by not repairing the plinths correctly in the first instance. However, the leak was repaired on the same day when reported.

6. Complaint against Housing Repairs

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that a vermin issue had not been correctly dealt with.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the repairs to the roof to stop the ingress of vermin was not undertaken correctly.

The Housing Repairs Team had delayed the erection of scaffolding at the property to complete the works to prevent vermin entering the loft space.

The scaffolding erection was delayed by 12 months

Furthermore, by delaying this work, the Council recognises that the preventative measures originally undertaken were not effective.

An apology and £500 compensation was offered and accepted.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises that this delay is unacceptable and caused significant distress.

Complaint Team Recommendations/actions

- The Housing Repairs Team have been reminded for the necessity to complete works in a timely manner.
- Where delays are expected, the Housing Repairs Team have been reminded to contact individuals and inform them of these delays.

Housing Operations

1. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had not dealt with an issue of Anti-Social Behaviour.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Tenancy Services Team are unable to act upon instances of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) without the necessary evidence.

In this instance, as the complainant had not provided any evidence to substantiate the alleged ASB they were experiencing, the Tenancy Services Team were unable to undertake any action.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and in line with Policies to investigate the Anti-Social Behaviour reports.

2. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had requested that they remove their belongings from the communal areas.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Tenancy Services Team had appropriately requested that the complainant remove their items from the communal areas following a fire safety assessment.

The Council undertook this action to ensure that residents are safe in their homes by reducing fire risks.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and in line with the tenancy agreement.

3. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had requested that they remove their belongings from the communal areas.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Tenancy Services Team had appropriately requested that the complainant remove their items from the communal areas following a fire safety assessment.

The Council undertook this action to ensure that residents are safe in their homes by reducing fire risks.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and in line with the tenancy agreement.

4. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had not dealt with their homelessness application correctly.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Housing Options Team had correctly assessed the homelessness applications in line with the Council's Allocations Policy.

There was no information to suggest that the homelessness applications had been incorrectly dealt with. The Council's records indicate that the correct advice and processes had been followed.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and in line with the Allocations Policy.

5. Complaint against Housing Operations/Capital Works

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had requested that they remove their belongings from the communal areas.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Capital Works Team and Tenancy Services Team had correctly undertaken the actions relating to the fire risk assessments.

In order for the Council to ensure that residents are safe within their homes, the decision had been made to remove all items from communal areas and areas which could be used to escape a potential fire.

This decision was factored by the recommendation provided by the fire risk assessment undertaken by the contractor, Savilles.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and in line with the tenancy agreement.

6. Complaint against Housing Operations

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had not dealt with their homelessness application correctly.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Housing Options Team had appropriately assessed the complainant's homelessness case.

During the complainant's initial homelessness case in 2024, the Council correctly discharged its duty when the offer of Derwentio Housing Trust accommodation was presented and accepted.

While Derwentio Housing Trust was supported housing, and not permanent accommodation, the complainant was appropriately housed for the Council to discharge its homelessness duty as they had accommodation.

Following the complainant's eviction from Derwentio Housing Trust, the Housing Options Team had attempted to contact the complainant to assess their current homelessness situation. This contact had been unsuccessful and the Housing Options Team could not progress the current application due to the lack of communication.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and in line with the Allocations Policy.

Housing Strategy

1. Complaint against Housing Strategy

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that their service charge estimate bill was higher than it should be.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Leaseholder Team had appropriately issued a service charge estimate.

This estimate is intended to give Leaseholders an overview of the intended charges and this is subject to change.

Assistant Director Comments

The correct actions were undertaken to produce the service charge estimate. This is only an estimate and a final bill is issued detailing all charges.

2. Complaint against Housing Strategy

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that they had been asked to remove a gate that they had installed.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Leaseholder Team had appropriately requested that the complainant remove the gate that had been identified as a potential fire risk.

The Council are obligated to comply with the outcomes of the fire risk assessment.

In this case, as the gate has been identified as a risk, the Council is obligated to request that it be removed.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and in line with the tenancy agreement.

3. Complaint against Housing Strategy

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that they the Leaseholder Team had not dealt with their complaints of Anti-Social Behaviour correctly.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Tenancy Services Team had appropriately investigated the complaints of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB).

The Tenancy Services Team reviewed the information that had provided in a timely manner and it was determined that there was not enough evidence to pursue any further action.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and in line with the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy.

Housing Income

1. Complaint against Housing Income

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council had requested that they remove their belongings from the communal areas.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Tenancy Services Team had appropriately requested that the complainant remove their items from the communal areas following a fire safety assessment.

Council undertook this action to ensure that residents are safe in their homes by reducing fire risks.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately and in line with the tenancy agreement.

2. Complaint against Housing Income

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Council contacted them excessively regarding rent arrears.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the Income Collection Team appropriately contacted the complainant regarding their rent arrears.

The Income Collection Team are obligated to contact individuals with rent arrears. There was no information to suggest that this contact has been inappropriate or harassing in nature.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council had acted appropriately when contacting the complainant regarding their rent arrears.

3. Complaint against Housing Income

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Independent Living Team are required to test their pull cords.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the complainant was allowed to enter into an agreement that allowed you to test your own pull cord.

This should not have been offered in the first place and is not standard procedure for the testing of pull cords.

The Independent Living Team subsequently provided the correct information regarding the pull cord testing.

The Council are obligated to test this equipment to ensure that it is working correctly and free of any damage or faults.

The Council will continue to test the pull cord equipment.

This is undertaken to ensure that residents are safe within their homes.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises that this has caused confusion and inconvenience.

Environmental Health

1. Complaint against Environmental Health

Response – 20 working days

Complaint not upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Environmental Health Team have not reconnected their gas supply to their property.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was provided as the appropriate advice had been provided regarding the gas being disconnected from complainant's property.

The Council does not have the power to reconnect the gas or dictate the method in which Cadent would reconnect the gas. This remains an issue between the complainant and Cadent to resolve as a private home owner.

There was no information to suggest that the Environmental Health Team have misinterpreted their enforcement powers. The Environmental Health Team cannot undertake enforcement on Cadent.

Under the Housing Act 2004, if the Council identifies hazards with a dwelling and deem enforcement action is required the action must be taken against the person who has a legal responsibility for the dwelling where the hazard is identified. It does not allow the Council to take action against any person who does not have a legal interest in the property affected.

Assistant Director Comments

The correct actions were undertaken to advise the complainant that as the legal owner of their property they are responsible for the reconnection of the gas supply.

Environment

1. Complaint against Environment

Response – 20 working days

Complaint upheld

Complaint

The complainant contacted the Council and complained that the Waste Team had failed to collect their waste bin on the correct day.

Council's response

It was determined that an appropriate level of service was not provided as the bins had not been collected on the correct day.

This was a service error and the bin was collected following its reporting.

Assistant Director Comments

The Council recognises the inconvenience of not collecting the bin on the designated day.

**STAGE 3 – COMPLAINTS TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN (LGO)
/HOUSING OMBUDSMAN (HO)**

Stage 3 - Ombudsman Complaint

1. Complaint against Housing Repairs (complaint concluded in 2023/24)

Complaint Upheld.

Complaint

The concern raised was that the Council did not deal with an issue of noise being created by an adjoining stair case.

Ombudsman's conclusion

The Council's stage 1 complaint response set out its position in relation to any repairs needed to the stairs. Which was appropriate. However, its response failed to address the specific concerns the resident raised in their complaint, the noise disturbance. This was an error in its handling of the matter. The resident was inconvenienced by the lack of response to the actual concerns raised.

The Council's stage 2 complaint response went some way to putting the above error right by setting out its position on the noise disturbance from the stairs. It explained its position that no repairs were needed. It also explained it needed recommendations from an Occupational Therapist (OT) before it would install sound proofing. While evidently disappointing for the resident, the Council's position was reasonable. OTs are best placed to understand what specific adaptations are needed based on the needs of an individual. The Council's stage 2 complaint response failed to address the lack of detail and shortcomings of its stage 1 complaint response.

While an appropriate position to take, the Council should have been more supportive in terms of assisting the resident with an OT referral/assessment.

The HO ordered the Council to issue an apology and £100 compensation.

2. Complaint against Housing Operations (complaint concluded in 2023/24)

Complaint not Upheld.

Complaint

The concern raised was that the Council did not deal with an issue of noise generated by the building of new Council properties.

Ombudsman's conclusion

It was determined that the complaint was outside of the HO's jurisdiction.

3. Complaint against Housing Operations (complaint concluded in 2024/25)

Complaint not upheld.

Complaint

The concern raised was that the Council did not deal with an issue of housing allocation correctly during a homelessness application.

Ombudsman's conclusion

The LGO would not investigate the complaint about the Council's decision to end the relief duty after the complainant refused an offer of housing because they have appeal rights, which are reasonable for them to exercise.

In any case, there is insufficient evidence of fault in the Council's decision-making to justify the LGOs involvement.