

Public Document Pack



Democratic Services
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent CT16 3PJ

Telephone: (01304) 821199
Fax: (01304) 872453
DX: 6312
Minicom: (01304) 820115
Website: www.dover.gov.uk
e-mail: democraticservices@dover.gov.uk

4 January 2016

Dear Councillor

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT a meeting of the **STANDARDS COMMITTEE** will be held in the HMS Brave Room at these Offices on Wednesday 13 January 2016 at 10.00 am when the following business will be transacted.

Members of the public who require further information are asked to contact Kate Batty-Smith on (01304) 872305 or by e-mail at kate.batty-smith@dover.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kate Batty-Smith", written over a white background.

Chief Executive

Standards Committee Membership:

B W Butcher (Chairman)
S M Le Chevalier (Vice-Chairman)
S S Chandler
M R Eddy
P J Hawkins
S C Manion
K Mills

AGENDA

- 1 **APOLOGIES**
To receive any apologies for absence.
- 2 **APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**
To note appointments of Substitute Members.
- 3 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** (Page 3)

To receive any declarations of interest from Members in respect of business to be transacted on the agenda.

4 **MINUTES** (Pages 4-6)

To confirm the attached Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 15 July 2015.

5 **COMPLAINTS REPORT** (Pages 7-15)

To consider the attached report of the Director of Governance.

Access to Meetings and Information

- Members of the public are welcome to attend meetings of the Council, its Committees and Sub-Committees. You may remain present throughout them except during the consideration of exempt or confidential information.
- All meetings are held at the Council Offices, Whitfield unless otherwise indicated on the front page of the agenda. There is disabled access via the Council Chamber entrance and a disabled toilet is available in the foyer. In addition, there is a PA system and hearing loop within the Council Chamber.
- Agenda papers are published five clear working days before the meeting. Alternatively, a limited supply of agendas will be available at the meeting, free of charge, and all agendas, reports and minutes can be viewed and downloaded from our website www.dover.gov.uk. Minutes will be published on our website as soon as practicably possible after each meeting. All agenda papers and minutes are available for public inspection for a period of six years from the date of the meeting.
- If you require any further information about the contents of this agenda or your right to gain access to information held by the Council please contact Kate Batty-Smith, Democratic Support Officer, telephone: (01304) 872305 or email: kate.batty-smith@dover.gov.uk for details.

Large print copies of this agenda can be supplied on request.

Declarations of Interest

Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a Member has a new or registered DPI in a matter under consideration they must disclose that they have an interest and, unless the Monitoring Officer has agreed in advance that the DPI is a 'Sensitive Interest', explain the nature of that interest at the meeting. The Member must withdraw from the meeting at the commencement of the consideration of any matter in which they have declared a DPI and must not participate in any discussion of, or vote taken on, the matter unless they have been granted a dispensation permitting them to do so. If during the consideration of any item a Member becomes aware that they have a DPI in the matter they should declare the interest immediately and, subject to any dispensations, withdraw from the meeting.

Other Significant Interest (OSI)

Where a Member is declaring an OSI they must also disclose the interest and explain the nature of the interest at the meeting. The Member must withdraw from the meeting at the commencement of the consideration of any matter in which they have declared a OSI and must not participate in any discussion of, or vote taken on, the matter unless they have been granted a dispensation to do so or the meeting is one at which members of the public are permitted to speak for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the matter. In the latter case, the Member may only participate on the same basis as a member of the public and cannot participate in any discussion of, or vote taken on, the matter and must withdraw from the meeting in accordance with the Council's procedure rules.

Voluntary Announcement of Other Interests (VAOI)

Where a Member does not have either a DPI or OSI but is of the opinion that for transparency reasons alone s/he should make an announcement in respect of a matter under consideration, they can make a VAOI. A Member declaring a VAOI may still remain at the meeting and vote on the matter under consideration.

Note to the Code:

Situations in which a Member may wish to make a VAOI include membership of outside bodies that have made representations on agenda items; where a Member knows a person involved, but does not have a close association with that person; or where an item would affect the well-being of a Member, relative, close associate, employer, etc. but not his/her financial position. It should be emphasised that an effect on the financial position of a Member, relative, close associate, employer, etc OR an application made by a Member, relative, close associate, employer, etc would both probably constitute either an OSI or in some cases a DPI.

Minutes of the meeting of the **STANDARDS COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Wednesday, 15 July 2015 at 11.00 am.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor B W Butcher

Councillors: M R Eddy
P J Hawkins
K Mills

Also Present: Mr B P S Dowley (Independent Person)

Officers: Director of Governance
Solicitor to the Council
Corporate Complaints and Resilience Officer
Democratic Support Officer

13 APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor S M Le Chevalier.

14 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that there were no substitute members appointed.

15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

16 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 17 December 2014 and 25 March 2015 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

17 COMPLAINTS REPORT

The Committee received the report of the Director of Governance on formal complaints received by the Council for the period 1 October 2014 to 30 June 2015 that had been investigated by the Corporate Services Team.

The Corporate Complaints and Resilience Officer (CCRO) advised that eight complaints had been investigated at stage two of the Council's complaints process, three of which had been upheld by the CCRO. In respect of Complaint No CTX095, the CCRO acknowledged that the delay in charging the complainant for Council Tax had been unacceptable. In respect of Complaint No HND059, the Council had failed to do what it promised, but steps had been taken to ensure that this did not recur. Of the four cases investigated by the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO), three had been upheld. However, in none of these cases had the LGO concluded that an injustice had occurred to the complainant.

Referring to Appendix A of the report, the CCRO advised that 138 complaints had been received for the period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015, exactly the same number as for the corresponding period in 2013/14. Appendix D set out the lessons learned and actions taken as a result of complaints received. Appendix E provided

a summary of decisions taken by the LGO in the preceding two years. These figures indicated no trends and gave no cause for alarm.

Councillor M R Eddy welcomed Appendix D which was useful. The CCRO advised that a significant number of complaints about Planning matters arose from the fact that the complainants did not like the decision that had been made or simply did not understand the Planning process.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

18 REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATIONS

The Committee received a report on dispensations requested by Councillors P S Le Chevalier and S M Le Chevalier under Section 33 of the Localism Act 2011 and paragraph 8 of the Council's Code of Conduct.

RESOLVED: That the dispensations for Councillors P S Le Chevalier and S M Le Chevalier be granted with immediate effect, in the form set out at Appendix 1 of the report, for the remainder of the Members' current terms of office as District Councillors, unless revoked by the Council before then.

19 AMENDMENTS TO ARRANGEMENTS FOR CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINTS

The Solicitor to the Council reminded Members that the Kent Model Code of Conduct and associated model arrangements, under which allegations could be investigated, had been developed by a working group of the Association of Kent Secretaries (AKS), a professional association comprising Monitoring Officers and Chief Legal Officers from across Kent. The working group had undertaken a review of the Code and associated arrangements, and its recommendations had been adopted by AKS. The revised model arrangements (which contained only amendments) were now before the Committee for its approval. No changes were being proposed to the model Code itself.

AKS considered that some of the time limits in the model arrangements were too tight in practice, and they had therefore been extended. Another change was the removal of the requirement to publish on the Council's website the initial decision of the Monitoring Officer on whether to take action in respect of a complaint. The hearing panel procedure had been amended to include the introduction of a new pre-hearing procedure, and also now made provision for the Monitoring Officer to play a role in hearings in recognition of his key role in handling complaints in the earlier stages.

The Committee was advised that AKS had considered the 3-month time limit for the receipt of complaints. AKS had decided to retain the 3-month time limit in the model arrangements, having considered and rejected the approach taken by at least one Kent authority in conferring discretion on its Monitoring Officer to extend the time limit. Both the Monitoring Officer and the Solicitor to the Council considered that the position adopted by AKS to retain the time limit was to be preferred.

RESOLVED: (a) That the revised arrangements for the handling of allegations, as set out in the appendix to the report, be approved.

(b) That the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any further editorial changes to the arrangements.

- (c) That, in the opinion of the Standards Committee, a fixed 3-month time limit should be retained for the receipt of complaints after the alleged misconduct occurred.

The meeting ended at 11.26 am.

DOVER DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF GOVERNANCE

STANDARDS COMMITTEE – 13 JANUARY 2016

COMPLAINTS REPORT FOR THE PERIOD 1 JULY 2015 TO 31 DECEMBER 2015

Recommendation

That the report be noted and the actions taken be endorsed.

Contact Officer: Sue Carr, extension 2322.

1. UPDATE OF COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Reported below is an update of formal complaints investigated by the Corporate Services Team at stage two of the Council's complaints process for the quarters from 1 July 2015 to 31 December 2015. Fourteen complaints have been investigated and three were upheld. There may be issues raised through the complaints process where the Corporate Support Section provides a written explanation of Council policy and procedures but which do not require an investigation. These are not included within this report but are included within the figures in the tables at Appendices A and C.

1.1 Complaint No. ASB010 – Walmer (Closed)

The complainant was dissatisfied with the amount of time taken by the Community Safety Unit (CSU) to resolve a neighbour dispute and stated that they did not receive feedback following a meeting between the Officer and their neighbour. The matter was investigated by the Corporate Complaints & Resilience Officer (CCRO) who found that this was not an issue over which the CSU had any jurisdiction. Despite this the Officer carried out mediation between the two parties. The Officer had already apologised for the length of time taken to resolve the matter and the CCRO explained that details of the meeting between the Officer and the third party could not be revealed due to data protection. The complaint was not upheld.

1.2 Complaint No. BDG030 – Eastry (Closed)

A complaint was received that information had been given by Building Control to a third party who was no longer employed by the complainant. The matter was reviewed by the CCRO and it was determined that Building Control had met with a third party but at that time the Officer was unaware that they were no longer employed by the complainant. No evidence was found of maladministration but the recommendation was made that file notes be made of all meetings to establish the nature of discussions and agreements reached. The complaint was not upheld.

1.3 Complaint No. DEV184 – Little Stour & Ashston (Closed)

The complainant was unhappy with a decision taken by Planning Committee for residential development. They alleged that the information provided to Committee was incorrect and therefore Members had taken a decision based upon mis-information. Following an investigation the process and procedures had been

explained to the complainant. There was no evidence of maladministration and the complaint was not upheld.

1.4 **Complaint No. DEV188 & DEV 190 – Aylesham (Closed)**

Two complaints relating to a planning decision for approval of residential properties were investigated. The complainants advised that letters confirming the date of the planning committee were not received and the decision should be overturned as the development would increase the flooding in the area. The CCRO apologised that they had not received the letters but confirmed that they had been sent. It was also explained that the objections had been taken into consideration within the Case Officer's report and a surface water drainage system was to be incorporated within the development which would provide improvements to the current surface water flooding situation. The complaint was not upheld.

1.5 **Complaint No. HND062 – Outside District (Closed)**

This complaint related to housing provision. The complainant who lived outside the district claimed that the Council had not applied the policy for local connection and that medical points relating to their disability had not been awarded. The matter was investigated by the CCRO who found that the Council had applied the local connection policy correctly and that the complainant's medical circumstances had been assessed. There was no evidence of maladministration and the complaint was not upheld.

1.6 **Complaint No. ENV044 – Little Stour & Ashstone (Closed)**

This complaint related to private drainage and flooding. The complainants were unhappy with the information and assistance provided by the Environmental Protection Team. The CCRO responded to the questions raised by the complainants and as they disputed the information provided, a meeting was arranged between the complainants and Officers. The matter was a civil dispute between neighbours and the Council explained that they could not support either party in their claim but would provide documentary evidence if requested to do so by either party's solicitor. There was no evidence of maladministration and the complaint was not upheld.

1.7 **Complaint No. PSH020 – Eythorne & Shepherdswell (Closed)**

This complaint related to the provision of information in respect of a disabled facilities grant and a decent homes loan. The complainant claimed that they should be awarded compensation as they had not been provided with all the information when they initially contacted the Council. The CCRO investigated and confirmed the details of the amounts due, when they would be repayable and whether or not interest was due. The complaint was upheld and the CCRO apologised on behalf of the Council for not providing all of the information when responding to the initial request.

1.8 **Complaint No. COM009 – Tower Hamlets (Closed)**

The complainant alleged that the correct procedures had not been followed when advertising the temporary closure of the cycleway through Pencester Gardens. The matter was investigated and it was found that the District Council officers who dealt with the events at the park were not aware that the cycleway had been the subject of a Deed of Dedication and therefore maintained at public expense by Kent County Council, the highway authority. The complaint was upheld and an apology given for

the error. The records have now been amended and the officers involved are aware of the status of the land so that if a closure is required in future the correct notices in accordance with the highway legislation will be used.

1.9 **Complaint No. DEV192 – Ringwold (Closed)**

This complaint related to the non-enforcement of a planning condition. The complainant was of the view that a condition in respect of parking at a holiday park should be enforced. They were of the opinion that it was a condition precedent and without its implementation the planning permission did not take effect. They alleged that as a condition precedent the Council had no discretion as to whether or not to enforce it. The CCRO confirmed that the planning officer had considered this point but was of the view that the condition did not go to the heart of the planning decision to allow all year round use. The park had permission to operate throughout the busy summer months when parking is at a premium and yet this condition does not apply to that planning permission. It was the Council's opinion that the provision of parking is not vital to the opening of the park for the remainder of the year when there is not as much traffic on site and therefore could not be considered to be a "true" condition precedent. The CCRO could find no evidence of maladministration and the complaint was not upheld.

1.10 **Complaint No. ENV045 – Middle Deal & Sholden (Closed)**

This complaint related to noise from a factory. The complainant was unhappy with the way the officer dealt with them and felt that their disability issues should have been taken into consideration. The matter was investigated by the CCRO who found that procedures had been followed. The noise was due to unauthorised work that had been carried out at the factory and as the factory owner agreed to undertake improvements there was no need for the Council to utilise the regulatory framework and law enforcement powers available. With regard to the Equalities Act, the Council has a duty to make reasonable adjustments where a practice of theirs would put a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage, especially with regard to access to services. In this case the complainant had not been disadvantaged in any way as they were able to report their concerns to the Environmental Protection and Planning Officers. The CCRO could find no evidence of maladministration and the complaint was not upheld.

1.11 **Complaint No. GOV021 – GOV027, – Little Stour & Ashstone (Closed)**

Seven complaints were received in respect of the decision taken by the Director of Governance to de-list a building which had been listed as an asset of community value on an application for review of a decision to list a building as an asset of community value. Under the Localism Act 2011 various community groups have the ability to nominate buildings and land that they wish to be added to the list of assets of community value which the Council is required to maintain. The Act (and regulations made under it) sets out the statutory scheme and the process for dealing with nominations and for reviewing them. Only the landowner can request a review of a decision to list land or buildings as an asset of community value, as happened in this case. The CCRO checked the records and was satisfied that the Council had followed its own procedures. The decision taken by the Officer was one that he was entitled to make under the legislation. The complaint was not upheld.

1.12 **Complaint No. HND064 – Little Stour & Ashstone (Closed)**

The complainant was unhappy that their details were no longer on the housing register and they claimed that they had previously been told that they did not have to register annually. The matter was investigated by the CCRO who found that the process for re-registering changed in 2006. The card system was replaced by a letter which the applicant had to sign and return to the Council. Although the process changed, it was still the responsibility of the applicant to confirm each year that they wished to stay on the housing register. From 2006 until 2011 the complainant had continued to re-register following the new procedure. The CCRO could find no evidence of maladministration by the Council and advised the complainant to complete a housing registration form if they wished to go back onto the register. The complaint was not upheld.

1.13 **Complaint No. CTX166 – St Margaret’s-at-Cliffe (Closed)**

The complainant had been granted an exemption from council tax for twelve months from April 2014. In April 2015 a bill was issued for a zero charge and the Council did not realise the error until September. The Council apologised and offered a payment plan. The complainant was unhappy stating that financial decisions had been taken based on the council tax bill received in April 2015. The matter was investigated by the CCRO who explained that the Council had no discretion to extend the discount period and that the letter granting the exemption in April 2014 made it clear that the discount period was only for twelve months and therefore the complainant should have queried the bill received in 2015. The complaint was upheld and an apology provided. The complainant advised that they would be referring the matter to the Local Government Ombudsman and this is reported at 2.2 below.

1.14 **Complaint No. PSH022 – Castle (Closed)**

The complainant alleged that they had lost business as a result of information provided by the Council to the Home Office. The CCRO advised the complainant that the Council had confirmed to the Home Office that the complainant’s property was licenced for use as a House in Multiple Occupation and there was no reason why that property could not be used. The CCRO could find no evidence of maladministration and suggested that if the complainant was unhappy that they contact the Home Office to ask for the reason for their decision. The complaint was not upheld.

2. **COMPLAINT DECISIONS ISSUED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN BETWEEN 1 JULY 2015 AND 31 DECEMBER 2015**

2.1 **DEV168** – The decision taken by the Ombudsman regarding this complaint was not to investigate as it was not made in time. The complaint related to the Council’s decision to grant planning consent for a major residential development near the complainant’s property. The application was approved in 2011, and as the Ombudsman cannot normally investigate late complaints unless there is good reason why the complaint was not made earlier, the Ombudsman carried out preliminary enquiries. The Case Officer’s report on the Council’s website revealed that due to the distance between the complainant’s property and the development site there would be no significant loss of amenity to the complainant. As the loss of amenity to the complainant was taken into account when the planning decision was made, the Ombudsman considered that there was no reason to accept the complaint when it was not made in time.

- 2.2 **CTX166** – This complaint is referred to at 1.13 above. The Ombudsman assessed the complaint but was of the opinion that although an error was made, the Council had previously made the complainant aware that the discount period could not be extended. The Ombudsman stated that if the complainant had made financial decisions based upon the council tax account received in April 2015 that they should have contacted the Council to check the validity of the account. The Ombudsman took the decision not to investigate as the Council had already offered a fair and proportionate remedy.

3. **COMPLAINT STATISTICS**

Appendix A shows the number of complaints received per Ward for the current financial year compared to 2014/15. Appendix B details the compliments received by Section for the period 1 July 2015 to 31 December 2015. Appendix C details the complaints received by the District Council and EK Services for the current financial year. Appendix D lists the Lessons Learnt from complaints from 1 July to 31 December 2015.

Resource Implications

None.

Impact on Corporate Objectives

An effective complaints system supports the delivery of the Council's corporate objectives set out within the Corporate Plan 2008-2020.

Comment from the Solicitor to the Council

The Solicitor to the Council has been consulted in the preparation of this report and has no further comments to make.

Background Papers

File C23/5 – Complaints.

Attachments

Appendix A – Ward Statistics

Appendix B – Breakdown of compliments by Section

Appendix C – Breakdown of complaints by Section for the current financial year

Appendix D – Actions Taken/Procedural Changes as a result of complaints received

SUE CARR

Corporate Complaints & Resilience Officer

The officer to whom reference should be made concerning inspection of the background papers is the Corporate Complaints & Resilience Officer, White Cliffs Business Park, Dover, Kent CT16 3PJ. Telephone: (01304) 872322.

Number of Complaints Received Per Ward and processed through the Complaints System

Ward	No of Complaints	
	1.4.14 to 31.3.15	1.4.15 to 31.12.15
	DDC	DDC
Aylesham	-	4
Buckland	4	5
Capel-le-Ferne	2	3
Castle	7	7
Eastry	1	3
Eythorne & Shepherdswell	9	2
Little Stour & Ashstone	7	9
Lydden & Temple Ewell	2	1
Maxton, Elms Vale & Priory	4	4
Middle Deal & Sholden	5	6
Mill Hill	4	2
North Deal	17	3
Outside District or N/A	11	4
Ringwould	2	2
River	2	3
Sandwich	7	3
St Margaret's-at-Cliffe	7	3
St Radigunds	5	2
Tower Hamlets	5	3
Town & Pier	4	-
Unknown	16	6
Walmer	12	3
Whitfield	5	4
Total	138	82

**Details of Compliments Received Per Section
From 1 July 2015 – 31 December 2015**

Section	Compliment
Building Control	Technical Clerk - Thank you for acting so quickly “takes the meaning of ‘first class customer service’ to a whole new level”
Communication & Engagement	PR & Marketing Officer – impressed with the content and layout of the DDC Winter News
Communication & Engagement	Design & Print Manager and Assistant – praise for the Christmas video message “inspired” and “impressive”
Licensing	Technical Support Officer – “A great credit to your service”.
Housing Needs	Housing Options Officer – “Helpful and reassuring”
Housing Needs	Housing Options Officer – Exceptionally high standard of customer care
Property Services	Multi skilled tradesmen - thanked for their work following vandalism at public conveniences in Eastry
Property Services	Multi skilled tradesmen - thanked for work to bench in Sandwich and the updates provided
Property Services	Valuation Officer - Thank you for time, effort and help tracing relative’s grave.
Property Services	Head of Assets & Building Control & Multi skilled tradesman – Thanked for help resolving complaint regarding trees/fence
Property Services	Valuation Officer – “You have just made my day, thank you so much for your trouble”
Property Services	Valuation Officer – thank you for care and consideration for assistance with funeral arrangements
Property Services	Valuation Officer & Senior Horticultural Officer – thanks for kind help and the work undertaken looks excellent
Property Services	Corporate Maintenance Inspector – thank you for assistance in purchasing a memorial bench – excellent service
Property Services & Waste Services	Head of Assets & Building Control and Waste Services Officers - Thank you for all involved in sorting out our rubbish dilemma
Various Departments	Officers from a number of departments plus Kent Highways – thank you for the assistance with the Trafalgar Day Parade in Deal. Technical questions resolved with the assistance of the various teams.

Complaints by Section from 1 April 2015 to 31 December 2015

Complaint Type	Reason for Complaint	Number
Communication & Engagement - DDC	Delay in response	1
Communication & Engagement - DDC	Procedural fault	1
Community Safety Unit - DDC	Delay in response	1
Building Control - DDC	Alleged breached of data protection	1
Building Control - DDC	Procedural fault	1
Council Tax & NNDR - EKS	Administration	2
Council Tax & NNDR - EKS	Billing	4
Council Tax & NNDR - EKS	Discount	3
Council Tax & NNDR - EKS	Recovery	9
Council Tax & NNDR - EKS	Data Protection	1
Customer Services - EKS	Staff attitude	1
Customer Services - EKS	Telephony system	3
Development Control - DDC	Administration - format of website	1
Development Control - DDC	Merits of decision	5
Development Control - DDC	Procedures	1
Development Control - DDC	Enforcement	2
Environmental Protection - DDC	Not answering telephones	1
Environmental Protection - DDC	Staff actions and attitude	1
Environmental Protection - DDC	Service Provision - action taken re sewerage issue	1
Environmental Protection - DDC	Merits of decision re: pollution monitoring	1
Governance - DDC	Breach of Data Protection	1
Governance - DDC	Merits of Decision - Asset of community value	7
Horticulture - DDC	Response and decision	1
Housing & Council Tax Benefits - EKS	Advice	1
Housing & Council Tax Benefits - EKS	Claim processing	2
Housing & Council Tax Benefits - EKS	Administration - wording of a letter	1
Housing & Council Tax Benefits - EKS	Overpayment	1
Housing Needs - DDC	Rehousing	4
Housing Needs - DDC	Maintenance of Housing Register	1
Housing Needs - DDC	Administration	1
Housing Services - EK Housing	Recharges	1
Licensing - DDC	Querying decision for licence	1
Parking Services - DDC	Staff attitude	1
Private Sector Housing - DDC	Provision of information	3
Property Services - DDC	Monitoring of cleaning contract	1
Property Services - DDC	Administration - processing of refund	1
Property Services - DDC	Service Provision - high hedge and rubbish attracting vermin	1
Waste Services - DDC	Missed collection	8
Waste Services - DDC	Merits of decision	2
Waste Services - DDC	Damage caused by crew	1
Waste Services - DDC	Service Provision - litter left after collection	1

**Actions Taken and/or Procedural Changes as a result of
Complaints received between
1 July 2015 and 31 December 2015**

Section	Complaint	Actions Taken/Procedural Changes
Building Control – DDC	Actions taken by a member of staff	Notes should be made of all meetings with applicants and builders
Council Tax – EKS	System error resulted in discounts not ending on accounts	Software provider amended the system
Council Tax – EKS	No explanation for amendment to account	Explanatory letter to accompany revised bills
Customer Services – EKS	Navigation through telephone system	Interactive voice response to be reviewed
Environmental Protection – DDC	Complainant not asked to put complaint in writing	When taking a complaint by telephone confirm details of complaint with complainant
Property Services - DDC	No response to correspondence.	Procedures put in place to log and monitor correspondence.
Housing Benefits – EKS	Wording of correspondence not courteous	Comments to be taken into consideration when the standard letters are reviewed
Property Services – DDC	Refund not processed as request included in an attachment which had not been opened	Officers must open and check all attachments
Property Services – DDC	Standard of work carried out by cleaning contractors.	New system for reporting issues direct to the Contractor is resolving complaints more quickly.
Private Sector Housing – DDC	Not all details of grant provided	Copy documentation to be provided