

Appendix A – Summary of upheld decisions by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO) during 2020-21 and 2021- 2022.

Reporting period – 1st April 2020-31st March 2021					
Reference	Decision date	Service area	Complaint Description and finding	Response and Remedy	Compensation
19008017	30.01.20	Planning	<p>The Council did not properly consider the impact a development close to Ms C's home would have on Ms C's amenity. It has agreed to consider a suitable remedy, once a live application has been decided. Upheld: maladministration and injustice.</p> <p><i>The decision showed on the LGSCO's records in 2019-20 and the Council's in 2020-21 when the remedy was carried out and accepted by the LGSCO.</i></p>	<p>The Council agreed to carry out an assessment of the impact that its fault has had on Ms C's amenity, within three months of the date of its planning application decision. It will then offer a suitable remedy to Ms C, in accordance with the Ombudsman's guidance.</p>	£2,150

Reporting period – 1st April 2021-31st March 2022					
Reference	Decision date	Service area	Complaint Description and finding	Response and Remedy	Compensation
20 003 779	26.08.21	Planning	<p>Ms X complains about how the Council has dealt with her neighbour's planning applications and its offer of £2000 to remedy its faults in the consideration of an earlier planning application. There is no fault in how the Council reached its</p>	<p>Send a written apology to Ms X for failing to provide sufficient information for her to understand why it</p>	£2000

			<p>decisions not to take enforcement action when it refused a retrospective planning application and no fault in its decision to consider a further planning application. There is also no evidence of fault in how the Council reached its decision that planning permission for the development is valid. The payment of £2000 is sufficient to remedy the injustice caused by the Council's fault in the consideration of the earlier planning application. However, the Council is at fault for failing to explain the basis for its payment and for failing to manage Ms X's expectations. The Council has agreed to apologise to Ms X for this fault. Upheld: maladministration and injustice.</p>	<p>considered a remedy of £2000 to be sufficient and for raising her expectations by not explaining the developer could have built extensions under the permitted development rules.</p>	
<p>20013809 20013810 20014040</p> <p><i>1 complainant on behalf of 3 individuals.</i></p>	24.09.21	Slough Children Trust	<p>Slough Children First refused to consider Mr D's complaint through the children's complaints procedure on the basis he made the complaint late. This has caused upset, time and trouble. The Council will now consider the complaint and apologise for failing to do so.</p>	<p>The Council will accept Mr D's complaint and consider it though its statutory children's complaints procedure. The Council will apologise for failing to accept the complaint following grounds arising in 2020 and for not giving a good reason for the rejection.</p>	