OD0027





## **Record of Officer's Decision**

## The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Date of Decision:	25 September 2015
Decision Maker (Officer):	Karen Neath (Management and Members' Support Manager)
Authority for Delegated Decision (Cabinet/Committee Decision or Scheme of Delegation – provide reference):	Part 3.38 section 4.3 paras 1. And 4 (ii)
Identify which Portfolio Holder(s)/Committee Chairman consulted?	Assets and Corporate Services Portfolio Holder
Ward Member(s) consulted?	None
Is it a Key Decision?	No
Is it subject to call-in?	Yes
Decision Made:	To agree an updated Corporate Complaints Policy
Reason for Decision (if a report was produced to support the Decision, refer to it):	To enable an updated policy to be introduced. Statistics show that 199 stage 1 complaints were dealt with in 2014/15. Of these 15 were considered at stage 2 and 8 at stage 3. Therefore the majority of complaints are resolved at stage 1. For complaints that progress beyond stage 1, it is very rare that there is a different finding at stage 2 or stage 3.
	It is therefore proposed to streamline the complaints procedure from a 3 stage to a 2 stage process.
	The attached updated policy proposes the following changes:-
	<ul> <li>Stage 1 to be dealt with by a manager within the relevant department. This could be s senior manager or the Corporate Director / Head of</li> </ul>

	<ul> <li>Department or a combined response;</li> <li>Stage 2 to be a review by the Chief Executive;</li> <li>Complainants to be directed in the first instance to administrative staff in the relevant department who will log and co-ordinate complaints. The current policy directs complainants to the Corporate Directors / Head of Department; and</li> <li>Response time for stage 1 to be extended to 15 working days rather than 10. This will give more time for the complaint to be fully considered at stage 1 as the stage 2 review within the department will be removed.</li> </ul>
Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations:	There are none.
Details of any Alternative Options Considered and rejected (together with reasons):	None
Details of any declarations of interest (by Portfolio Holder/Committee Chairman who was consulted by the officer, which related to the decision)	None
If relevant, a note of the dispensation granted by the Monitoring Officer:	
ReasonDecision,orsupportingReport,ispublished:Tickoneormorespecific exemptions,	<ul> <li>The report supporting the Decision contains confidential information</li> <li>The Report supporting the Decision falls within an exemption pursuant to Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 Information:         <ul> <li>Relates to an individual</li> <li>Likely to reveal the identity of an individual</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<u>and</u> Giua mara information in the	<ul> <li>Relating to financial or business affairs of a person or organisation</li> </ul>
Give more information in the final box with regards to why the exemption applies and outweighs the public interest test (which is in favour of disclosure).	<ul> <li>Relates to a claim for legal professional privilege in legal proceedings</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Reveals that the Council proposes to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a</li> </ul>

the second second

. ÷.,

person; or to make an order or direction under any enactment • Relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime And is exempt if and so long, as in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information Reasons: Officers KWEath Signed: Title: Management and Members' Support Manager In consultation with Signed: Portfolio Holder For Assets and Corporate Services Dated: 2015