# TQPD OPM <br> District Council 



## 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. <br> It is therefore proposed to streamline the complaints procedure from a 3 stage to a 2 stage process. <br> The attached updated policy proposes the following changes:- <br> - 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 |


|  | Department or a combined response; <br> - Stage 2 to be a review by the Chief Executive; <br> - 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 <br> - 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. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 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) <br> If relevant, a note of the dispensation granted by the Monitoring Officer: | None |
| Reason Decision, or supporting Report, is not published: <br> Tick one or more of the specific exemptions, <br> and <br> 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). | The report supporting the Decision contains confidential information |
|  | The Report supporting the Decision falls within an exemption pursuant to Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 Information: |
|  | - Relates to an individual |
|  | - Likely to reveal the identity of an individual |
|  | - Relating to financial or business affairs of a person or organisation |
|  | - Relates to a claim for legal professional privilege in legal proceedings |
|  | - Reveals that the Council proposes to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a |



