

JBD annual complaint report – 2024



1. Introduction.

It is a requirement of the Housing Ombudsman Service's Complaints Handling Code that an annual report must be provided to the Board for scrutiny and challenge. Below I have set out numerical and narrative details on complaints received in 2024.

Separate from this report, I will also provide a draft of our annual self-assessment submission to the Ombudsman. This will give the Board an opportunity to make comments prior to our final submission.

2. Complaints in 2024:

Complaints in 2024	
Received	6
Responded to at S1	5
Not accepted	1
Upheld at S1	3
Not upheld at S1	2
Escalated to S2	0
Escalated to HOS	0

All complaints were responded to within ten working days, which is the timescale for Stage 1 complaints set out in our policy and the Complaints Handling Code.

2.1 Themes:

All complaints responded to centered around customer service from staff, in four cases from House Managers and in the other from Tenancy Support.

No complaints were received regarding maintenance issues, or anti-social behaviour, which are two key drivers of dissatisfaction in social housing. This reflects the success of the communities in our buildings, and our in-house repairs service.

2.2 Location of complaints responded to:

Building	Number	Upheld
Aztec House	3	1
Cherry Tree Court	1	1
Frances & Dick James	1	1
Cecil Rosen Court	0	0
Milne Court	0	0
Fairacres	0	0
Hilary Dennis Court	0	0

2.3 Upheld complaints, lessons learned, and actions taken:

One complaint regarded tone and location of communication between a House Manager and a tenant. The House Manager was reminded of her responsibilities around communication, and no further complaints have been received.

The second upheld complaint regarding House Managers regarded the appropriateness of a House Manager accessing a flat in a non-emergency situation. Refresher training was given to all House Managers to ensure that flats are only accessed when it is necessary and appropriate to do so.

The complaint regarding Tenancy Support concerned the tone of a phone call, and advice given over the phone that caused confusion. We arranged for our Tenancy Support Advisor to visit the tenant in person to reduce the risk of miscommunication and reminded the Tenancy Support Advisor of the expectation around her role that potentially sensitive conversations should be held in person wherever possible.

2.4 Complaints not upheld:

In both cases, complaints were not upheld because in the investigation it was clear that House Managers took appropriate action. This was explained in detail in the complaint responses.

In one case, contact from the tenant around the issue was at a significantly inappropriate level of frequency, and contact restrictions were placed on him in line with our Complaints Policy. This led to a successful reduction in contact, and the restrictions were removed upon review after three months, also in line with policy.

In the other case, the explanation was accepted by the tenant.

2.5 Complaint not accepted:

This is related to noise from the milk delivery service at Fairacres, which is not something within JBD's direct control and therefore falls outside the scope of our complaints policy. The tenant was advised that we could not respond as a complaint, but we have also shared the tenant's concerns with the delivery company, which is an outcome the tenant was satisfied with.

3. Interaction with the Ombudsman in 2024:

We have had no formal interactions with the Ombudsman in 2024. This means there have been no:

- findings of non-compliance with the Complaints Handling Code.
- Reports about our performance.
- mentions of JBD in any reports or publications issued by the Ombudsman.

Aidan McCarthy
February 2025