



JBD annual complaint report – 2025

Aidan McCarthy – Director of Housing Management & Community Services

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 2025.

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 2025:

Complaints in 2025	
Received	6
Cancelled/withdrawn	1
Responded to at S1	5
Not accepted	0
Upheld at S1	2
Partially upheld at S1	1
Not upheld at S1	2
Resolved at S1	3
Escalated to S2	2
Upheld at S2	0
Partially upheld at S2	1
Not upheld at S2	1
Resolved at S2	2
Escalated to HOS	0

All complaints were responded to within ten working days at Stage 1, and twenty working days at Stage 2, which are the timescales set out in our policy and the Complaints Handling Code.

2.1 Themes:

Five complaints centred broadly around customer service from staff (this includes the complaint that was withdrawn by the tenant). The issues included whether procedures were being fairly applied, how decisions were communicated, and how effectively we had responded to concerns.

One complaint concerned a delay to roofing repairs being carried out.

2.2 Location of complaints responded to:

Building	Number
Aztec House	2
Cherry Tree Court	0
Frances & Dick James	0
Cecil Rosen Court	4
Milne Court	0
Fairacres	0
Hilary Dennis Court	0

The complaints at Aztec House both came from the same tenant. The four complaints at Cecil Rosen Court were on separate issues, from separate tenants.

2.3 Upheld complaints, lessons learned, and actions taken:

One complaint was upheld in full at Stage 1, regarding the delay to roofing works. While the delay was caused by factors that were not fully within our control – regarding poor response from a contractor for repairs that were under warranty – we accepted that the ultimate responsibility was ours, and have resolved to take a more dynamic approach should a similar situation arise in the future. Compensation was offered to the tenant in line with the Housing Ombudsman’s guidance on redress, and we will implement a policy based on that guidance in 2026.

The second complaint was upheld at Stage 1 because it had not been properly recorded when the issue was raised – the issue itself, which concerned unhappiness over the actions of a House Manager, could not be substantiated and no further action was taken.

In both cases where complaints were partially upheld (one at Stage 1, another at both Stage 1 and Stage 2), we have updated policies and procedures to improve performance, and clarified how information should be communicated.

In one case, this has involved an update to our Allocations procedure to clarify how we prioritise transfer applications, and which staff members are responsible for communicating decisions. In the second, this involved implementing a written approach to car park management at Cecil Rosen Court to formalise an approach that had previously not been supported by a written policy.

2.4 Complaints not upheld / withdrawn:

The complaint not upheld, at both Stage 1 and following escalation to Stage 2, was not upheld on the basis that correct procedure had been followed – the tenant was unhappy that a warning letter had been issued to him on the basis of reported anti-social behaviour which he denied. The warning letter was issued following a procedurally correct investigation, and as a result was not withdrawn. The tenant has the right to escalate the complaint to the Housing Ombudsman Service within twelve months, but at the time of writing no escalation has taken place, and until such time

as an escalation is received, JBD consider the matter to be closed – the tenant's right to escalate will expire on 14th August 2026.

The complaint that was withdrawn by the tenant concerned unhappiness at disturbance from the intercom system, and was withdrawn as steps already taken by JBD had been effective. It is likely that the complaint would not have been upheld had a formal response been completed.

3. Interaction with the Ombudsman in 2025:

We have had no formal interactions with the Ombudsman in 2025. 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.