

APPENDIX 1

Housing

A tenant contacted the complaints section claiming she had reported problems with damp at her property on a number of occasions but no works had been carried out to try to resolve the problem. The tenant wanted the matter considered as a Stage 1 complaint.

On investigation it was noted that our records indicated a number of repairs had previously been carried out to try to help resolve the problems but as this was some time ago it was agreed that a further inspection should be carried out. Following the surveyor's visit a few repairs were identified to resolve the problems including remove existing shower and replace with a new bath and clean out to DPC level around the house, to remove bridging. The tenant was satisfied with the outcome of her complaint. This was recorded as partially upheld as, although works had previously been undertaken and there was no outstanding reports of ongoing problems, it was accepted that additional works were required.

Stage 1 – Process for dealing with stray dogs

A dog went missing on a Sunday, which was reported by the owner as soon as the Council's offices were open and advising that the dog was microchipped.

In the meantime, a neighbour had found the dog, reported it as missing to the out of hours team and had taken it to the Kennels. The owner was reunited with her dog three days later, however was dissatisfied with the delay in achieving this and requested a refund of the kennel fee payable and that clear advice was published on the Council's website on how to retrieve a missing dog.

The owner was advised that it is normal procedure when stray dogs are picked up by the dog warden they are scanned for a microchip when they are placed in the dog warden's van. The dog warden has access to national pet microchipping databases and is able to check ownership details. Such checks can sometimes facilitate an early reunion between the dog and its owner. The proprietors of the kennels are also able to scan for the presence of a micro-chip, however they cannot access the national database; due to data protection, this ability is restricted to public enforcement agencies and veterinary surgeons etc.

It was however ascertained that there was a delay in passing on the information provided in the out of hours telephone call to relevant departments, which meant relevant officers were not aware the dog had been handed in to the kennels. As a result when the owner telephoned on the Monday and Tuesday they were not able to confirm the dog was at the kennels. This delay was acknowledged and officers were reminded of their duty to refer such reports immediately. This situation has not happened previously and should not happen again.

With regard to the information on the website the owner was advised that this is up-to-date and the retrieval procedure has effectively worked for many years, it was however fettered on this occasion due to human error.

With regard to the fee as the dog was handed into the kennels who carried out routine health assessments, kennel and feed the dog it was not possible to reimburse the £44 retrieval fee.

The complaint was partially upheld due to the delay in reporting receipt of the dog at the kennels.