

## Learning from Complaints 2025/26 - Report

### Quarter 4 – 1 January 2026 to 31 March 2026

	No. of Stage 1 complaint's
No. of Stage 1 complaints received	1
No. escalated to Stage 2	0
Stage 1 – response in 5 working days	0
Average no. of working days to respond	0
Stage 1 - Extended to 10 working days	6
Average no. of working days to respond	6
All stage 1 complaints – Average no. of working days for response	1
Outcome at Stage 1 - upheld/partially upheld/not upheld/ resolved	0 upheld/0 partially upheld/1 not upheld/0 resolved

	No. of Stage 2 complaint's
Stage 2 – no. escalated from Stage 1	0
Stage 2 – response in 20 working days	0
Average no. of working days to respond	0
Stage 2 – no. started at Stage 2	1
Stage 2 - response in 20 working days	1
All Stage 2 - Average no. of working days to respond	11
Total number of Stage 2 complaints	1
Outcome at Stage 2 - upheld/partially upheld/not upheld/ resolved	0 upheld/0 partially upheld/1 not upheld/0 resolved

**Total Complaints submitted: 3**

**No. of Stage 1 complaints as a % of all complaints: 1 (33%)**

**No. of Stage 2 complaints as a % of all complaints: 1 (33%)**

**Complaints resolved as a % of all complaints: 0 (0%)**

**Complaints upheld as a % of all complaints: 0 (0%)**

**Complaints partially upheld as a % of all complaints: 0 (0%)**

**Complaints not upheld as a % of all complaints: 3 (100%)**

**Complaints referred to the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO): 1 (33%)**

### **Outcome of Stage 1 Complaints:**

There were 1 stage 1 complaints relating to Council Tax.

The complaint is in relation to a visit to a property by 2 members of LVJB staff to discuss the Council Tax banding of a property which was not currently on the Council Tax Valuation List. The occupant of the property was not the owner and had asked the council to provide a separate address for the property as they were having issues surrounding a number of matters in relation to the status of the property. The occupant had originally asked to have the owner of the property present at the arranged meeting but when our staff arrived the owner was not present. The meeting went ahead but the owner made a complaint about the contact made with the occupant as they considered the person to be vulnerable. This was not obvious to our staff and they were only made aware of this issue after their meeting as the occupier was the person who arranged the meeting. Our Divisional Valuer investigated what has been had occurred during the meeting with the occupant and was satisfied that the 2 valuation staff who attended the meeting had acted in accordance with our procedures for engaging with CT payers to discuss their property being added to the Council Tax Valuation List and had been courteous and polite in their interactions. The Divisional Valuer apologised to the owner in respect of any distress caused to the occupier but did not consider that the members of staff had fallen short of the high level of service we aim to achieve.

#### **The complaint was not upheld.**

The learning outcome from this complaint was to update our procedure where a request for someone to be accompanied at the meeting with LVJB staff is mentioned in the initial contact a house visit. Staff should be advised that they should ask at the door or in advance if all persons who had expressed a wish to be attendance were present and if not, ask if the visit should proceed. Guidance is being prepared to assist both the Council Tax payer and protection LVJB staff when visiting a CT payers' property to discuss the Council Tax band or other related matters.

There were no stage 1 complaints relating to Valuation Roll.

There were no Stage 1 complaints relating to Electoral Registration.

### **Outcome of Stage 2 Complaints:**

There were 1 stage 2 complaint relating to Council Tax.

The complaint was in relation to a Council Tax payer who has a Council Tax appeal for properties within the Lothian area. The complaint addressed a number of issues surrounding the hearing of the complainant's cases at court in regard to the Council Tax band. The complaint made a number of unfounded accusations in relation to information provided and actions of staff which were unfounded.

#### **The complaint was not upheld.**

There were no stage 2 complaints relating to Valuation Roll.

There were no stage 2 complaints relating to Electoral Registration.

### **Outcome of Complaint Submitted to the SPSO:**

**The complaint below received in the last quarter was not treated as a complaint under the LVJB Complaints Procedure therefore it was not noted in the report for complaints for the last quarter 1 October to 31 December 2025. As the complaint was referred to the Scottish Public Service Ombudsman by the complainant the outcome has been noted on this report.**

The complaint was in relation to Valuation Roll and was raised after the draft revaluation notice for 2026 which was issued in respect of the property the complainant owned. The ratepayer had made a proposal in respect of the of the Rateable Value of their property on the 2023 Valuation Roll and wanted to challenge the Rateable Value applied in respect of the revaluation 2026. The issues raised by the ratepayer could not be considered under the LVJB Complaints Procedure as there is a separate and distinct statutory process in place for challenging the Rateable Value where there is a disagreement. Our Governance Officer provided the ratepayer with guidance as to the restraints of the LVJB Complaints Procedure and the right of appeal to the SPSO should the ratepayer disagree with their decision taken not to treat their complaint as a complaint under our Complaints Procedure. The ratepayer was advised that their enquiry in relation to the rateable value of their property would be responded to with the timescales set for response to business as usual enquiries under our Customer Service Policy. The ratepayer received a full and prompt response from our Divisional Valuer to assist them and provide details of the right to make a proposal against the Rateable Value.

The SPSO provided the ratepayer with a response to their challenge in respect of the way their complaint had been treated. The SPSO provided the LVJB with a copy of their response to the ratepayer's complaint and advised:

The response from the SPSO confirmed that they would not take the complaint forward. Whilst they acknowledged the strength of the ratepayers feeling about the issues raised and recognised had been difficult for them they provided a Statement of reasons which indicated that following the further response provided by our Assistant Assessor the SPSO were satisfied that all administrative procedures were correctly carried out and that LVJB had correctly advised that the complaint was not one that could be considered through their complaints procedure. They further said that LVJB had offered a full explanation of the circumstances to explain its position. They said they noted that he intended to pursue the statutory proposal and the right of appeal in respect of the 2026 rateable value. They recognised that the ratepayer felt strongly about the issues raised in their complaint but in the circumstances the SPSO would not consider their complaint further.

Produced by	Governance Team	24/04/2026
Approved by	Corporate Leadership Team	29/04/2026