

Housing

Ombudsman Service

REPORT

COMPLAINT 202013563

Peabody Housing

28 February 2021

Our approach

The Housing Ombudsman's approach to investigating and determining complaints is to decide what is fair in all the circumstances of the case. This is set out in the Housing Act 1996 and the Housing Ombudsman Scheme (the Scheme). The Ombudsman considers the evidence and looks to see if there has been any 'maladministration', for example whether the landlord has failed to keep to the law, followed proper procedure, followed good practice or behaved in a reasonable and competent manner.

Both the resident and the landlord have submitted information to the Ombudsman and this has been carefully considered. Their accounts of what has happened are summarised below. This report is not an exhaustive description of all the events that have occurred in relation to this case, but an outline of the key issues as a background to the investigation's findings.

The complaint

1. The complaint is about:
 - a. The landlord's handling of reports of anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance.
 - b. Complaint handling.

Scope of investigation

2. Although it is noted that there is a long history of ASB reports by the resident, this investigation has primarily focussed on the landlord's handling of the resident's recent reports from June 2020 onwards that were considered during the landlord's complaint responses. This is because residents are expected to raise complaints with their landlords in a timely manner so that the landlord has a reasonable opportunity to consider the issues whilst they are still 'live', and while the evidence is available to reach an informed conclusion on the events that occurred.

Background and summary of events

3. The property is a two-bedroom, ground floor flat. The resident and her late husband experienced anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance from a neighbour in the flat above since 1999.
4. The landlord is a housing association and the resident held an assured tenancy from 1997 until she terminated her tenancy in February 2021. She left the property shortly after this. The resident has stated that she left the property due to the severe impact that the anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance had on her over many years.

The landlord's obligations

5. The landlord's ASB Policy (March 2018 to April 2021) states that it will take a victim-centred approach to tackling anti-social behaviour. It also states it will assess the vulnerability of all residents who report anti-social behaviour. It further states that it will ensure the appropriate level of support is provided to its residents.
6. The landlord's website contains details of its Witness Support Promise (2015-2018) in which it further outlines its commitment to putting victims and witnesses first. It promises to identify if victims and witnesses have any support needs and states that it will work with individual support needs to tailor packages of support. It outlines that it will refer victims and witnesses to victim support and other counselling and advice services where needed.
7. The landlord's website also contains details of its Vulnerable Persons Policy which sets out its approach to identifying, assessing and recording resident's vulnerabilities. It states that it will provide tailored services that meet residents needs where appropriate and that it will refer vulnerable residents to external support agencies.
8. The landlord's complaints policy and procedure outlines that it has two complaint stages. It states it will acknowledge a residents formal request to log a complaint within three working days. It will then provide a stage one complaint response within ten working days. It also confirms that if a resident requests an escalation to stage two of its process, it will acknowledge this within three working days. it will then provide a full response to stage two complaints within 15 working days of an escalation request. It also lists the level of detail it will include in its stage one and stage two complaint responses.
9. The landlord's compensation policy details that it will make compensation payments when a resident has experienced a delay or incurred costs because of a service failure on its part; or if it has failed to carry out a service within its published guidelines.

Summary of events

10. On 6 June 2020 the resident contacted the landlord to report that her neighbour in the flat above was causing anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance. She reported that this was happening in the early hours of the morning and it was affecting her and her terminally ill husband for whom she was caring. She also reported that she felt harassed by the neighbour's behaviour and asked the landlord to outline how it would address her

concerns. Another local resident contacted the landlord that same day and reported the same issues.

11. On 19 June 2020 the landlord, local policing team and local authority were in contact about the resident's case. The local authority advised that it would not investigate the reported noise nuisance and its position was that the landlord was responsible for this. The local authority advised that its noise monitoring systems would not be suitable to capture evidence of the reported nuisance.
12. The landlord submitted a referral to its local community multi-agency risk assessment conference (CMARAC) on 24 June 2020. This is a forum in which complex anti-social behaviour cases are discussed between partners and actions agreed. The referral named the resident as a victim in this case and outlined the history of the case.
13. On 9 July 2020 the resident contacted the landlord to report that her neighbour was continuing to causing anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance. She reported that the neighbour was dropping a heavy object on the floor during the early hours of the morning and pounding across the walls and ceiling. The landlord opened a case file and agreed an action plan with the resident;
 - a. The resident was requested to keep a note of further incidents in a diary.
 - b. The resident was requested to report any incidents of harassment to the police.
 - c. The resident was requested to report any noise nuisance incidents to the local authority.
 - d. The landlord's officer would make contact with the neighbour about the allegations of anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance.
 - e. The landlord's officer would check in with the resident every two weeks for a period of one month.
 - f. The landlord would keep the action plan under review and said it would make sure that it was providing the resident with support.
14. The landlord sent a warning letter to the neighbour on 9 July 2020 and reminded her of her tenancy obligations with regards to anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance. It warned the neighbour that it may take action against her tenancy should the behaviour continue.
15. On 23 August 2020 the resident contacted the landlord and advised that her husband had recently passed away. She said that she was grieving alone due to Coronavirus restrictions in place at that time. She advised that she had returned to the property on 20 July 2020 having stayed elsewhere whilst

caring for her husband before he passed away. She detailed ongoing incidents of anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance from her neighbour and stated that the landlord had not provided her with any support. She explained that she had support from the local policing team and was pursuing a restraining order against her neighbour. This service has not received any evidence to show that a restraining order was obtained during the timescales within this case. The resident also asked the landlord to install noise monitoring equipment at her property to assist in the capture of evidence.

16. Having not received a response, the resident chased the landlord for an update via an email to its chief executive on 26 August 2020. The resident's email stated the following;
 - a. She explained that her and her late husband had suffered anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance from her neighbour for over 20 years.
 - b. She described the impact of the behaviour on her including worry, stress and upset. She further explained that she was unable to sleep and could not tolerate the situation any further.
 - c. She explained that she had recently lost her husband and was now living alone whilst feeling isolated and anxious, deepened by grief.
 - d. She reported difficulties in receiving a response from the officer managing her case following her recent contacts.
 - e. She felt that the landlord had failed in its duties and wished to make a formal complaint.
17. The landlord acknowledged the resident's complaint, confirming that it would investigate and provide her with a timely response.
18. At this time, another neighbour living nearby had contacted the landlord via email and also reported that they were affected by the neighbour's behaviour. The resident was included in the landlord's email response where it stated that it would contact the resident and offer support to her whilst it investigated the reported nuisance.
19. On 28 August 2020 the resident contacted the landlord via email and advised that other neighbours were affected by the ongoing anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance. She explained that in March 2020 she had been admitted to hospital and due to the impact of the ongoing anti-social behaviour, she had rented a property elsewhere so that she could care for her terminally ill husband. She informed the landlord that she had made her own recordings of the nuisance but requested that it installed noise monitoring equipment to assist with the capture of further evidence. This Service has not received any

evidence to show that the landlord obtained and reviewed the resident's footage as part of its investigations.

20. On 1 September 2020 the landlord acknowledged the resident's email and advised that an officer would respond to her reports. The resident replied and informed the landlord that she had made further recordings of the noise nuisance during the early hours of that same morning.
21. On 11 September 2020, the landlord issued the resident with its stage one complaint response. In its response the landlord states;
 - a. It apologises for the long term anti-social behaviour that the resident and her late husband had experienced at the property. It acknowledges her frustration. It assures the resident that it is taking her complaints seriously.
 - b. It advised the resident that the officer dealing with her anti-social behaviour case was on long-term sick leave and that any emails sent to him had not been read. The landlord provided the resident with a general email address to which she could communicate going forwards.
 - c. It requested that the resident continued to note any further incidents and also for her to contact the police if necessary.
 - d. It has reviewed its anti-social behaviour case and feels 'confident that matters are moving forwards'.
 - e. It stated that tackling the neighbour's behaviour was more difficult due to her vulnerabilities and refusal to work with the landlord and support services.
22. The resident replied to the landlord on 14 September 2020 and outlined her dissatisfaction with its stage one response;
 - a. She was aware that the officer dealing with her anti-social behaviour case was on long-term sick leave, and asked why the case was not assigned to another officer.
 - b. She stated that she was not aware of any progress made by the landlord in its attempts to resolve the anti-social behaviour caused by her neighbour.
 - c. Her wellbeing was affected by the ongoing anti-social behaviour and the landlord had not considered this in its response.
 - d. She requested an escalation of her complaint to stage two of the landlord's complaints process.
23. On 15 September 2020 the landlord replied to the resident and stated that all contacts at stage one of its process must go to the officer managing the complaint. It stated that the officer would look into her complaint and escalate to stage two of its complaints process if a resolution could not be agreed. The

landlord confirmed that it would provide the case officer with the details of her complaint.

24. On 22 September 2020 the resident contacted the landlord and asked again for her complaint to be considered at stage two of its complaints process. The resident stated that she had received a call from the landlord asking her to complete a customer satisfaction survey, as it had closed her complaint. The resident confirmed that she was unhappy with her complaint being closed and requested again that the landlord escalated her complaint. The resident reported further anti-social behaviour from her neighbour and outlined the stress and anxiety she was suffering as a result.
25. The landlord's notes show that it closed the resident's anti-social behaviour case on 7 October 2020. The reason for closure stated on its systems was that the complainant had passed away so it could not take any further action. It noted that other local residents had confirmed that they had not suffered any further anti-social behaviour caused by the neighbour. This Service has not received any evidence to show that the landlord communicated with the resident to advise her that her case was closed at that time.
26. On 19 October 2020 the landlord contacted the resident having carried out a review of her stage one complaint. It stated it understood the resident's frustrations but it could not take any further action on the resident's reports. It informed the resident that it had tried to speak with the neighbour about her behaviour but she refused to engage. It stated that it was difficult for it to resolve the situation when the neighbour would not engage. It felt it had taken action under its procedures and that this response concluded the stage one complaint.
27. The resident's advocate contacted the landlord via email on 29 October 2020. The email outlined the following;
 - a. The resident's frustration with the landlord's complaint processes.
 - b. The landlord's lack of perceived action to tackle the anti-social behaviour over a long period of time.
 - c. The landlord had not considered the impact of the ongoing anti-social behaviour on the resident and offered her support.
 - d. A further request was made for the landlord to consider the resident's complaint at stage two of its complaints process.
28. On 3 November 2020 the landlord replied to the resident and confirmed that it had logged a complaint at stage two of its complaints process. It stated that it would provide a response to the resident by 1 December 2020. It would contact the resident if it was not able to provide a response by that date.

29. On 2 December 2020 the landlord provided the resident with its stage two complaint response in which it stated;
- a. It does not uphold the resident's complaint.
 - b. It will not consider any complaints which are over six months old.
 - c. It will only take action in anti-social behaviour cases where evidence of tenancy breaches exist. It states that it does not have 'confirmed evidence' to enable it to take enforcement action against the neighbour.
 - d. It refers the resident to seek assistance from the local authority who have more statutory powers to take action against noise nuisance.
 - e. It does not offer compensation to the resident but does apologise for her frustration.
 - f. It advised the resident that she may bring her complaint to this Service after eight weeks from the date of its response.
30. On 4 December 2020, in records provided to this Service by the landlord, another local resident contacted it via email to report being affected by ongoing anti-social behaviour caused by the neighbour. The landlord responded and advised that its officer who was managing the case was on long-term sick leave and it asked the resident to resend emails he had sent to the officer. The landlord also advised that its attempts to engage with the neighbour and support referrals it had made on the neighbour's behalf had been declined.
31. On 7 December 2020 the resident contacted the landlord to advise that she had returned to the property having been unwell and had stayed elsewhere. She stated to the landlord that she left the property due to the impact of the ongoing anti-social behaviour from her neighbour. The resident also stated that she was now taking prescribed medications. She asked the landlord to confirm which of its officers was handling her anti-social behaviour case. The landlord replied and advised that other staff were now dealing with her case.
32. The landlord's case notes dated 29 December 2020 state that they had not received any further contact from the resident and that they assumed she had approached this Service or another agency for advice.
33. On 1 February 2021 the resident informed the landlord that due to the years of anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance she had experienced at the property, she was terminating her tenancy. The resident also described how the impact of the anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance had made her unwell.

34. On 16 February 2021 the resident contacted the landlord again to report further incidents of anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance being caused by her neighbour. She also reported that water was running down the bathroom wall in the property and she believed that her neighbour had caused a leak intentionally. The resident stated that in the twelve months up to that point she had only stayed at the property for four months, due to the impact of her neighbour's behaviour. The landlord replied to the resident and stated that her case officer had returned from long term sick leave and that he would contact her about the case in the following week.
35. The case officer made contact with the local policing team on 2 March 2021 to request an update on any action they had taken against the neighbour during his absence. The landlord's case notes dated 8 March 2021 detail that discussions took place with the police and the landlord was hoping to obtain an injunction order against the neighbour.
36. On 15 May 2021 the landlord's case notes detail that it had sought legal advice however this related to an access request at the neighbour's property and not regarding anti-social behaviour. It noted that the resident and another affected neighbour had moved out so there were no recent reports of any further anti-social behaviour. It noted that it was still considering seeking an injunction against the neighbour to tackle the anti-social behaviour. The landlord later closed the anti-social behaviour case on 2 July 2021 as it stated it did not have enough evidence to pursue an injunction against the neighbour. This Service has not received any evidence to show that the landlord considered the use of any other tools and powers to tackle the reported anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance.

Assessment and findings

The landlord's handling of reports of anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance

37. The Ombudsman's Dispute resolution principles are to:
- a. Be fair
 - b. Put things right
 - c. Learn from outcomes

This Service will apply these principles when considering whether any redress is appropriate and proportionate for any maladministration or service failure identified.

38. Despite the landlord having an ASB policy, Witness Support Promise and Vulnerable Persons Policy in place, this service has not received any evidence that the landlord assessed the resident's vulnerability at any point in

the case. At numerous times in the case, the resident outlined in detail to the landlord her potential vulnerabilities and the impact that the ongoing anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance was having on her. This included the resident informing the landlord that she was feeling stressed, anxious and could not tolerate the situation any further. This was further compounded by the resident having lost her husband during the timescale of the case, and also the restrictions imposed during the coronavirus lockdown.

39. Whilst this Service has not received any evidence to show that the resident has a vulnerability or disability as defined in the Equality Act 2010, the landlord still has a duty to assess the resident's vulnerability and any risk posed to her.
40. Even though the landlord did refer the resident to its local community multi-agency risk assessment conference in June 2020, the information in the referral centres mainly around its concerns for the resident's neighbour. The referral does not adequately detail the impact of the ongoing anti-social behaviour on the resident and there is no indication of what the outcome of the referral was, or if the landlord followed up on this referral at any point. The resident told the landlord at numerous times throughout her case that it had not offered her any support, yet it did not make any tailored support referrals on her behalf as per its Witness Support Promise. This Service finds that the landlord's failure to follow its own processes and promises left the resident without a clear action plan and access to support services. The landlord failed to assess whether the resident required adjustments to be made based on her vulnerability and support needs throughout her case.
41. The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 outlines that when responding to reports of anti-social behaviour, agencies must consider the effect that such behaviour has on victims and witnesses. It also states that agencies should recognise and consider the debilitating impact on that persistent or repeated anti-social behaviour can have on victims, more so over a period of time. The landlord did not consider the impact of the anti-social behaviour on the resident, who ultimately terminated her tenancy as a direct result of the behaviour. This Service finds that the landlord failed to meet its obligations as outlined in the ASB, Crime and Policing Act 2014, and as outlined in its own policy and procedures.
42. The landlord's ASB Policy details that it will use 'a range of preventative measures, early intervention and legal action to tackle ASB' and references the full range of tools and powers in the ASB, Crime and Policing Act 2014. Whilst the landlord's records show that it did consider obtaining legal advice on seeking an injunction against the resident's neighbour, there is no evidence that it did this. Additionally, pursuing such action would not require the full

cooperation of the neighbour, as the landlord had stated was a barrier in resolving the case in its responses to the resident.

43. This service has not been provided with any evidence to show that the landlord considered the use of any non-legal tools to tackle the reported anti-social behaviour. The landlord did issue a written warning to the neighbour on 9 July 2020 however this service has not received any further evidence that the landlord had any further contact with the neighbour in relation to the ongoing anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance that the resident and other neighbours continued to report. This Service finds that the landlord's poor management of the resident's case, and its poor communications with her throughout the case caused severe detriment to her.
44. The landlords ASB Policy outlines that it will 'only investigate noise nuisance where the noise is frequently excessive in volume and duration or occurs at unreasonable hours'. Despite the resident reporting that she was disturbed by noise nuisance during the early hours of the morning, there is no evidence that the landlord considered this in its investigations.
45. Whilst the landlord did approach the local authority to request if it would investigate the noise nuisance, there is no evidence to show that it carried out its own investigations once the local authority had stated that it was the landlord's responsibility to investigate. Even though the landlord's policy states that it will refer residents to the local authority to investigate noise nuisance, this does not completely negate its responsibilities to investigate such issues within its communities. This Service's Spotlight Report on Noise Complaints outlines a number of best practices and guidance that landlords should consider when investigating reports of non-statutory noise nuisance.
46. Whilst the landlord did work with its partners at the police and the local authority in the case, it could have provided evidence to these partners who are both able to seek other interventions and outcomes to address the anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance. This could have resolved or improved the situation at an earlier stage on behalf of the resident and other affected neighbours.
47. It is noted that the landlord did agree an action plan with the resident when it opened a new case on 9 July 2021. Whilst the actions listed were somewhat reasonable given the reports the resident made at that time, there is no evidence that the landlord monitored and reviewed these actions as it had promised the resident, who continued to report being severely affected by anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance until she terminated her tenancy in February 2021. This Service finds that whilst the landlord did agree an action plan with the resident at the start of the case, it did not review these actions or

agree new actions based on the resident's needs or the reports of anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance that she continued to provide to the landlord.

48. The landlord's case notes show that between 9 July 2020 and 8 December 2020 there was no activity on the resident's case. During this period the landlord closed the resident's case on 7 October 2020 incorrectly noting that the complainant had passed away and that other residents had confirmed that they had not experienced any further nuisance. This is despite the resident and other affected residents reporting further incidents to the landlord throughout this period. There is no evidence that the landlord informed the resident that it had closed her case, or explained to her the reasons why, even though its ASB policy states it will do this. This Service finds that the landlord failed in its service delivery to the resident, causing further frustration, distress and delay.
49. The case was not investigated by the landlord during the officer's sick leave from July 2020 to March 2021, therefore the landlord is likely to have missed opportunities to bring this case to a more timely conclusion for the resident and other affected parties. Once the case officer returned from sick leave in March 2021, the investigation recommenced and the officer sought updates from the landlord's partners. However by this time the resident had terminated her tenancy, citing the severe impact of the ongoing anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance as her reason for doing so. This Service finds that it was unreasonable for the landlord to not pass the case to another officer to continue working towards a resolution. The Landlord's poor communication with the resident, its failure to manage her expectations and its failure to take account of any ongoing risk and vulnerability that the resident may have had caused further detriment to her. The landlord missed opportunities to tackle the reported issues by not reassigning the case to another officer.
50. The landlord stated at several points within the case, and within its stage two response to the resident that its position was that there was insufficient evidence to take legal action against the neighbour.
51. There is no evidence to confirm that the landlord considered in its investigations the footage that the resident had captured herself. Had it done so, the landlord could have determined if this footage contained useful evidence for it to consider if further investigation was required, or to progress towards legal action. Reviewing the resident's footage would have enabled the landlord to support its position in advising the resident that it had insufficient evidence to support legal action as outlined in its stage two response. Combining the resident's evidence with the potential evidence that the other affected residents may have been able to provide, the landlord's position in this case may have changed. This Service finds that the landlord did not fully investigate and consider all of the available evidence in the case,

therefore it was incorrect for it to state in its responses to the resident that it had done all that it could to resolve the situation.

52. Throughout the case there was inconsistent communication with the resident about the progress of the case. Evidence provided by the landlord and reviewed by this Service shows that communications it had with other affected residents gave more detailed updates to them than it did to the resident. Despite the landlord's ASB policy stating that it will keep residents informed, the resident herself had to chase the landlord for updates in her case.
53. The resident has stated that during the time period within the scope of this investigation, she incurred costs in having to rent another property in order to care for her terminally husband. She has also highlighted staying elsewhere for months at a time due to the impact of the anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance on her. This Service finds that the landlord did not consider this information in its responses to the resident, nor did it take this into account by assessing her support needs and vulnerabilities at any point in the case.

Complaint handling

54. Following the landlord's stage one complaint response, the resident responded on 14 September 2020 to express her dissatisfaction with its response. She requested that the landlord escalated her complaint to stage two of its process. The landlord did not log a stage two complaint until 3 November 2020, following further requests from the resident and her advocate. The landlord's complaints procedure states that it will acknowledge an escalation request to stage two within three working days. In light of this, the landlord has not followed its own processes and procedures and caused a significant delay and frustration to the resident in addressing her complaint.
55. On 22 September 2020 the resident stated that she received a telephone call from the landlord where it requested that she completed a satisfaction survey having closed its case relating to the resident's complaint. This is despite the resident requesting on 14 September 2020 an escalation of her complaint to stage two of the landlord's complaints process, following its stage one response. This Service finds that the landlord's poor communication in this regard and its failure to follow its own processes was unreasonable.
56. On 19 October 2020 the landlord provided the resident with a further response at stage one of its complaints process, despite already having sent a stage one response to the resident on 11 September 2020. This Service finds that the landlord's failure to follow its own processes caused further delay to the resident's complaint and that the landlord did not listen to the resident's requests.

57. In its stage two complaint response to the resident, the landlord states that it categorised her reports as general living noise. As the landlord has not reviewed the footage that the resident captured herself, its response does not consider that this footage may evidence other anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance which could have been a breach of the neighbour's tenancy.

Determination (decision)

58. In accordance with paragraph 52 of the Housing Ombudsman Scheme, there was severe maladministration by the landlord in respect of its handling of the resident's reports of anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance.

59. In accordance with paragraph 52 of the Housing Ombudsman Scheme, there was maladministration by the landlord in respect of its complaint handling.

Reasons

60. As outlined above, the landlord failed to follow its own policies, procedure and promises in investigating the anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance that the resident reported. This failure caused severe detriment to the resident who eventually terminated her tenancy as a result of the significant impact of the behaviour on her. Had the landlord thoroughly investigated and supported the resident, as per its own policies, procedures and promises her situation may have improved and caused her not to feel that terminating her tenancy was her only solution.

61. Whilst the scope of this report only focuses on the resident's case within the outlined timescales, it is clear that the resident was affected by anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance at the property for many years. The resident stated that she was compelled to rent another property in order to care for her terminally ill husband and to recover herself from ill health in peace, away from the property. Despite the resident informing the landlord of this, it did not consider this information, or tailor its approaches to the resident throughout her case.

62. The landlord's lack of action to assess the resident's vulnerability and to offer support to her is a significant failing in this case. The landlord's inactions show that they did not consider the guidance in supporting victims and witnesses as outlined in the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, or as described in its own policies and procedures.

63. The lack of action taken by the landlord in investigating the resident's reports of anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance and lack of support offered caused a significant impact on her. By not reassigning her case to another officer whilst its officer was on long-term sick leave, the resident's ongoing reports of nuisance went unanswered, leaving her to feel ignored. The

landlord's failures resulted in the resident terminating her tenancy at the property, which she had held for many years.

64. The landlord's poor handling of the resident's formal complaint caused further detriment to her. She had to chase the landlord for updates and for it to escalate her complaint. By incorrectly closing the resident's complaint and then contacting her to request that she completed a satisfaction survey shows that the landlord did not listen to the resident or carefully consider all the information it had regarding her circumstances. This failure caused further frustration and distress to the resident who was grieving for her late husband, experiencing ill health herself, all whilst continuing to be affected by the ongoing anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance caused by her neighbour.

Orders and recommendations

Orders

65. Within four weeks, the landlord's Chief Executive is to apologise to the resident in writing for the identified failures in this case and to provide this service with a copy of its written apology.
66. Within four weeks, the landlord to pay the resident £2000 compensation, comprised of:
- a. £1500 in recognition of the landlord's failures in its handling of the resident's anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance case.
 - b. £500 in recognition of the landlord's poor complaint handling and the distress and inconvenience experienced by the resident.
67. Within four weeks, the landlord is to provide this Service with an action plan of how it will manage incoming emails and enquiries regarding live anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance cases to staff members who are on long-term sickness leave.

Recommendations

68. The landlord to consider the findings of the Ombudsman's spotlight on noise complaints ([Spotlight on noise complaints - Housing Ombudsman \(housing-ombudsman.org.uk\)](https://www.housing-ombudsman.org.uk)) – The landlord to share the findings with relevant staff, including training where appropriate and to incorporate the findings of this report in its management of such cases in future.
69. The landlord to review its complaint handling approaches and to consider the Ombudsman's complaint handling code ([Complaint Handling Code - Housing Ombudsman \(housing-ombudsman.org.uk\)](https://www.housing-ombudsman.org.uk)) – The landlord to share the findings with relevant staff, including training where appropriate and to

incorporate the findings of this report in its management of complaints in future.