**[Case Ref: ENF228458] Case Ref: ENF228458 - Cordell**
**Date:** 11th October 2026

**Subject: Stage 2 Complaint Review Request - ENF228458**

**The Stage 1 Review Officer was a:**
Jayne Paterson
Business Development Manager
Housing and Regeneration

**Dear Stage, 2 Review Officer,**
I formally request a **Stage 2 Review of the Stage 1** Complaint Response dated **8 October 2026**.
Having carefully reviewed the response, I do not believe that Enfield Council has fairly investigated, addressed, or answered the complaint that I gave.
The Stage 1 response appears to reduce a complex complaint consisting of seven structured complaint files, supported by extensive documentary evidence, into a single assertion that there was insufficient evidence of occupation. That was not the complaint I sent.
My complaint raised issues concerning succession, policy compliance, evidence managing, procedural fairness, representations made by Council officers, disclosure of information, exclusion from the property, consequential losses, safeguarding concerns, and the chronology of events I establish within the evidence supplied.
The Stage 1 response fails to meaningfully engage with those issues.

**Ground 1 - The Complaint Was Not Investigated Properly**
Even if the Council maintains the succession refusal, the Enfield Councils Staffs Stage 1 response still fails to investigate the number of issues raised in the complaint concerning the handling of evidence raised during my Housing Succession application and the response the council provided also fails to address the officer conduct during that procedure, such as: communications, safeguarding, notices, raised in my seven core chronology, the raised points of concerns are wrongly avoided throughout my official complaint.

**Ground 2 - The Succession Decision Was Wrong**
The Council has not properly explained why the evidence proving my occupation and connection to 23 Byron Terrace was insufficient.
The Enfield Councils response does not show what evidence they accepted, and/or rejected, while explaining the merits and reasons given to each exhibited piece of evidence I provided as I requested.

**Exhibited Snippet of:**

| **Reasons Given by The Investigator That He or She Believes I Raised to Be Investigated.** | | **Jayne Paterson Findings** |
|---|---|---|
| **1.** | Your Complaint Is That the Council Mishandled Your Succession Request, incorrectly. | Jayne Paterson who works for the Enfield Council States: She came to the conclusion that no supporting proof can be found by her while she conducted her investigation to find my claims as true, while she overviewed internal company files and My Seven-Core Official Complaint! |
| **2.** | Stated That You Had No Confirmed Right to Occupy the Property, | **"The Same as Above!"** |
| **3.** | Failed To Process the Matter Properly, | **"The Same as Above!"** |
| **4.** | Disclosed Information to Relatives, | **"The Same as Above!"** |
| **5.** | And Acted Concerning the Tenancy and Belongings While the Succession Issue Was Being Considered. | **"The Same as Above!"** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **6.** | You Also Allege Misconduct by the Officer Involved | **"The Same as Above!"** |
| **7.** | And Hold the Council Responsible for Your Exclusion from The Property and The Loss of Personal Possessions. | **"The Same as Above!"** |

**Reasons given by the Investigator 1.:**

**Your Complaint Is That the Council Mishandled Your Succession Request, incorrectly.**

The complaint is not simply that Enfield Council mishandled my succession application. The real issue is that they were provided with overwhelming documentary evidence proving my occupation of the property, yet that evidence appears to have been repeatedly side-lined, ignored, or left unaddressed throughout the succession process and complaints process.

The exhibits were not weak, speculative, or unsupported. They were contemporaneous records, genuine documents, and verifiable artefacts which, when assessed fairly, provided extremely strong proof of my claim. In simple terms, these exhibits were the type of evidence that should have carried decisive weight the moment they were submitted.

What is concerning is that neither the officers dealing with the succession application, nor management reviewing the matter afterwards, nor the Stage 1 investigator, have properly accounted for that evidence. They have not explained which exhibits were accepted, which were rejected, why they were rejected, what weight was given to them, or how they reached conclusions that appear inconsistent with the documentary record.

That is the central problem. When multiple people, at multiple levels of the Council, arrive at the same adverse conclusions whilst failing to engage with the strongest evidence supporting the application, it becomes difficult to dismiss this as a simple mistake or oversight. The continued failure to address the exhibits creates the appearance that the evidence is being avoided because it conflicts with the outcome the Council wishes to maintain.

In layman's terms, it looks as though they are refusing to mark the exam paper because they already decided on the result. The evidence proving my case is sitting in front of them, but instead of assessing it, grading it, and explaining their reasoning, they keep reaching conclusions without confronting what the exhibits actually show.

That is why the Stage 1 response is fundamentally inadequate. An investigation cannot be considered fair where the most important evidence is left untested and unexplained. Unless Stage 2 openly addresses every relevant exhibit, obtains explanations from the officers involved, and explains how the evidence was weighed, it will simply repeat the same unsupported conclusions and continue the prejudice caused to my succession application.

What makes this even more concerning is that those involved know exactly the position I am in. They know I am a vulnerable applicant seeking housing succession whilst grieving the death of my mother. They know the exhibits have been formally exhibited within the proceedings. They know those exhibits prove my occupation of the property. They know those exhibits have not been properly accounted for. They also know that any challenge to their actions remains under the control of Council employees at Stage 2 rather than an independent third party. Despite this, they continue to leave the exhibits unanswered whilst maintaining conclusions that have a negative effect on my succession application, wellbeing and safety.

In layman's terms, they know the evidence, they know my circumstances, they know the harm being caused, and they know they remain in control of the process, yet the burden of their continued failure to address the exhibits falls entirely upon me.

**Reasons given by the Investigator & My Response 2.:**

No Confirmed Right to Occupy the Property of 23 Byron Terrace Edmonton London N9 7DG,

1. Ombudsman Case Presidents were given, proving:

2. My Legal rights to occupy a property while a case is ongoing in also based in case law depriving from:

3. The house was still in my mother's name, and the council had revived no death certificate before they gave advise to the police.

4. Being the eldest son, I applied to succeed to my late mother's secure tenancy. However, **Georgina Solan, the Enfield Council officer responsible for handling and managing my succession application**, misled me into believing that it was a mandatory part of the succession procedure for my mother's secure tenancy to be closed down and for a Section 41 Notice to be issued before my application could continue. Had Georgina Solan correctly explained that, where a person legally qualifies for statutory succession, the existing tenancy passes to the successor rather than a new tenancy being created, I would have **100% required my mother's existing tenancy to remain in place** while my right to succeed was properly determined. Instead, closing the tenancy placed me into a separate use-and-occupation or payment arrangement during the succession process, enabling charges to be sought from me that would otherwise have remained connected with my late mother's tenancy or estate. I therefore require Enfield Council to explain what legal or policy authority Georgina Solan relied upon when representing the closure of the tenancy as mandatory, who authorised the Section 41 Notice, and whether my mother's tenancy agreement, the applicable succession procedure, and my statutory or contractual succession rights were properly assessed before that action was taken.

5. Registered as overnight carer and co care of address and of my mother by Enfield Council Themselves:

6. Exhibited evidence that I was occupying the premises before and after my mother's passing until council involvement is as follows:

**But Something Never Went Right and We Ended Up with The Following!**

**Reasons given by the Investigator & My Response 3.:**
The Enfield Councils Staff Failed to Process the Matter Properly,

There was no letter sent by Georgina stating that I as an applicant did not qualify once applying for succession but rather the opposite!
Applying for Housing Succession is not to be confused as to it stages.
I phone or write and ask for succession to start in my name, in my case I did both.
I am contacted back by way of an email by an Enfield Councils housing officer, she asks me to fill a form in and supply it back to her.
I do this and ask her if everything is fulfilled correctly,
She reviews the documents and is to also check my credentials and mothers, this leads her to all case noted held on us attached to the address being requested for succession and any other dwellings listed!
Case handler is to attach any internal notes relevant **"such as my overnight living allowance for care of address and Miss Lorraine Cordell."** To the case file being submitted and address attached.
**At this stage if I did not qualify, I must be made aware and was not!**
I was told everything was in check for me to succeed other than a typo and missing evidence pack of occupation.
I provided a twelve Core Exhibited File with that other whelming evidence.
This was all reviewed and no issues were raised that I did not qualify.
I was then asked to provided Bank statements.
I provided my bank details!
At no stage before a housing panel issued decision was given to me was, I said that I did not qualify to be able to continue after applying.

1. **The Housing Panel Issued Decision 1:**
   - From the file, the first clear refusal reason given by Enfield Council was:
   - Email 20
   - **Date**: 26 June 2026
     **Time**: 12:17 BST
     **From**: Georgina Solan
     **Document**: "20. Received 26-06-26" [00. Binder...26 up to 40 | PDF]
   - **The exact reason given was**: *"Your succession application has been reviewed by management and has been denied as you do not fulfil the criteria for succession due to having your own tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ."*

2. **The Housing Panel Issued Decision 2: Dated**
   - Email 23
   - **Date:** 2 July 2026
     **Time:** 17:24 BST
     **From:** Georgina Solan
     **Document:** "23. Received 02-07-26" [00. Binder...26 up to 40 | PDF]
   - **The position was repeated**: *"You Do Not Have Succession Rights to This Tenancy and Therefore Do Not Have a Legal Right to Succeed to the Tenancy Of 23 Byron Terrace."*
     And
     *"The Council's Records Confirm That You Remain the Tenant Of 109 Burncroft Avenue."*

3. **The Housing Panel Issued Decision 2: Dated**
   - **Email 26**
   - **Date:** 8 July 2026
     **Time:** 12:22 BST
     **From:** Georgina Solan
     **Document:** "26. Received 08-07-26" [00. Binder...26 up to 40 | PDF]
   - This is where the reason changed.
   - **The Council expressly acknowledged**: "*Whilst We Acknowledge That the Existence of Another Tenancy Does Not, In Itself, Automatically Prevent a Person from Succeeding to A Secure Tenancy..."*
     They then replaced the original reason with:
     *"The Council Is Not Satisfied That the Evidence Provided Demonstrates That 23 Byron Terrace Was Your Only or Principal Home for The Purposes of a Statutory Succession Claim."*

4. **The Housing Panel Issued Decision 2: Dated**
   - **Stage 1 Complaint Response**
   - **Date:** 8 October 2026
     **Case Ref:** ENF228458
     **Document:** "48. Received Outlook 08-10-26" [00. Binder...26 up to 40 | PDF]
   - **The Investigator Repeated the Second Reason:** *"you did not provide sufficient evidence demonstrating your occupation of the property as your only or principal home for the required 12-month period".*
     and
     *"The Council considered the request, sought supporting evidence and reached a decision based on the absence of sufficient evidence that the property was your only or principal home for the 12 months immediately before the tenant's death."*

**Reasons given by the Investigator & My Response 4.:**

Disclosed Information to Relatives,

**Reasons given by the Investigator & My Response 5.:**
The Enfield Councils Staff Acted Unmorally Concerning the Tenancy and Belongings While the Succession Issue Was Being Considered.

**Reasons given by the Investigator & My Response 6.:**
Alleged Misconduct by the Officer Involved

**Reasons given by the Investigator & My Response 7.:**
I Hold the Council Responsible for Your Exclusion from The Property and The Loss of Personal Possessions.

**The Investigation Is a Clear Failure to Address the Seven Core Complaint Files**
I personally organised the complaint into seven core files and deliberately in order to present the evidence clearly and allow the Enfield Councils Staff to yet again be able to re review each issue separately as fairly examined.
The Stage 1 response does not appear to provide findings against each of those files.
Instead, Enfield Council continues to repeat the outcome of the succession decision without demonstrating that they have overviewed the complaint in its entirety and responded to those complained about issues in a well-structured and orderly manner, so that they have been addressed to fair standard that in accordance with my stage 1 complaint. The issues I raised, I documented alongside with the relevant evidence so for Enfield Councils Staff not to be able to get confused otherwise than to my evidenced statements beaning an absolute in facts, I exhibited these files of proof so that the Enfield Councils Staff cannot ignore these facts as has now happened!
I therefore request confirmation of which officer reviewed each of the Seven Core Complaint Files, what sections / questions or exhibit of the seven Core files they responded to and did not respond to and why, within the Stage 1 response of theirs.

| **THE INVESTIGATOR FINDINGS** | |
|---|---|
| **1.** | Succession occurs only where all relevant statutory conditions are met. = *"Completing an application form does not itself create a right to succeed;"*<br>the Council must establish whether the qualifying conditions were met at the date of the tenant's death. |
| **2.** | A material condition in this case was whether you occupied the property as **your only or principal home** throughout the 12 months immediately before the tenant's death. = "*Unfortunately, you did not provide sufficient evidence demonstrating your occupation of the property as your only or principal home for the required 12-month period and the succession did not take place."* |
| **3.** | *"I have found no evidence that the officer deliberately misrepresented the law,"* |
| **4.** | *"I have found no evidence that the officer deliberately concealed a valid succession or acted fraudulently."* |
| **5.** | **THE CORRESPONDENCE SHOWS THAT FURTHER SUPPORTING INFORMATION WAS REQUESTED AND THAT THE CLAIM WAS CONSIDERED AGAINST THE QUALIFYING CONDITIONS.** |
| **6.** | The fact that the outcome was disputed does not demonstrate misconduct or maladministration. |
| **7.** | Your concerns about alleged criminal conduct and the actions of the police are matters for the relevant police authorities. The Council's complaints procedure is not the appropriate process for investigating or reaching findings on allegations of criminal conduct or the actions of the police. |
| **8.** | I acknowledge your report of missing and damaged personal property at 23 Byron Terrace, including the comic collection, cash**, generators**, **vehicles**, tools, clothing and other belongings, together with the **reported damage to the property**. The Council's complaints process is not the appropriate routes for claims relating to loss of or damage to personal possessions. These matters should be pursued through your own household or contents-insurance policy. Your insurer can assess the claimed loss under the terms of your cover. |
| **9.** | Your data protection concerns will be **considered separately** through the Council's information governance process. |

**END**

**The Investigator Findings 1.:**

**The Investigator Findings 2.:**

**The Investigator Findings 3.:**

**The Investigator Findings 4.:**

**The Investigator Findings 5.:**

**The Investigator Findings 6.:**

**The Investigator Findings 7.:**

**The Investigator Findings 8.:**

**The Investigator Findings 9.:**

**The Investigator Findings 10.:**

**Jayne Paterson Failed to Assess File 04 - Timeline of Proven Facts**

I am particularly concerned by Enfield Council's failure to engage with File 04, **"Timeline of Proven Facts".**

I specifically prepared this file to provide a chronological record supported by documentary evidence, Council correspondence, records, emails, and contemporaneous documents that stand enough weight for Enfield Councils Reviewing staff not to be able to be put the mail administration I have suffered into doubt and all due to the staff that are under investigation!

1) The Enfield Councils Stage 1 Response to my raised concerns Does Not Identify Any Factual Inaccuracy Within That Timeline.
2) It Does Not Identify Any Document Within the Timeline That Enfield Council Disputes.
3) It Does Not Identify Any Event That Enfield Council Says Did Not Occur.
4) It Does Not Produce Any Alternative Chronology.
5) Instead, Enfield Council Appears to Have Ignored the Timeline Entirely.
6) I Request That the Enfield Council re review Each Chronology Disputed Fact I have shown and provide me with a list of dates they may have Identified as questionable and then provide me with that list!

If Enfield Council does not dispute the order and listed events in the chronology that I compiled together, I request an explanation as to why they omitted out **99%** on average of the evidence from within it once they had stated they had finished they internal review to be able to provide me with their findings of investigation.

**The Councils Staffs Alleged Failure to Explain the Evidence they Assessed.**

The Stage 1 response repeatedly says that I provided insufficient evidence that 23 Byron Terrace was my only or principal home, when this is not the facts of the case we all hold!
However, Enfield Council does not explain how they concluded to their conclusion, when reaching for it.

**Also, the Enfield Councils staff's response does not find:**

1) The Councils Staffs do not say Which Documents they Considered.
2) Which Documents Staff Accepted.
3) Which Documents Staff Rejected.

4) Why They Train Staff Rejected.
5) What Evidential Weight the Enfield Councils Employees Attributed to Each Item.
6) What Evidence Enfield Council Relied Upon in Reaching the Opposite Conclusion.

A conclusion without an explanation is not a reasoned decision.
The complaint bundle contained substantial evidence which I believe demonstrates occupation, residence, connection to the property, caring responsibilities, Council knowledge of those arrangements, and my longstanding involvement with the address.
The Stage 1 response fails to explain why that evidence was insufficient.

**Failure to Address Representations Made by Council Staff**

The complaint raised concerns regarding statements, communications, requests for evidence, and actions taken by Enfield Council officers during the succession process.
Throughout the process, Enfield Council requested documentation, sought further information, acknowledged submissions, and continued correspondence regarding the claim.
The complaint specifically raised concerns that Enfield Council staff created a reasonable belief that the application was progressing through the Council's procedures.
The Stage 1 response does not investigate those concerns.

**The Investigators Response Does Not Identify:**

1) What Representations he or she Made.
2) Whether Those Representations Made by Employers Are Accurate.
3) Whether the Enfield Councils staff followed their own internal policies within compliance with their stationary obligated obligations to their clients and selves as to themselves, while mandatorily Following protocols that other departments of theirs fairly monitored & reviewed!

Instead, the response simply restates the succession outcome.

**Failure to Investigate Procedural Complaints**

A succession decision and a complaint investigation are not the same thing.
As the Enfield Council maintains to refuse my housing succession claim, the Council still has a duty to investigate whether its officers are guilty of the following:

1) The Enfield Councils Staff Never Followed Policy.
2) The Enfield Councils Staff Failed to Manage and Oversee Evidence Correctly.
3) The Enfield Councils Staff Recorded Information About Me Incorrectly.
4) The Enfield Councils Staff Communicated with Third Party Police in Joint Circular Accurately to Procedure and Protocols.
5) The Enfield Councils Staff Never Complied with Procedures.
6) The Enfield Councils Staff Acted Unfairly Throughout the Process.

The Stage 1 response does not demonstrate that The Enfield Councils Staff treated those matters were reviewed & not thoroughly with a fair investigation.
Instead, Enfield Council appears to assume that because they refused my legal rights to succession based on the evidence I provided or that they failed to further ask for that, every concern raised within the main complaint can be answered with the same reason they gave as a very late reason for refusal after I proved they first and main reason given for months was flawed as it was inaccurate, in the hope that this said negligent actions of theirs will help them evade responsibility for their negligence and wrong doings I prove to be facts, will eventfully cause all issues raised to automatically fails.
The response I received from the Enfield Councils Management is not in accordance with a statutory obligated fair complaint of any rightful management. My own properly filed stage 1 complaint has not been Faily been adhered towards by the Enfield Council Staff, as the staff have not proved me with a response that proofs any fair investigation occurred!

**Failure to Address Consequential Harm**

The complaint also raised concerns regarding exclusion from the property, inability to access belongings, administration of my late mother's affairs, and losses which I contend followed from the actions and decisions taken during the dispute.
The Stage 1 response merely refers me to insurance.
That does not answer the complaint.
The issue raised was whether Enfield Council's actions, omissions, decisions, failures, communications, or handling of the matter contributed to those circumstances.
That question remains unanswered.

**Failure to Provide a Reasoned Investigation**
The Stage 1 response concludes that there was no service failure.
However, the response does not demonstrate how the Enfield Councils came to the conclusion that they reached.
The response contains conclusions, but it does not contain a detailed analysis of the evidence supplied, the chronology presented, the representations relied upon, or the individual complaint points raised.
As a result, I have serious concerns regarding whether the Enfield Councils independent reviewing teams that investigated my seven-core complaint, conducted a thorough investigation that covers all the aspects to a fair degree that I raised to them, as it does not appear to have been conducted in a nonobjective, and independent professional manner that lays out all the correct results, as is a must for any officially logged complaint!

**Remedy Requested**
I request that the Stage 2 Investigator:

1) Re reviews all seven Core Complaint Files in full.
2) Provides [professional findings in a non-bios way, against each individual complaint made in each core section of the seven-core complaint.
3) That he or she, specifically addresses File 04, **"Timeline of Proven Facts,**" with a fair response of well documented conclusions that all equally to a satisfactory level of an excellent standard of work, as I state has not happened as of the date of this official document.
4) I request for the investigator to clearly Explain how the Enfield Council Staff involved all assessed the evidence submitted by myself and why they never asked me for anymore exhibits of mine?
5) For the provided person of investigating role to Identify which evidence the staff in question accepted and also which evidence they rejected, as well as how they merited and scored the exhibited evidence.
6) For the persons responsible to Identify the evidence relied upon by Enfield Council in reaching its conclusions.
7) For the reviewing officer to Addresses the conduct, communications, and representations of Enfield Council staff during the succession process.
8) Separately, for the staff in control of these proceeding to considers procedural failures irrespective of the final succession decision.
9) Investigators are to Investigates whether any Council actions or omissions caused me any avoidable disadvantage, distress, loss, or prejudice.
10) Please also Explain to me as my cases designated case handler what remedies are available for me when you identified services failures committed by Enfield Councils Staffs?

The prior investigation into the complaint I made leaves the new investigator with serious questioning to be make!
The Enfield Councils current response gives the clear evidenced that Enfield Council has defended a bad existing decision rather than fully investigating the complaint that I actually submitted to come to the correct conclusions.
**I Therefore Request a Full Stage 2 Review**.
Yours faithfully,
**Mr. Simon Paul Cordell**