

The complaint

Mr W complains about his mortgage with Lloyds Bank PLC. He's unhappy with how the mortgage has been managed, that Lloyds has refused further borrowing, and about the customer service he's been provided with.

What happened

Mr W has a mortgage with Lloyds. He's made several complaints before about how his mortgage has operated.

In 2017, an ombudsman said that Lloyds should allow Mr W to port his mortgage, subject to any new property being suitable security for the lending. But the ombudsman said that Lloyds was not obliged to provide further borrowing at the same interest rate or terms as the existing mortgage.

In 2024, Mr W complained about the amount Lloyds was charging him – including that his monthly payments had not changed as he would have expected when the interest rate changed. An investigator said that Lloyds had managed the mortgage fairly and appropriately, and didn't uphold the complaint.

Also in 2024, Mr W got in touch with Lloyds to discuss further borrowing. He said that an ombudsman had said that Lloyds should lend him an additional £70,000. Lloyds said it wasn't aware of any ombudsman finding to that effect, and it wouldn't be able to lend Mr W further money without a full application being considered.

Mr W complained. He also complained about how his complaint had been handled by Lloyds – including about how staff had spoken to him, and that his calls had been recorded without prior warning. He also said that he had received excessive text messages.

Lloyds said that its complaint team texted Mr W to tell him that his complaint had been received. It said that because of a system problem the same message was sent multiple times and it apologised for that. It said that it recorded all calls, and didn't need customer consent to do so. It didn't agree that its staff had acted unreasonably on the phone to Mr W.

Our investigator said we couldn't look at matters that had been the subject of previous complaints. He didn't think Lloyds had acted unfairly. So Mr W asked for an ombudsman to review his complaint.

What I've decided – and why

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

I've looked at Mr W's previous complaints, and I've not seen any evidence that an ombudsman told Lloyds to lend Mr W £70,000, or any sum. The ombudsman in 2017 said that if Mr W wanted to apply for further borrowing alongside porting his mortgage, he would need to make an application – and that if Lloyds agreed to lend, it would be based on current

interest rates and products. Mr W would be able to port his existing offset facility, but as it no longer offered offset mortgages, new borrowing would be on a non-offset basis.

With that in mind, I don't think it was unfair that Lloyds said in 2024 that any application for further borrowing would require a full application – and it wasn't unfair that it said it had no record of an ombudsman's direction to lend £70,000.

Separately, we've looked before at how Lloyds is operating Mr W's mortgage. Lloyds explained that this was an offset mortgage. It recalculated the monthly payment annually, and at other times (for example, when interest rates change). When doing so, it calculates the monthly payment based on the current balance being repaid over what the term is projected to be taking into account the impact of interest charged being reduced because of offset balances. An investigator said that Lloyds was operating the mortgage fairly and in line with the terms and conditions. It wouldn't be appropriate for me to review that complaint again, in the absence of material new evidence.

I've also considered how Mr W's complaint was handled. It's lawful, and reasonable, for Lloyds to record calls with customers. I've listened to Mr W's calls with Lloyds' staff and I think Lloyds acted fairly. Mr W was difficult and challenging from the outset, and Lloyds' staff tried to manage the calls appropriately.

I understand it was frustrating for Mr W to receive multiple text messages. Lloyds apologised for that, which I think is fair. I don't require it to take any further action.

My final decision

My final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr W to accept or reject my decision before 13 October 2025.

Simon Pugh
Ombudsman