

The complaint

Mrs G complains about the service she received from Barclays Bank UK PLC ("Barclays") in relation to her mortgage.

What happened

Mrs G had a mortgage with Barclays. She complained to the Financial Ombudsman Service about a number of issues, and in August 2024 a final decision was issued on her complaint.

In that decision the ombudsman said that Barclays should retrospectively apply an interest rate to her buy-to-let mortgage from December 2022 to December 2024.

After that Mrs G said she wasn't made aware how the interest rate had been applied and what the position of her account was. She says she had many phone calls with Barclays after that where she tried to establish if it had actioned the ombudsman's decision and how that impacted her account going forward. She wanted to know whether she could apply for a new product following the expiry of the retrospectively applied interest rate.

Mrs G says she couldn't get the information she needed so she complained. She said that much of the trouble getting the information stemmed from the fact that her mortgage was managed on a historic IT system. That system was limited.

Mrs G's mortgage has been migrated onto another IT system now.

In its November 2024 final response Barclays recognised it could have provided Mrs G with better customer service. It thanked Mrs G for accepting its offer of £200 compensation and confirmed that the compensation had been paid into her account.

After that Mrs G complained to us about another issue as well. She said she was unhappy with the interest that accrued on the arrears that had built up during the period she was advised by Barclays not to resume payments while her previous complaint was under review.

Our investigator looked into what happened. He said he didn't think the compensation Barclays had paid Mrs G for this matter was enough. He said he thought Barclays' offer should be increased from £200 to £400. He said Mrs G had had significant issues communicating with Barclays about her mortgage given the limitations of the historic IT system her mortgage was managed on. Those mirrored the issues she had had in the past that resulted in our previous final decision. Our investigator said that Mrs G spoke to more than one person who couldn't find information. So she had to spend a long time on the phone with Barclays about this matter. He said that listening to the call recordings he appreciated that that was upsetting and an exasperating experience for Mrs G who had endured these kinds of issues on countless occasions before.

Our investigator didn't look at Mrs G's complaint about the interest that accrued on the arrears that have built up on the account as that was a new issue that she'd raised after she'd complained to Barclays in relation to this matter.

Barclays appears to have accepted what our investigator said. It said it had nothing to add. It confirmed that all actions required by the August 2024 final decision were delayed but completed in November 2024.

Mrs G didn't think £400 compensation was enough. She made a number of points I'll consider below and asked for her complaint to be reviewed by an ombudsman. So this complaint was passed to me to decide. She made a number of points that I've considered below.

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'll begin by saying that there's no dispute that Barclays' service was poor after the ombudsman issued a final decision on Mrs G's previous complaint in August 2024.

The ombudsman that issued the August 2024 final decision instructed Barclays to rework her mortgage by applying a backdated tracker rate from November 2022 and confirm (in writing) that it had done that. Barclays didn't send Mrs G a written confirmation of that, and Mrs G has told us that confusion around the interest rate persisted well into 2025. Mrs G says she was given contradictory information by Barclays staff, including an incorrect claim that the tracker rate had been applied until 2026.

Mrs G says that Barclays' actions went beyond poor service - it represented a failure to comply with the ombudsman's final decision and suggested deeper systemic issues within Barclays' internal processes and accountability.

I don't underestimate Mrs G's strength of feeling about what happened. Nor is it in dispute that Mrs G had to have many frustrating phone calls with Barclays about this matter. I'm in no doubt that this matter been upsetting and time consuming for her. But I'm not Barclays' regulator so it isn't my role to look into potential systemic issues with Barclays' systems. I'm pleased to see that Barclays has acknowledged and apologised for its mistakes here and migrated Mrs G's mortgage onto another online system where she is able to access online services so the problems Mrs G has experienced don't reoccur. Overall I think £400 compensation is a fair and reasonable amount to cover Mrs G for the distress and inconvenience this matter has caused. It reflects the fact that Barclays' handling of this matter caused her considerable distress, upset and worry over a number of months. Mrs G has said that she thinks that £400 is a small amount of money for a bank as big as Barclays and that she doesn't think £400 compensation will drive any meaningful change or recognition of wrongdoing on Barclays' part. I appreciate Mrs G's point of view, but my role isn't to punish Barclays in my decisions.

Finally I think it's also worth saying here that my role in this complaint is to consider the mistakes Barclays made after the August 2024 final decision was sent, and their impact on Mrs G. It wouldn't be appropriate for me to revisit issues that have been considered in a previous complaint where a final decision has been issued. I can see that the ombudsman that decided Mrs G's previous complaint took into account a large number of issues including the old IT system, the mortgage arrears she says accrued in a period when she was advised by Barclays not to resume payments, and Barclays writing to her asking for tenant information in order for it to access the mortgaged property.

Putting things right

Taking this matter as a whole, I think that Barclays should pay Mrs G £400 in total to resolve

this complaint. I can see that it has already paid her £200, so it should pay her another £200 on top of that.

My final decision

For the reasons set out above, my final decision is that Barclays Bank UK PLC should pay Mrs G £200 (on top of the £200 it has already paid her) to resolve this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mrs G to accept or reject my decision before 23 December 2025.

Laura Forster
Ombudsman