

The complaint

Mr G has complained about his property insurer U K Insurance Ltd. He feels its given poor service during a damage claim, which has caused prolonged disruption and has had a significant emotional impact.

What happened

There was a water leak at Mr G's home. Damage was caused. A claim was made to UKI in July 2025. In August 2025 Mr G made a complaint to UKI as he felt the claim had not progressed well. Subsequent to that complaint, issues of concern for Mr G continued to arise and two further complaints to UKI were made.

UKI responded separately to Mr G's three complaints. Across three final response letters (FRLs) UKI acknowledged delays and poor service. It paid Mr G a total of £1,550 compensation. Regarding an issue Mr G had raised about it declining to pay any further disturbance allowance (DA), it said its decision was reasonable. It said some disturbance is to be expected and Mr G had full cooking and washing facilities.

When Mr G complained to the Financial Ombudsman Service, our Investigator explained the purpose of DA was to cover the extra costs likely incurred due to living in an unrepaired home (or somewhere not like your home) during the claim but which can't be quantified. She felt UKI's decision to not pay any more DA in this instance was fair. She also thought UKI's total compensation was reasonable in the circumstances here.

Mr G emphasised that there had been repeated communication breakdowns, missed deadlines, and works which remained incomplete. He said he wanted the repeated and systemic failures of UKI to be taken into account, along with the prolonged and avoidable disruption and the cumulative practical and emotional impact on his household.

The complaint was referred for an Ombudsman's decision.

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.

Having done so I find my view is the same as that of our Investigator. Quite simply UKI failed Mr G in the circumstances here, but it has paid fair and reasonable compensation to make up for that.

I can certainly assure Mr G that I have taken into account the points he made in response to our Investigator's view. From reading our Investigator's view, I think it's fair to say, as far as she was able, she had also previously taken those points into account. Mr G's claim should have been resolved long before UKI's FRL dated 24 November 2025. It wasn't. The reason it wasn't was because of failures by UKI. The impact on Mr G, which includes the upset he's suffered seeing his family being impacted, reasonably has to be compensated for. UKI has

paid £1,550 for upset caused in the period of around four months. I'm satisfied that is fair and reasonable. I'm not going to require UKI to pay any more compensation.

I can understand that Mr G would have liked the DA to continue. But as our Investigator explained – DA is paid to cover the extra but unquantified costs incurred due to living in the disrupted home, not to make up for the practical and emotional impact of living there, that is taken into account by the compensation payment. For the period Mr G is concerned about, the home had essential facilities and Mr G has not shown that any additional costs were being incurred/likely being incurred by the family living there. I'm not going to require UKI to pay any more DA.

My final decision

For the reasons explained above, I'm not making any award against U K Insurance Limited.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr G to accept or reject my decision before 15 May 2026.

Fiona Robinson
Ombudsman