

Dear Mr Daffarn

Thank you for your message dated 21<sup>st</sup> December 2014. I am considering this matter at Stage 2 of the KCTMO Complaints Procedure.

You complain that you were led to believe that residents would have an opportunity to view and comment on the type of window to be installed at Grenfell.

I have reviewed this matter and there is clear evidence that residents have been consulted on the window design in the development of the proposals:

- On 17<sup>th</sup> June 2013 a public meeting was held at which the proposed designs for the scheme were discussed with residents.
- On 26<sup>th</sup> July 2013, a newsletter (copy attached) was sent to all residents giving feedback on the issues that were discussed on 17<sup>th</sup> July 2013. The newsletter also invited residents to a “drop-in session” on 14<sup>th</sup> August 13 and a further public meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> August 13 with the following items on the agenda: “Progress of the Planning Application, window design, contractor selection and future consultation”.
- At the consultation events held on 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> August 13, our architects presented their design drawings to residents and explained the design of each element of the scheme that was to be included in the revised planning application. This included the configuration and operation of the windows that were presented on display boards at the events. Notes of this meeting of were distributed to all residents (copy attached). These notes reflect the discussion on the design and configuration of the windows. They also confirm that the plans would be on display in the concierge office in the entrance foyer of Grenfell Tower for residents to see.
- Residents had an opportunity to comment on the amended planning proposals in September 2013 and I understand that you made a number of comments to the Planners throughout the formal process.
- In September 2013, we sent a further newsletter to residents (copy attached) and held a further drop-in session and public meeting with residents to give an update on the Planning Application, contractor selection and other matters relating to the programme of works. I also attach the notes from this meeting.
- Following the appointment of Rydon as the contractor for the scheme, we have carried out further one to one consultation with residents about the detail of the works to be carried out. As part of this consultation, some residents raised concerns about enlarging the window openings in the flats as they felt that this would be messy and disruptive and that their curtains would no longer fit. We therefore wrote to residents on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2014 to advise residents that we proposed to apply for a planning amendment to keep the windows within the existing opening.

At the Residents meeting of 15<sup>th</sup> August 2013 it was confirmed that *“we would let residents see a sample so they residents would better understand how the windows opened, security arrangements and how they could be cleaned”*. We still intend to do this and the window is currently on order and will be made available to residents as part of the ongoing consultation. However, it was never intended that this sample would be used as part of the design consultation – it is not practical to produce numerous window samples and there would be a risk of misleading resident by producing a sample that is not exactly what we intend to install. We have therefore consulted residents by using

design drawings that have been put on display in the reception area, and at our drop-in sessions and public meetings.

I therefore do not uphold your complaint. There is clear evidence that there has been a considerable amount of consultation with residents on the design of the windows and all residents have had an opportunity to view the proposals and make comments. I would also note that we have also taken on board comments of residents in the development of the window design by removing the “louvre” detail that was initially proposed that residents did not like and by amending the design to keep the windows within the existing opening.

You also complain that you understood that the windows were to be plastic and that the material has now been changed to aluminium.

I can find no evidence that a plastic window was ever proposed for the scheme. Aluminium is a higher quality and considerably more expensive product and is detailed in the planning application. The material will complement the design of the exterior of Grenfell Tower.

In your message you make reference to your request for copies of meetings of the project team in relation to the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower. Fola Kafidiya has already responded to this matter to explain why this information will not be divulged. Fola has also explained that you may contact the Information Commissioner if you are not satisfied with this response. This position is clear and I do not propose to respond to this matter as part of this complaint.

I do not uphold your complaint and propose to close this matter. If you are not satisfied with this response, you can ask for the matter to be considered at Stage 3 of the KCMTTO complaints procedure. In order to consider your complaint at stage 3 you will need to outline the problem and why you feel our stage 2 response is not good enough and what you think we can do to put things right. Please let me know by 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2015, otherwise I will close down your case.

Yours sincerely

Sacha Jevans

Executive Director of Operations