

7 December 2015

Dear Complaints

Following a meeting this morning with Mr. Daffarn, I am writing in support of his referral of his formal complaint to **Stage Two of the Complaints Procedure** on the following matters.

Access to his property

Mr. Daffarn gave good notice that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] he had a meeting with Ms. Prentice and "Stuart" of Rydon to fix a date for the works to his flat to commence on his return. During that meeting he asked for a detailed explanation of how the works would be carried out and made a suggestion as to how the works could be modified to suit the conditions in his flat. He was told that Rydon could not answer that suggestion; only Ms. Williams could reply. Mr. Daffarn left it on the assumption that Rydon would progress his enquiry [REDACTED] with Ms. Williams; Rydon thought that he would raise it with Ms. Williams himself, so the issue was not addressed.

[REDACTED] he received a letter stating that the works were due to start on 2 December. As his outstanding queries had not been addressed and the date had not been mutually agreed, he advised Rydon that they would first have to liaise with Ms. Williams before the works could begin.

Harassment

Instead of a response from Ms. Williams, the next thing he received was a hand-delivered letter from the TMO's solicitors. He states that there was no need for this. What was required was a discussion with Ms. Williams and Rydon about how the works in his flat would be carried out. Consequently he lodged a formal complaint claiming undue harassment.

Instead of receiving a response to this formal complaint, he then received a second hand-delivered solicitors' letter, stating that the works would commence from 8 am on 14 December. However, as the TMO is well aware, Mr. Daffarn has arranged a meeting with Cllr Victoria Borwick MP, Mr. Maddison, myself and others for that morning, so that start date is not

convenient. And Mr. Daffarn has still not had the discussion about how the works will be carried out.

Furthermore, since receipt of the first solicitors' letter, Mr. Daffarn remained at home all morning on 2 December for the visit from Rydon. No one attended, but he was not advised that no one would be coming. This was a discourtesy and requires an apology.

Loss of trust

There is a further matter that needs to be addressed, given the level of distrust between Grenfell Tower residents and the TMO and Rydon in general and Mr. Daffarn in particular. This is the incident when the door to flat no. 136 on Mr. Daffarn's floor was left open all weekend due to a defective door fastening. The response he received - that the door was not left open - was clearly and demonstrably untrue. In view of this misinformation, Mr. Daffarn feels unable to trust any assurances that are given to him concerning the works to his flat.

However, he is very willing to provide access to Rydon operatives to complete the works to his flat so long as:

- The date is mutually agreed in advance
- He is able to meet with Rydon representatives and Ms. Williams beforehand to understand precisely how the works to his flat will be carried out
- He can be reassured that his furniture and property will not be damaged during the process.

He also requires a response to his question as to why the TMO wasted money using solicitors' letters to pressure him instead of responding directly to his substantive concerns. Finally, may I please be reassured that no more solicitors' letters will be sent to Mr. Daffarn in the meantime?

Kind regards.

Cllr Judith Blakeman