

---

**From:** Simon Lawrence  
**Sent:** 05 November 2014 20:07  
**To:** Neil Crawford  
**Cc:** Simon O'Connor; Bruce Sounes  
**Subject:** RE: Grenfell windows

Hi Neil,

After my meeting with Claire this afternoon I am keen to issue as many 'Construction drawings for approval' to her even if most of them are straight from the tender. She is still making a big issue that she hasn't got all of the up to date drawings issued during the tender stage. I've been trying to politely suggest that issue lies with her rather than with us but it seems to be falling on deaf ears. I've also put together a change tracker document which I plan to issue tomorrow which will hopefully capture the changes and affect of the changes she is requesting so its clear for everyone what is being asked.

It will probably be easier for me to give you a call tomorrow to discuss.

Regards

Simon Lawrence, ACIOB, MInstLM  
Contracts Manager

T  
M

---

**From:** Neil Crawford [mailto:Neil@studioe.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 05 November 2014 14:49  
**To:** Simon Lawrence  
**Cc:** Simon O'Connor; Bruce Sounes  
**Subject:** RE: Grenfell windows

Simon

Please see attached new drawings PL322- PL325. These are updated line drawings of the preferred scheme that can be compared to PL 312- PL315 (also attached) that were issued to the planners at the end of July (to confirm materials and finishes). The proportional changes to the windows can be compared at a larger scale than sheet SK110 previously issued (also attached).

As it looks like this is the preferred option shall I go ahead and circulate these to Amy Peck, Matt Smith and Harleys?

Also I would like to shortly re-issue the following drawings and schedules to consolidate the current design position if that's okay;

- Floor finishes
- Wall finishes
- Fire Strategy Drawings
- CA 0810 glazed screens
- Door Schedule
- Ironmongery schedule
- Sanitary ware schedule

Let me know how you wish to proceed,

Regards  
Neil

---

**From:** Simon Lawrence [<mailto:slawrence@rydon.co.uk>]

**Sent:** 04 November 2014 14:35

**To:** 'Claire Williams'

**Cc:** [philip.booth@uk.arteliagroup.com](mailto:philip.booth@uk.arteliagroup.com); Bruce Sounes; Neil Crawford; [M.Smith@maxfordham.com](mailto:M.Smith@maxfordham.com); Simon O'Connor; David Gibson; VALENTE Nick ([nick.valente@uk.arteliagroup.com](mailto:nick.valente@uk.arteliagroup.com))

**Subject:** RE: Grenfell windows

Afternoon All,

I'll try and summarise below the window design change and conclusions to date.

- Planning risk - LPA confirmed via Amy that the new window design requires a Non-Material Amendment application to formalise the change. This would be a require an application to be submitted (detailing the proposed changes). A non-material amendment application has a 28 determination period by the LPA.
- Window design – Since our meeting Studio E have looked at various configurations that could be used in each position without the need to enlarge the structural openings. The options are:- a) same as currently proposed/tendered but scaled down to fit i.e. 2no. opening windows 1no. large window and 1no. small b) 1no. large window only and c) 2no. windows of equal size (same as existing but tilt 'n turn not sliding). From a performance point of view (thermal and ventilation) all configurations are equal. However we feel that it is probably best to stay with 'Option a' because it will have less planning risk as it will visually look very similar to the original, 2no. different size windows will also give the resident greater flexibility by adjusting the amount of airflow they want. In addition to this it will only mean the small window will need to be fully opened on turn mode to allow purge ventilation thereby preventing overheating.
- Ventilation – (As per Claire's point 3 below) Matt has looked at the study that Max Fordham carried out at Stage C (as per his recent email 30/10) which had calculations based on keeping the structural opening size the same as existing. In order not to make the overheating situation worse than existing (a requirement in Building Regs for work on existing) then the large window could be on tilt mode with the smaller window on fully turned mode. My understanding is that the overheating issue is only a problem due to weather temperatures rather than anything to do with HIU's or central heating within the flat. So this is likely to only be an issue during hotter spells in the summer months. But will still be an issue none the less. So the answer is that by keeping the existing opening sizes we can achieve the regs and not have overheating *but* it will mean that the smaller window will need to be fully open during hot weather spells. Is this acceptable from a safety point of view as there is no fall protection i.e. louvres as originally proposed in tender docs? The new windows will have restrictors in the handle mechanism so you would need a key to open fully so it is in the residents control. In theory no different from existing. What are KCTMO thoughts on this?
- Daylight – Because of frame thicknesses the daylight levels will be slightly worse than existing however the levels are still more than required in the Regs. No BREEAM credits were assumed for section HEA01 so therefore no affect on BREEAM rating.

In summary the biggest decision that is required in order for us to progress is around fully opening windows and residents safety. Comments welcomed.

Regards

Simon Lawrence, ACIOB, MInstLM  
Contracts Manager

T [REDACTED]  
M [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Claire Williams [<mailto:clwilliams@kctmo.org.uk>]

**Sent:** 31 October 2014 11:23

**To:** Simon Lawrence

**Cc:** [philip.booth@uk.arteliagroup.com](mailto:philip.booth@uk.arteliagroup.com); [bruce@studioe.co.uk](mailto:bruce@studioe.co.uk); Neil Crawford ([Neil@studioe.co.uk](mailto:Neil@studioe.co.uk));

[M.Smith@maxfordham.com](mailto:M.Smith@maxfordham.com); Simon O'Connor; David Gibson; VALENTE Nick ([nick.valente@uk.arteliagroup.com](mailto:nick.valente@uk.arteliagroup.com))

**Subject:** Grenfell windows

Simon

I have just spoken to Matt re the window calculations and would like just to see if we can agree the position on these windows. I have left a message for Amy Peck, our planning consultant who is off until Monday 3 Nov, so I am not sure what feedback she has had from the planners re keeping the existing structural opening.

- 1 Can you please confirm the insulation values of the proposed cladding/insulation and windows? There are assumptions in Matt's report which I need to check are still valid.
- 2 I understand that Studio E have provided a new drawing showing a proposal of a large tilt and turn window and a smaller tilt and turn window. I do not know if at least one of these windows is to 'standard size' or if there is any requirement for a technical check from Harley as the dimensions will be critical. Then Matt may need to review his overheating model.
- 3 I have spoken to Matt, and understand that based on the above drawing, that if the larger window was on full tilt (ie hinged at the base opening inward) and the smaller window was used in casement mode and opened fully – this would meet the refurbishment standards.

I will catch up with you next week when you are back at your desk.


Thanks

Claire Williams  
Project Manager



t: [REDACTED]  
m: [REDACTED]

a: The Network Hub, 292a Kensal Road, London, W10 5BE

 Before printing, please think about the environment

---

This e-mail message has been scanned for Viruses and Content and cleared by **MailMarshal**

---

**DISCLAIMER:**

This E-mail and any files transmitted with are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the System Administrator. This message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this email.

Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Kensington & Chelsea TMO Ltd Finally, the recipient should check this email and any

attachments for the presence of viruses. Kensington & Chelsea TMO Ltd accepts no liability for any damage caused by any Virus transmitted by this email.

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---