

Dempsey, Matthew

From: Carl Sanders [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 May 2013 00:44
To: Planning
Subject: 2013/1899/P Planning Application consultation
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

It is noted that we have 21 days to respond to the date of the letter of the 17 April 2013.

On receipt of this letter only a week ago it is found unacceptable that it was not posted in reasonable time in which to answer within 21 days. It was thought on reading that there was plenty of time to reply but find it is now too late to submit though our comments may be included if a decision has not been made.

It would be helpful to put the actual address of the website instead of requesting we do a search.

Comments

1. We are not satisfied with the consultation process and only today Tuesday 14 May, have we received another version of the proposed window to be installed.
2. The window that we first received as an example was not the same window that was put forward on the first consultation and no reason was given to why this was.
3. It was not until some weeks later that some residents were informed that the window was too heavy so was changed. It can not be seen how this is possible as the same materials are being used so should not weigh any different.
4. There were delays in seeing this example due to the mechanism failure and when it did eventually arrive residents had similar problems in operation. Eventually a visit by another TRA found that the mechanism had failed completely that the window became jammed open.
5. Our concerns as a leasehold is that our present windows are sealed and work fine and are not in need of replacement just adjustment. Other residents have also expressed this.
6. The windows in this tower block have not been regularly maintained the consequence of which means that they have been allowed to let in water and cold wind, allowing tenants to feel that they need a complete new window when in fact it just needed adjustment.
7. It is known that the council has also not done a survey on each flat to determine which windows are defective and have made a collective judgement that they all need replacement. This is a waste of funds and

certainly our savings as a leaseholder.

8. The Bacton Tower TRA informed the council that only the balcony door and window frames needed replacement as it was single pane glass, the reason the heat was escaping from the flats. Despite our advice in consultation the council have ignored our recommendation and are now replacing all windows and frames.

9. It is noted in our leasehold agreement that the windows and frames are the responsibility of the council and yet it is being inferred that lease holders will be expected to pay for them. It appears that when we purchased the flat the windows were not maintained and allowed to fail.

10. As leaseholders we want sliding doors on the balcony and many residents have requested this, we are informed that other council flats have had these sliding doors fitted on other estates in London.

11. We need assurance that access to the worksite will not be attended until after 08.00hrs as we will be burdened with noise all day due to various works from the heating replacement and window fittings.

We object to the application for the following:

The consultation is being rushed through and replies to questions delayed.

The consultation with residents requests have not been met or not taken into consideration in that sliding doors on balconies are not being fitted without credible reason.

I object to the application as the windows in our flat are sealed, secure and do not need replacement. The ones in the bedroom have one window that needs adjustment so that the wind can not blow through the seals, it does not need a complete new frame.

That no contingency plans have been made to allow tenants relief from daily noise from this major project ie quiet rooms or areas that residents can use.

In all honesty the point of these consultations are not seen the council just do as they please anyway!

regards,

Carl Sanders

