

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)
Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR)
Decision notice

Date: 4 October 2024

Public Authority: London Borough of Lewisham
Address: Town Hall
Catford
London
SE6 4RU

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant submitted a multipart request to the London Borough of Lewisham (the Council) seeking information about works on the Dacres Estate. The Council provided information falling within the scope of the request but the complainant argued that it would hold additional recorded information.
2. The Commissioner's decision is that on the balance of probabilities the Council does not hold any recorded information beyond that disclosed to the complainant.
3. The Commissioner does not require further steps.

Request and response

4. The complainant submitted a 16 part request to the Council on 29 November 2023. A copy of this request is included in the annex attached to this notice.

5. The Council responded to this request on 28 December 2023, providing answers to each of the questions and disclosed information (eg emails or documents) for some of the questions.
6. The complainant contacted the Council on 11 January 2024 and raised three queries regarding the information provided. A copy of these queries is also included in the annex to this notice.
7. The Council provided a response to these queries on 11 March 2024, noting that any supporting documents that it held had previously been provided.
8. The complainant contacted the Council on the same day and explained that they were dissatisfied with this response and asked the Council to conduct an internal review.
9. The Council provided the complainant with the outcome of the internal review on 5 April 2024. The review explained that it upheld its previous response and that all recorded information held within the scope of the request had been provided.

Scope of the case

10. The complainant contacted the Commissioner on 9 April 2024 in order to complain about the Council's handling of their request. They raised various grounds of complaint regarding the responses provided to the original request of 29 November 2023, and the response provided in respect of the follow up queries sent on 11 January 2024.
11. The particular details of these grounds of complaint are set out in the analysis section of this notice below, by reference to the specific question number of the request. For completeness and clarity the Commissioner has quoted each of these grounds of complaint as provided to him by the complainant. Each quote consists of the relevant part of the request, the complainant's summary of the Council's initial response, and why they were dissatisfied with its responses.
12. For each ground of complaint the Commissioner has explained the nature of the enquiries he made of the Council, set out its response, and then explained his findings.

Reasons for decision

13. In cases such as this where there is some dispute as to whether information falling within the scope of the request is held, the

Commissioner, following the lead of a number of Information Tribunal decisions, applies the civil standard of the balance of probabilities.

14. In other words, in order to determine such complaints the Commissioner must decide whether on the balance of probabilities a public authority holds any information which falls within the scope of the request.
15. In applying this test the Commissioner will consider the results of the searches undertaken by the public authority and/or other explanations offered as to why the information is not held.

Question 5

16. In respect of question 5 the complainant submitted the following:

"5/ On what date (or dates) was a decision made to carry out surveys on blocks on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point) in relation to major works under the Long Term Agreement LTA01310?"

Order was raised for surveys to be carried out on 30th October 2021.

NOT SATISFIED: does not answer question - states when order was made, not the date the decision was made to carry out surveys. May have been decided a long time prior to the order being raised. No supporting documentation e.g. emails, internal documents provided to support this response."

17. The Commissioner asked the Council to respond to a number of questions regarding the steps it had taken to locate information falling within the scope of question 5. The Commissioner has reproduced these questions, and the Council's response, below, albeit that it confirmed that it did not hold any recorded information that clearly states a date a decision was made to carry out surveys.
18. Question: What searches have been carried out to locate information recording when the decision was made to carry out the surveys and why would these searches have been likely to retrieve any relevant information?

Response: Searches were made through the main computer shared drive (so would likely have yielded the information if it was held) used by the Stock Investment and Asset Management Team (SIAM)/Major works to store information.

19. Question: Please describe thoroughly any searches of relevant paper/electronic records and include details of any staff consultations.

Response: If this information was held, it would have been held electronically on the shared drive and not in paper format so this is where all of our searches were conducted. Our officer also communicated directly with other members of staff in the SIAM/Major Works team and the Home Ownership Services.

20. Question: If searches included electronic data, which search terms were used and please explain whether the search included information held locally on personal computers used by key officials (including laptop computers) and on networked resources and emails.

Response: Search terms used were: Dacres Road, Ashleigh Crescent and a specific address. Searches conducted as above.

21. Question: Was any recorded information ever held concerning when the decision to carry out the surveys was taken but deleted/destroyed prior to the request?

22. Response: We are unable to confirm this.

23. Questions: If recorded information was held but is no longer held, when did the Council cease to retain this information? Does the Council have a record of the document's destruction?

Response: N/A.

24. Question: What does the Council's formal records management policy say about the retention and deletion of records of this type? If there is no relevant policy, can the Council describe the way in which it has handled comparable records of a similar age?

Response: There is no specific reference to retention periods for information detailing when decisions to carry out surveys were carried out. The nearest fit would be relating to the retention of surveys themselves which would be 6 years from the date of the survey itself.

25. Question: Is there a business purpose for which the requested information should be held? If so what is this purpose?

Response: No.

26. In view of the Council's responses, the Commissioner is satisfied that on the balance of probabilities it does not hold recorded information detailing when the decision was taken to commission the surveys in question. He considers the searches, as undertaken by the Council, to have been sufficiently focused to locate any relevant information, both in terms of the search terms used and the locations searched. He notes that such searches were sufficient to locate the date the order was

raised for the surveys. He also notes that the Council does not have a business purpose to hold the date the decision was taken to commission the surveys, and that by the time this request was submitted more than two years had passed since the order in question was raised.

Question 6

27. In respect of question 6 the complainant submitted the following:

"6/ On what dates were surveys performed on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point) to determine if major works were required under the Long Term Agreement LTA01310?

Surveys followed the order above.

NOT SATISFIED: does not answer question – states surveys followed the order but not the dates the surveys were performed as asked."

28. The Commissioner asked the Council whether it held any recorded information detailing when the surveys were performed. If it did not, the Commissioner asked the Council to provide a response to the points outlined in relation to question 5 regarding the searches undertaken for the dates of the surveys, whether such information was destroyed, the records management policy regarding such information and whether there is a business to retain such information.

29. In response the Council provided the Commissioner with three documents, "Dacres Road Towers Development Refurbishment Assessment Report" dated July 2022 and examples of two letters to residents regarding window asbestos surveys and window surveys. The Council noted that the report refers to a structural engineer visiting the five blocks on Wednesday 23 March 2022. It noted that the letters to residents were sent on 8 February 2022. (The Commissioner notes that the letter regarding the "Windows Asbestos Survey" was sent on this date, and the letter regarding "Window Survey" is dated 12 July 2023.)

30. The Commissioner considers the date information set out above to fall within the scope of question 6 of the request and that this addresses this ground of complaint.

Questions 8 and 9

31. In respect of question 8 the complainant submitted the following:

"8/ On what date was Symphony (Address: Unit 14 Salamanca Road, Tharston Industrial Estate, Long Stratton, Norfolk, NR15 2PF) first contacted to provide customer sketches for the replacement of windows at Ashleigh Point and other Dacres Estate blocks and by

whom within Lewisham Homes (job number 278, job reference SYM16556)?

United Living Ltd have confirmed that they first contacted Symphony to carry out surveys in Nov 2022. Please see attached email.

NOT SATISFIED: date is more than a year after date in company sketches consistent with our windows that were provided to Dacres Estate residents in the consultation. Appealed this response and told 'we wish to uphold our previous responses' AND 'The relevant teams have been contacted and have stated that all recorded information held within scope of your request, has been provided to you.'"

32. In respect of question 9 the complainant submitted the following:

"9/ Please provide copies of any communications with Symphony in relation to providing sketches for the replacement of windows at Ashleigh Point and other Dacres Estate blocks (job number 278, job reference SYM16556)

As above. Please see attached email for reference.

NOT SATISFIED: the response to question 8 provides verifiably incorrect information and the attached email chains do not provide copies of communications with Symphony, rather, the written recollection of a team member (that contradicts documents they have shared with residents)."

33. The Commissioner sought the Council's views on the complainant's suggestion that there is a discrepancy between the date provided in response to question 8 and the date in company sketches.

34. Furthermore in respect of question 9 he sought the Council's views on the complainant's position that the information provided does not include provide copies of communications with Symphony, rather, the written recollection of a team member.

35. Furthermore, the Commissioner asked the Council to confirm whether it held any communications with Symphony of the nature sought by this part of the request. If no such communications are held, the Commissioner asked the Council to respond to the questions he set out in respect question 5, regarding the searches undertaken for the dates of the surveys, whether such information was destroyed, the records management policy regarding such information and whether there is a business to retain such information.

36. In response the Council acknowledged that there was a discrepancy in respect of date provided for question 8. However, it explained that the

main contractor, United Living Ltd, who are currently carrying out the major works have confirmed in their email, disclosed to the complainant, they had a conversation with Symphony in November 2022. The Council explained that it was unable to comment further on this point.

37. In respect of question 9, the Council explained that in order to demonstrate its transparency in relation to this request it provided the complainant with copies of its internal emails, ie what the complainant referred to as "the written recollection of a team member".
38. In response to the questions above, the Council's response was as follows:
39. Question: What searches have been carried out to locate information recording communications with Symphony in relation to providing sketches for the replacement of windows at Ashleigh Point and other Dacres Estate blocks why would these searches have been likely to retrieve any relevant information?

Response: Searches were carried out through the main computer shared drive (so would likely have yielded the information if it was held) used by the Stock Investment and Asset Management Team - Major works to store information. The officer who carried out the search, was unable to locate any communications with Symphony in relation to providing sketches for the replacement of windows at Ashleigh Point and other Dacres Estate blocks (job number 278, job reference SYM16556)

40. Question: Please describe thoroughly any searches of relevant paper/electronic records and include details of any staff consultations.

Response: If this information was held, it would have been held electronically on the shared drive and not in paper format so this is where all of our searches were conducted. Our officer also communicated directly with other members of staff in the SIAM/Major Works team and the Home Ownership Services.

41. Question: If searches included electronic data, which search terms were used and please explain whether the search included information held locally on personal computers used by key officials (including laptop computers) and on networked resources and emails.

Response: Dacres Road, Ashleigh Crescent, and a specific address.

42. Question: Was any recorded information ever held concerning when the decision to carry out the surveys was taken but deleted/destroyed prior to the request?

Response: We are unable to confirm as it has not been made clear

where the resident, ie the complainant, got the sketches from and United Living Ltd have confirmed when they first contacted Symphony.

43. Question: If recorded information was held but is no longer held, when did the Council cease to retain this information? Does the Council have a record of the document's destruction?

Response: N/A.

44. Question: What does the Council's formal records management policy say about the retention and deletion of records of this type? If there is no relevant policy, can the Council describe the way in which it has handled comparable records of a similar age?

Response: 6 years.

45. Question: Is there a business purpose for which the requested information should be held? If so what is this purpose?

Response: No.

46. The Commissioner appreciates the complainant's point that the information provided in respect of question 8 does contain a discrepancy. However, he notes the Council's response that the information provided was based on information provided to it by United Living Ltd. In respect of question 9, the Commissioner considers that the searches undertaken by the Council are sufficient – again based on the search terms and locations searched – to locate information which would be caught by both questions 8 and 9, both of which seek communications with Symphony.

47. On the balance of probabilities the Commissioner is therefore satisfied that the Council does not hold any information falling within the scope of either question.

Question 10

48. In respect of question 10 the complainant submitted the following:

"10/ When did work start on the DACRES ROAD DEVELOPMENT UPDATE SEPTEMBER 2021 NEWSLETTER by the New Initiatives Team? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

The new initiative team have confirmed that the first draft of newsletter was 24th September 2021 and the final draft was 29th September 2021.

NOT (QUITE) SATISFIED: does not answer question – does not state when work started on newsletter, only date when the first draft of the

newsletter was created – this could have been weeks after work started on the newsletter.”

49. As part of his investigation, the Commissioner asked the Council whether it held any recorded information which states when the work began on the newsletter, and if no information was held, the nature of the searches undertaken to locate such information.
50. In response, the Council explained that there is a specific folder for newsletters in the Dacres electronic file that relates to the work New Initiatives team, were carrying out, not related to the specific works that are the basis of the main query. However, it explained that there is no earlier information on when the work started on the September 2021 newsletter held on file. It also added that there is no policy requirement that requires this information to be held for a newsletter.
51. The Commissioner notes that the Council has consulted the relevant file where information concerning the newsletter is stored and that no information relevant to this particular question is held. The Commissioner also accepts the Council’s point that there would no business need to retain (or perhaps even originally record) such information. The Commissioner is therefore satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, the Council does not hold any further information falling within the scope of the request.

Question 11

52. In respect of question 11 the complainant submitted the following:

“11/ At what point did team members from the New Initiatives Team who developed the DACRES ROAD DEVELOPMENT UPDATE SEPTEMBER 2021 NEWSLETTER issue of the newsletter become aware of the plans for 'new roofs and windows, external redecorations and brickwork repairs' on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point)? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

The above works were planned and included in the newsletter however, the works were confirmed after the surveys were carried out.

NOT SATISFIED: does not answer the question nor provide documents or communications to evidence when the team became aware of the plans.”

53. As part of his investigation, the Commissioner asked the Council whether it held any recorded information which would fall within the scope of this question.

54. The Council explained that as per its response for question 10 above, no additional information relevant to this request is held on the electronic file, namely the Electronic folder for "Newsletters" for Dacres (New Initiatives folder). The Council explained that there is no policy requirement that requires such information to be held for a newsletter.
55. Given the searches undertaken of the file in question, and the fact there would be no business need to record when officers responsible for drafting the newsletter became of certain developments, the Commissioner is satisfied that on the balance of probabilities it does not hold any recorded information falling within the scope of this request.

Questions 12 and 13

56. In respect of question 12 the complainant submitted the following:

"12/ Who had received the DACRES ROAD DEVELOPMENT UPDATE SEPTEMBER 2021 NEWSLETTER issue of the newsletter? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

See attached mailing list that is on file for the newsletters. Please see attached email for reference.

NOT (QUITE) SATISFIED: does not provide any evidence that the newsletter was mailed out, only the existence of a list of addresses for the estate. (Note – question asked as no copy received by the flat – newsletter found online after combing theirs and linked websites. The newsletter and associated documents have been removed from the website now. This despite documents attached to other local developments still being on there)"

57. And in respect of question 13 submitted the following:

"13/ Was the DACRES ROAD DEVELOPMENT UPDATE SEPTEMBER 2021 NEWSLETTER issue of the newsletter posted to individual properties on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point)? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

The newsletters are normally mailed to the addresses in the attached distribution list.

NOT SATISFIED: doesn't answer the question – states what's normally done, but not what was done in this instance."

58. As part of his investigation, the Commissioner asked the Council whether it holds any recorded information which states who received the newsletter or whether the newsletter was actually posted to individual

properties, and if no such information is held the searches taken to locate such information.

59. The Council explained that the only information held on the electronic folder is the mailing list. There is no evidence held on file showing the newsletters were sent and to whom. The electronic folder has been reviewed. Again, the Council noted that there is no policy requirement that requires this information to be held for a newsletter.
60. The Commissioner is satisfied that on the balance of probabilities the Council does not hold any further information falling within the scope of questions 12 and 13 beyond the mailing list. He notes that there is no need for the Council to record who actually received the newsletter, and indeed does not envisage an obvious or clear way in which such information would be recorded, beyond the existence of a mailing list to whom such a newsletter would be sent. Moreover, again the Commissioner observes that these questions are seeking details about a newsletter sent over two years prior to the request being submitted and in his view given such circumstances it seems very unlikely that any information, beyond the mailing list, would be held or retained.

Question 15

61. In respect of question 15 the complainant submitted the following

"15/ What communications did this department have with the Lewisham Homes Home Ownership Team prior to 21st September 2021? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

Please see attached dated notices confirming when communication between the two departments took place.

NOT SATISFIED: the notices don't provide information on when the Lewisham Homes Home Ownership team became aware of decisions regarding major works. They undoubtedly become aware well before the dates in the notices as they need to draw up the individual notices."

62. The Commissioner sought clarification from the Council as to whether it held any communications of the nature sought by this question, prior to the notices in question being issued. If no such information was held, the searches taken to locate such information.
63. In response, the Council explained that there is no information held on electronic files recording meetings with the Lewisham Homes Home Ownership Team. There is no policy requirement that requires this information to be held for a newsletter.

64. In respect of question 15, the Commissioner notes that the reference to 'this department' in the opening part of the question refers to the department which question 14 sought the identity of, namely the Stock Investment and Asset Management Team - Housing Quality & Investment Department of the Council. Therefore, this request seeks communications between this department and Lewisham Homes Home Ownership Team prior to September 2021. The Commissioner also notes that Council's response to his enquires regarding this request would appear to focus on information that would be held for the purposes of the newsletter rather than any correspondence between these two parties.
65. Nevertheless, the Commissioner is satisfied that given the searches that have been conducted of the shared drive used by the Stock Investment and Asset Management Team (SIAM)/Major works department for other parts of this request, with the broad search terms including Dacres Road, Ashleigh Crescent, if information relevant to this part of request was held it also would have been located as part of such searches.
66. On the balance of probabilities the Commissioner is therefore satisfied that the Council does not hold any further information falling within the scope of this question.

Question 16

67. In respect of question 16 the complainant submitted the following:

"16/ What correspondence regarding front entrance doors to individual flats were sent to the previous leaseholders of [address redacted], Dacres Estate prior to 21st September 2021? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

The Compliance Team have confirmed that they are not aware of any correspondence regarding front entrance doors to individual flats was sent to the leaseholder at [address redacted] Please see attached email.

NOT (QUITE) SATISFIED: does not answer the question - the answer provided in the email by XX states 'at' this time. I asked for correspondence 'prior' to this date, not 'around' this date. This was determine if any correspondence had been sent to the previous leaseholders/sellers about the front entrance door that they had not passed on to me during the conveyancing process."

68. The Commissioner sought the Council's views on the complainant's position that the information provided did not answer the question set.

69. The Council explained that it could not locate any information about the front entrance door being sent to the leaseholder of the address in question prior to 21 September 2021. In respect of the searches undertaken, the Council explained that the following had been examined:

- Former Housing management system action notes relating to this.
- Shared Home Ownership Team drives.
- Home Ownership staff Personal drives and archives (on laptops).
- Home ownership team generic inbox and archives.
- Excel spreadsheets used for mail merging letters to leaseholders about front entrance doors.
- Previous Fire risk Assessments relating to Ashleigh Point to establish if there were any Fire Risk Actions relating to this property that would prompt the need for a letter to be sent to the individual dwelling.

70. In view of these searches, which have not located any further recorded information, and which again the Commissioner considers to be focused and specific, he is satisfied that on the balance of probabilities the Council does hold any further information falling within the scope of this question.

Follow up queries 1 and 3

71. The complainant explained to the Commissioner that they were also dissatisfied with the Council's responses to the first and third of the follow up queries set out in their email of 11 January 2024.

72. The complainant's concerns in respect of the first query were as follows:

""1/ I asked about when Symphony were contacted due to documents received by residents as part of the consultation process, which included 'Customer Sketches' dated 14th September 2021 (on page 7 of attached). This is much earlier than information I'd previously received and well before November 2022 as stated below. The answer provided also did not answer my question of when they were contacted about 'customer sketches' - the answer below states the date when they were contacted about 'surveys'. Please can this information be reviewed and an accurate answer to my question be provided.

The Team is unable to confirm who contacted Symphony Windows and when even though they produced a brochure with sketches in September 2021. We can confirm that the order was raised for surveys to be carried out on 30th October 2021.

We attach a copy of the windows and sketches which were approved, manufactured and currently being installed at Dacres road.

NOT SATISFIED: has not answered the question. I also asked for information on when they were contacted not who contacted them (although that could be relevant)."

73. For the reasons set out above in respect of questions 8 and 9, the Commissioner considers that on the balance of probabilities the Council does not hold any further information relating to communications with Symphony regarding the windows.

74. The complainant's concerns in respect of the third query were as follows:

"3/ Looking at the email trails, I expected answers to my questions to be based on emails and documents from the time being asked about, but instead answers are based on staff's memory from the events at the time. As you can imagine, this does not provide me with much confidence that the information given is accurate especially given the inaccuracy of information given about contact with Symphony. Could supporting evidence (documents or emails) be provided to support the information given?"

Your comments are noted however, the responses received are from the different teams who provided responses to the request for information. Where there is supporting documents they were previously sent.

NOT SATISFIED: there's no reason why supporting documents should not be available to support their answers to my questions. The only documents received were recent email trails of internal responses to my FOI requests, a list of notices and a list of addresses on the estate."

75. The Commissioner appreciates the complainant's point regarding the provision of recorded information. However, for the reasons discussed in relation to each individual question of the request, the Commissioner is satisfied that on the balance of probabilities the Council has located and disclosed all recorded information it holds falling within the scope of this request.

Right of appeal

76. Either party has the right to appeal against this decision notice to the First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights). Information about the appeals process may be obtained from:

First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights)
GRC & GRP Tribunals,
PO Box 9300,
LEICESTER,
LE1 8DJ

Tel: 0203 936 8963

Fax: 0870 739 5836

Email: grc@justice.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

77. If you wish to appeal against a decision notice, you can obtain information on how to appeal along with the relevant forms from the Information Tribunal website.
78. Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 (calendar) days of the date on which this decision notice is sent.

Jonathan Slee
Senior Case Officer
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

Annex

Copy of request submitted on 29 November 2023:

"I would like to make a Freedom of Information Request with respect to information held by Lewisham Homes and Lewisham Council with respect to major works at Dacres Estate. Please can the following questions be answered at your earliest opportunity:

1/ When were the last major works undertaken on flats (both leasehold and council tenant) at Dacres Estate (excluding works to council tenants kitchens and bathrooms in 2022 and 2023)?

2/ In what year was the outside of the Ashleigh Point building and other buildings on Dacres Estate last decorated?

3/ In what year were any internal communal parts last decorated in Ashleigh Point building and other buildings on Dacres Estate?

4/ What previous Notices in relation to Long Term Agreements have been sent to leaseholders on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point) in the last 20 years?

5/ On what date (or dates) was a decision made to carry out surveys on blocks on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point) in relation to major works under the Long Term Agreement LTA01310?

6/ On what dates were surveys performed on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point) to determine if major works were required under the Long Term Agreement LTA01310?

7/ What were the outcomes of the surveys performed on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point) to determine if major works were required under the Long Term Agreement LTA01310?

8/ On what date was Symphony (Address: Unit 14 Salamanca Road, Tharston Industrial Estate, Long Stratton, Norfolk, NR15 2PF) first contacted to provide customer sketches for the replacement of windows at Ashleigh Point and other Dacres Estate blocks and by whom within Lewisham Homes (job number 278, job reference SYM16556)?

9/ Please provide copies of any communications with Symphony in relation to providing sketches for the replacement of windows at Ashleigh Point and other Dacres Estate blocks (job number 278, job reference SYM16556)

10/ When did work start on the DACRES ROAD DEVELOPMENT UPDATE SEPTEMBER 2021 NEWSLETTER by the New Initiatives Team? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

11/ At what point did team members from the New Initiatives Team who developed the DACRES ROAD DEVELOPMENT UPDATE SEPTEMBER 2021 NEWSLETTER issue of the newsletter become aware of the plans for 'new roofs and windows, external redecorations and brickwork repairs' on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point)? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

12/ Who had received the DACRES ROAD DEVELOPMENT UPDATE SEPTEMBER 2021 NEWSLETTER issue of the newsletter? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

13/ Was the DACRES ROAD DEVELOPMENT UPDATE SEPTEMBER 2021 NEWSLETTER issue of the newsletter posted to individual properties on Dacres Estate (including Ashleigh Point)? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

14/ Which department was/is responsible for decisions regarding major works within Lewisham Homes/Council?

15/ What communications did this department have with the Lewisham Homes Home Ownership Team prior to 21st September 2021? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this.

16/ What correspondence regarding front entrance doors to individual flats were sent to the previous leaseholders of [address redacted] Dacres Estate prior to 21st September 2021? Please provide documents or communications to evidence this."

Queries submitted on 11 January 2024

"1/ I asked about when Symphony were contacted due to documents received by residents as part of the consultation process, which included 'Customer Sketches' dated 14th September 2021 (on page 7 of attached). This is much earlier than information I'd previously received and well before November 2022 as stated below. The answer provided also did not answer my question of when they were contacted about 'customer sketches' - the answer below states the date when they were contacted about 'surveys'. Please can this information be reviewed and an accurate answer to my question be provided.

2/ Is there no record of major works that have been done on these flats previously at all? This is surprising to hear. Why do they have no information? Where would this information usually be kept? Will the new searches this year be able to provide this information?

3/ Looking at the email trails, I expected answers to my questions to be based on emails and documents from the time being asked about, but instead answers are based on staff's memory from the events at the time. As you can imagine, this does not provide me with much confidence that the information given is accurate especially given the inaccuracy of information given about contact with Symphony. Could supporting evidence (documents or emails) be provided to support the information given?"