

**London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham**

Housing and Regeneration

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Extension, King Street, London W6 9JU

Tel: 020 8753 4228

Email: [westken@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:westken@lbhf.gov.uk)

Web: [www.lbhf.gov.uk](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk)



Date: 21<sup>st</sup> August 2012

Jonathon Rosenberg  
West Ken & Gibbs Green Community Homes Ltd,  
105 Gibbs Green,  
London,  
W14 9NE

Dear Mr Rosenberg,

**RE : West Kensington & Gibbs Green Estates**

Thank you for your letter of 27 July 2012 and the attached report.

The consultation responses have now been rechecked by officers, and some minor discrepancies have been corrected. Save as to this, the Council maintains its position as set out in earlier correspondence on this issue, and in particular considers that it has conducted a proper analysis of the consultation responses.

I briefly address the issues raised in Ms Kuklowsky's report below, adopting the numbering in her report.

(1) Totals

Ms Kuklowsky has incorrectly stated the Council's figure for wider area support. The figure she gives is 597. The figure as reported to Cabinet at its meeting on 23 April 2012 was in fact 448 (see table 3 of Appendix 5 to the relevant Cabinet report). Thus, the comparison has been undertaken on an incorrect basis.

Further, even as regards her figures, it appears that Ms Kuklowsky has neglected to add together the total number of consultation responses in the two binders of wider area support to which she refers. One bundle contains 329 consultation responses (which is very close to Ms Kuklowsky's figure of 331 / 297). However, the other bundle - which contains 104 consultation responses - appears to have been overlooked.

(2) Duplicates

There was a small number of duplicate consultation responses. These were however identified and removed in the rechecking to which I have already referred.

### (3) Miscategorisation

The rechecking revealed that a small number of consultation responses had been miscategorised. These have now been correctly categorised.

### (4) Censored information

Some of the duplicates to which I referred above under (2) had also been redacted. This issue has now been resolved.

Officers have not used redaction as a means of miscategorising consultation responses.

### (5) Data Protection

The Council would like to thank Ms Kuklowsky for pointing out the instances where personal details had not been redacted. The consultees in question will receive an apology.

### (6) Multiple sets of responses and binders

I can confirm that Ms Kuklowsky was given access to all the consultation responses.

### (7) Notable changes since previous inspections

One consultation response was changed (in that information was redacted) during the inspection process. No other changes were made.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MBA', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Melbourne Barrett  
Executive Director for Housing and Regeneration