

IN THE MATTER OF
THE GRENFELL TOWER PUBLIC INQUIRY

SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF CARL SPENCER STOKES
ON BEHALF OF
CS STOKES & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

I, Carl Spencer Stokes, will say as follows:

- 1 I am the sole director of CS Stokes & Associates Limited (“CS Stokes”), the corporate entity by which I have until recently carried out business as a Fire Risk Assessor. As such, my references to “I”, “me”, “my”, “myself” and “mine” in this Witness Statement are references to CS Stokes and should be read accordingly, unless specifically stated, or unless the context so implies.
- 2 I have made this witness statement to the best of my recollection, as prompted by those documents which I have reviewed, and by my visit to Grenfell Tower (“Tower”) on 17 September 2018.

Request for a Statement

- 3 CS Stokes has fully co-operated with the GTI to-date, and has already provided assorted statements and submissions.
- 4 Of particular relevance for present purposes is a detailed witness statement dated 28 September 2018, which was prepared for the GTI pursuant to a request from the Solicitor to the GTI dated 5 June 2018 (“First Statement”).
- 5 In that First Statement, I spoke to the broad subject areas to which I was directed, and in so doing, I provided an account of my involvement with the Tower.
- 6 On 21 November 2019, I received a request for a supplementary witness statement from the GTI, which asked me to clarify various matters arising out of my First Statement (“Request”). An extension of time was granted until 28 February 2020, conditional

upon CS Stokes also responding to a supplemental request containing additional questions, which was received on 5 February 2020 (“**Supplemental Request**”). Subsequently a further extension of time was granted until 13 March 2020.

Copies of the Request and the Supplemental Request are provided at **CSS2/1 (CST00030171)** and **CSS2/2 (CST00030178)** respectively for reference.

- 7 This “**Second Statement**” is provided in response to the Request and the Supplemental Request.
- 8 Save as clarified or expanded below in this Second Statement, CS Stokes maintains and repeats the contents of its First Statement, and all other submissions it has made to the GTI to-date.

Approach to this Statement

- 9 The Request contains 60 subdivided questions under various headings. The Supplemental Request contains 4 additional questions, the first of which is subdivided. Some questions are standalone, and others operate together to explore a particular theme or topic.
- 10 For the purposes of clarity, this Second Statement is subdivided using comparable headings to those used in the Request. Under those headings, I have then sought to answer the questions posed by the GTI, on some occasions individually, and on other occasions collectively, where I hope it will be more helpful to do so. Certain sections are sub-divided further (i.e. beyond the divisions in the Request) for greater clarity.
- 11 The questions posed in the Supplemental Request relate to the training I received, and qualifications I held, at the time I carried out fire risk assessments (“**FRAs**”) at the Tower. As such, I respond to these questions under the “*Qualification and Training*” section below, whilst dealing with the related questions posed in the Request.

- 12 At the start of each section – or sub-section – I set out the questions posed in the Request or Supplemental Request to which that section relates: designated ‘*Question X*’ or ‘*Supplemental Question X*’ accordingly.
- 13 When referencing documents in this Second Statement:
- i. If a document is already accessible on Relativity, the Relativity reference is simply given within brackets (*i.e.* **CSTXXXXXXXX**); and
 - ii. If a document is not currently accessible on Relativity, the document is referenced as follows: **CSS2/X (CSTXXXXXXXX)**, and a copy of that documents is exhibited with this Second Statement. Where the later “CST...” reference is blank (*i.e.* **CST**), this is because CS Stokes is not currently aware of the Relativity reference which has been assigned to that document.

A – QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING

- 14 In this section I respond to *Questions 1 – 6* and *Supplemental Questions 1 – 4*.

Question 1 – Fire risk assessment (“FRA”) Certificate

- 15 The certificate referred to in paragraph 11 of my First Statement is exhibited at **CSS2/3 (CST00030166)**.
- 16 The course, as per the certificate, was titled “*Fire Risk Assessment: Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005*”.

Supplemental Questions 1a-d, 3, and 4 – Evidence of qualifications

- 17 Please see attached at Appendix 1 an index of my qualifications. The documents referred to are exhibited with this Second Statement as **CSS2/4 (CST00030150) – CSS2/17 (CST**).
- 18 Included within Appendix 1 is **CSS2/4 (CST00030150)**, a certificate confirming my admission, as an Associate, to the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators on 25 September

2009. I retain my membership with the Institute today. I exhibit at **CSS2/18 (CST)** a receipt of my latest membership payment.

19 In respect of the other post-nominals referenced in my FRAs, again please see the certificates I have been able to locate, which are referenced in Appendix 1.

20 Over the years I have amassed a significant quantity of material relevant – in varying degrees - to the carrying out of FRAs:

- i. Much of this is publicly available reference material such as copies of relevant legislation and guidance, the majority of which is not directly relevant to the Tower;
- ii. In terms of the courses I attended, some of these took place some considerable time ago, including some whilst I was still part of the Fire Service;
- iii. Where I have located certificates or other documents attesting to attendance at courses, these are included within Appendix 1.
- iv. I also have located various folders containing course materials from assorted courses I attended. As this material is voluminous and in hard copy, it has not been provided with this Statement. If however the GTI wish to inspect any of these folders, it is welcome to do so.

It may however be easier for the GTI to approach the various course facilitators directly, who may in turn be able to provide electronic copies of relevant material, and/or summaries, syllabuses, etc..

21 Mindful of the questions asked, and the post-nominals used in my FRAs and CVs (**SAL00000009** and **CST00001895**), I set out some specific comments below:

a) *FPA Dip FP (Europe)*

This is the Fire Protection Association (“FPA”) Diploma, the certificate for which is exhibited at **CSS2/5 (CST)**.

b) Fire Eng (FPA)

This designation refers to the various ‘NOS’ courses I took, the certificates for which are appended at Appendix 1 as **CSS2/6 (CST00030154) - CSS2/12 (CST00030143)**.

c) NEBOSH

Certificates in relation to NEBOSH (‘Level 3 Certificate in Occupational Health and Safety’) and IOSH (‘Managing Safely Course’) are provided at **CSS2/13 (CST00030176)** and **CSS2/14 (CST00030167)** respectively.

d) FIA BS 5839 Part 1 System Designer

As attested to by the certificate exhibited at **CSS2/15 (CST00030172)**, I attended and passed a course titled “*BS 5839 Part 1 -2002: Unit 1 – Fire Detection Design*”, which related to fire alarm systems.

e) BS 5839 Part 6

As attested to by the certificate exhibited at **CSS2/16 (CST00030159)**, I attended and passed a course titled “*BS 5839 Part 6 - 2004: Unit 11 – Domestic Dwellings*”, which related to smoke alarm installations in domestic dwellings.

f) Competent Engineer BS 5266

As attested to by the certificate exhibited at **CSS2/17 (CST** , I attended and passed a course titled “*BS 5266 Parts 1 (2005), 7 (1999) and 8 (2004) ICEL Competent Engineer Course*”, which related in part to the layout and positioning of emergency lighting.

g) IFE Assessor / Auditor (FSO)

I included this designation pursuant to my understanding that this was the case having undertaken the course referenced at paragraphs 15 and 16 above. I refer

in particular to the text included at the bottom of my fire risk assessment certificate CSS2/3 (CST00030166) which reads:

“An IFE Approved Course is any course that has been assessed by the Institution of Fire Engineers as not equivalent to the Institutions’ Examinations, in whole or part, but which is of a standard and quality that is worthy of association with the Institution” [emphasis added].

I have since been informed by the IFE that in order to use this designation, I should have paid membership and gone through the process of being added to the IFE register.

Supplemental Questions 1e-1g

- 22 Whilst a member of the Fire Service, you are required to undertake continual development and training. I do not have a record of the same, nor can I now recall precisely how that training was delivered, but it would have been to the standard required by the relevant Fire and Rescue Service I was working for at the time for the roles I was undertaking.
- 23 It may be that, if the GTI were to make enquiries of the brigades for whom I previously worked, they would be able to retrieve historic training records. Given that I left the Fire Service more than a decade ago, however, I suspect this is unlikely. Should the GTI wish to make such requests, I am happy for it to do so, and agree to this paragraph standing as my consent to any such enquiries being made.
- 24 The roles of Enforcement Officer, Audit Officer, Building Control Liaison Officer (“BCLO”) and Technical Fire Safety Officer were specific job titles and separate roles, not one, which I held within Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service. Apart from the BCLO role, these were akin to what some other brigades refer to as a ‘Fire Safety Officer’. I will have undertaken specific training in order to be appointed to different roles referenced above and it would have been to the standard required by the relevant Fire and Rescue Service I was working for at the time for the roles I was undertaking.

Questions 2 & 3 and Supplemental Question 2 - Training

25 The training and continuing professional development I have undertaken since 2007 includes:

- i. Attending various events and training sessions run by recognised fire industry bodies such as the Fire Industry Association;
- ii. Subscribing to various update services such as the IFSEC Global fire briefs in order to keep up-to-date with trends and key topics in the fire industry;
- iii. Attending formal CPD designated training 2 or 3 times a year provided by the CPD Certification Service: construction industry courses. These training courses were usually 1 day events consisting of various presentations on different current topics of interest in the construction industry;
- iv. Attending FireEx international events to gain knowledge of key industry products. I cannot now recall what specific products were discussed at these events, however the products will have related to various aspects of construction;
- v. Attending annual fire lectures given by the Worshipful Company of Firefighters. One of these lectures was titled "*The Fire Lecture 2014: High Rise – Not High Risk*" and included certain aspects of firefighting in high rise buildings, as well as many firefighting related matters. I exhibit at CSS2/19 (CST00030142) a copy of the programme and my notes which record:

"Timber Frame

is stay put appropriate?

FRA must be building specific

Breaching of compartments during refurbishment work.

FRA's need to be better"

I appreciate that the notes are not particularly fulsome. I cannot recall what else was discussed, however the Worshipful Company of Firefighters and/or the speakers listed in the agenda may be able to assist if the GTI make enquiries;

- vi. Attending assorted training provided by CS Todd & Associates Limited in relation to various matters concerning to the carrying out of FRAs. In particular I recall attending a talk on the then new LGA Fire Safety in Purpose Built Blocks of Flats Guide 2012 (“**LGA Guide**” - **RBK00026109**), for which I have a document hand out containing the slides presented at that talk: this is exhibited at **CSS2/20 (CST00030160)**; and
- vii. Attending training on specific fire measures such as fire alarms and emergency lighting, design and installation.

26 I did not keep a CPD log or other written record, but have retained various certificates / documents which attest to my attendance at various CPD events / training – where retained these are contained in **Appendix 1**. Further to my comments at paragraph 23 above, I am happy for this paragraph to stand as my consent to the GTI approaching any of the bodies which provided training referred to in Appendix 1, or which are specifically mentioned in paragraph 23 above (e.g. CPD Certification Service, FPA etc.), to request any records that they may retain, of training which I attended.

27 In addition to the above, in 2007/2008, I contributed to the LACoRS (now, Local Government Regulation) Housing Fire Safety Guidance (**CST00002330**), on behalf of Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service for whom I worked at the time (see paragraph 9 of my First Statement). Exhibited at **CSS2/21 (CST**) is a copy of an email which I was copied into thanking the contributors.¹ I also took part in the consultation process for the LGA Guide , and attach a copy of my consultation response at **CSS2/22 (CST**).

¹ If one looks at pg. 76 of the LACoRS Guide it can be seen that Oxford Fire and Rescue Authority is listed as one of the contributors.

Questions 4 – 6 – Training of ESAs

- 28 As can be seen from the email exhibited at **CSS2/23 (CST00030149)**, I was asked in October 2016 to provide training to the Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation’s (“KCTMO”) Estates Services Assistants (“ESAs”) on fire safety. As can be seen from those emails, Janice Wray of the KCTMO produced the majority of the content for the training, including the slides, a copy of which are provided at **CSS2/24 (CST00030177)**.
- 29 I have been specifically asked about **CST00001854**, which is an agenda for the ESA training. This document was prepared by Ms Wray and I simply provided some photos by email dated 29 November 2016 (17:07) – see Enclosure **CSS2/25 (CST00030138)** to illustrate certain matters Ms Wray wished to consider.
- 30 This training was given on 2 December 2016 by myself and Ms Wray. At that training I spoke from the agenda prepared by Ms Wray. I do not recall making notes ahead of the training, and if I did these would have been by hand – for example on a printed copy of the agenda – and any such notes are no longer in my possession. As can be seen from my invoice dated 5 January 2017 – exhibited at **CSS2/26 (CST** **)**, I charged £285.00 plus VAT for this training.
- 31 I was generally willing to speak to ESAs should they wish to ask my opinion on a particular matter, if I happened to be present at a KCTMO property. This was however rare, and I do not specifically recall an occasion when it happened.
- 32 I gave a further pre-arranged presentation to the ESAs and some KCTMO housing officers (I believe on 27 July 2017). The content was similar to the training delivered on 2 December 2016.
- 33 I cannot recall whether I was asked about the frequency of checks the ESAs should undertake. Had I been asked by the KCTMO, I would have referred them to the timescales set out in section 23 of the relevant FRA – see for example June 2016 FRA (**CST00000100**).

B – EARLY INVOLVEMENT WITH TOWER

34 In this section I respond to *Questions 7 – 11*.

Questions 7 and 8 - Visit to the Tower in 2009

35 Any information I was provided with would have come from either:

- i. Salvus Consulting Limited (“**Salvus**”) – to the extent that it was already in its possession when I began undertaking FRAs for the KCTMO as CS Stokes; or
- ii. Persons from the KCTMO, once I begun undertaking FRAs for the KCTMO as CS Stokes.

I cannot now recall specifically what information I was provided with or by whom.

36 Documents *CST00003121* and *CST00003124* – which are inventories of assorted features of the KCTMO housing stock – were provided to me by Keith Fifield of the KCTMO. Once CS Stokes had been awarded the contract for FRAs – see paragraphs 23 of my First Statement – these documents were useful to me as they provided an overview of the KCTMO’s housing portfolio. When attending a new building to carry out a FRA, rather than starting entirely from scratch, these documents gave me an indication of some of the features which would be present at any such property.

Question 9 - Tender

37 As far as I recall, the KCTMO’s invitation to tender was accessible by a link sent to me on an email from Peter Tozer of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (“**RBKC**”) dated 3 May 2011 (14:43) – see *CST00002296*. The link no longer appears to work.

38 CS Stokes’ tender application has already been provided to the GTI, titled “*Quotation Form*” – *CST00002368*, and was provided along with no more formal tender.

Questions 10 and 11 – Contract with KCTMO

- 39 The terminology ‘new FRA’ and ‘FRA review’ is KCTMO wording: a ‘new FRA’ referring to the first FRA I carried out at a particular building, and a ‘FRA review’ being any subsequent review of the same property.
- 40 There was no difference between the information gathering and assessment process for a ‘new FRA’ and a ‘FRA review’. The difference – and hence the lower price for a ‘FRA review’ – is that I did not have to locate the building and do the primary work to establish the layout etc.
- 41 For a ‘FRA review’ I would at the very least be able to review my previous FRA for the property in question which would give me an indication of what I would need to look for. With a new property there is an initial scoping element which was not required for a ‘FRA review’.
- 42 Each year the prices charged by CS Stokes increased slightly. By 2016, CS Stokes was charging £440 plus VAT for a ‘new FRA’ and £410 plus VAT for a ‘FRA review’.

C – FIRE RISK ASSESSMENTS OF GRENFELL TOWER: GENERAL

43 In this section I respond to *Questions 12 – 14*.

Question 12 – PAS 79

44 In respect of the version of PAS 79 I would have referred to, at any given time it would have either been the 2nd Edition (June 2007) or the 3rd Edition (August 2012), as applicable.

Questions 13 and 14 – FRAs

45 The December 2010, November 2012, October 2014, April 2016 and June 2016 FRAs undertaken by CS Stokes – Relativity references for which can be found at paragraph 31 of the First Statement – were FRA reviews. These FRAs were ‘fresh’ FRAs but costed as ‘FRA reviews’ as I had already attended the Tower previously.

46 The use of the word ‘fresh’ in my First Statement was merely an attempt to distinguish the FRAs undertaken from reviews undertaken in-house by the KCTMO. To the best of my recollection, I was not provided with copies of any reviews undertaken by the KCTMO.

47 On each occasion where I conducted a FRA review at the Tower, I would have made notes on a copy of the previous FRA.

48 Unfortunately, I do not have a copy of such notes for each FRA I undertook at the Tower, but copies of the significant findings schedule for the 2014 FRA (*CST00000002*) and the April 2016 FRA (*CST00000003*) are the ones I will have used for the April and June 2016 FRAs accordingly.

49 I did not as a matter of course keep handwritten notes once I had completed a FRA. I cannot now recall why I retained *CST00000002* and *CST00000003*, but I do not believe I had any specific intention in retaining a copy on this occasion.

Criticism of FRAs in Phase 2 Openings

50 Some criticism of CS Stokes' FRAs have been made in Phase 2, Module 1 Opening Submissions, principally by Counsel to BSR Team 1. This is despite the fact that, as Counsel to the GTI noted when opening Phase 2, the FRAs are to be considered in Module 3. As such, noting also that the Module 3 evidence (both contemporaneous and expert) has not yet been fully disclosed, I do not provide detailed comment at this time. That said, any criticism is not accepted.

51 I would however pick up on one particular document, which seems to be being used as the 'gateway' for criticism. It is important that the Panel has the proper context for that document in mind.

52 The document in question is a note of a meeting between KCTMO H&S and the LFB dated 5 January 2016 (*LFB00000061*). It has been alleged that this shows I was "*prone to making unjustified statements (BSR Team 1 Phase 2, Module 1 written submissions, paragraph 5.6)*". I would point out that what this note in fact says is:

"Rebecca raised her concern that our Fire Risk Assessor sometimes makes statements which are not justified or supported and that FRA reports need to include justification for statements made" [emphasis added].

The Panel will have to form its own view as to how it should travel from "*concern*" and "*sometimes*" to "*prone*", and the Panel will also want to consider the fact that even if it were the case that there was a lack of express justification in a particular FRA, that does not necessarily mean that the conclusion is itself "*unjustified*".

53 It is also worth noting that the matters giving rise to this concern were:

"In particular, reference to discussion with senior LFB officers must provide names, dates and confirmation of outcome of discussions etc. Also, in relation to Balfour the FRA needs to be reviewed to clearly demonstrate that the impact of the missing doors in front of the hopper head area in the event of a fire has been assessed and documented."

My recollection at the time was that the primary concern was the reference to senior LFB figures, which in any event related to a specific building which was not the Tower. Again it will be for the Panel to decide how it should travel from a specific “concern” to an “*epidemic level of incompetence*”, which it is being invited to do. I do not however accept this criticism

54 Finally, on this point, it should be noted that the comments by Ms Burton – who was new to her post – were not left unchallenged:

“Janice [Wray] agreed to raise these issues with our assessor but did comment that we have frequently provided copies of FRAs to the LFB in recent years and until now these have been well received, considered to be comprehensive and no criticism had been fed back” [emphasis added].

55 It is obviously for the Panel to determine what the KCTMO did or should have done following this discussion, and the importance of Ms Burton’s comments. I raise the above, however, as it would seem to me helpful for the Panel to have the full context: particularly as the Panel has been invited to consider other matters discussed below.

D – DOORS

56 In this section I respond to **Questions 15 – 32**.

Flat Entrance Fire Doors

Questions 15 – 20 – Replacement programme

57 In relation to the door replacement programme undertaken by the KCTMO, CS Stokes had no specific role other than providing advice on the requirements for fire doors set out in relevant guidance. This advice was provided in the abstract. I did not advise on the acquiring of a procurement company, the procurement process, the selection of Manse Masterdor or any tender bids submitted.

58 Along with my letter of 24 June 2011 – *CST00003149* – I did author the document titled “*Criteria for prioritising the fitting of new entrance doors to flats*” – *CST00001156* – at the request of Ms Wray. Again this was provided to assist the KCTMO navigate its way through the door replacement process (see also *CST00000006*). I am not aware of how this document was used, and if I was ever aware, I cannot now recall. Other than those documents referred to above, I do not recall providing further specific advice on new entrance doors, but will have discussed the contents of those letters with Ms Wray.

59 I was asked to comment on certain Manse Masterdor (“**Masterdor**”) literature – see *CST00002306* and *CST00002070* (referenced in paragraph 88 of my First Statement) and *CST00000116* – which I believe I downloaded as a pdf.s from Masterdor’s website. My review of this material was desktop in nature only and I was really only checking that the doors were available as 30 minute fire doors, which were required, as I had informed the KCTMO.

60 It was London Housing Company (“**LHC**”) which was tasked to inspect the actual doors installed and provide third party accreditation for them.

- 61 In respect of my attendance on site on 11 May 2011, to observe LHC's inspection of the door installed by Masterdor at Flat 16, I have little to add to my comments at paragraph 89 of my First Statement and the documents referred to therein. I understood that I was asked to attend by the KCTMO to observe a single sample door being installed. Although therefore I observed the installation of this door on this one occasion, the purpose of my presence was to ensure that LHC's inspection process for all other doors in the building that were to be changed by Masterdor (the installation of which I would not witness) was sufficient for me and/or KCTMO to rely on when addressing this issue in an FRA.
- 62 I cannot precisely recall the instructions I was given, but I would have attended to ensure that, from a fire risk assessment perspective, the sample door installation was being inspected by LHC in such a way that ensured the doors to be fitted by Masterdor in the rest of the building did not compromise compartmentation and that LHC were aware of that issue. For example, I would have been concerned that LHC were aware of the importance of there being no gaps around the frame and structure which might subsequently be covered over by an architrave, and the correct fitting of door furniture and the self closing mechanism.
- 63 As set out in my First Statement, I raised a question following that inspection concerning the form of the report, further to which additional information was added. In this regard I refer to the letter which I sent to Ms Wray following my attendance at the Tower dated 23 May 2011 – *CST00001654*. I also sent a further letter on 24 June 2011 – *CST00003149*.
- 64 Thereafter, LHC inspected the rest of Masterdor's installations. After my initial comments, I had no further involvement.
- 65 At no point was I instructed to check the integrity of the doors individually, nor was I required to formally audit or in any other way check the inspections undertaken by LHC.

66 Having observed the first door to be installed correctly, and knowing that LHC also inspected Masterdor's further installations, I understood as a starting point, when conducting FRAs at the Tower, that all the replaced doors were Building Regulations compliant. What I was therefore looking for when carrying out a FRA after May 2011, was whether there was any presenting issue with a replaced door which gave me cause to deviate from that understanding.

Question 21 - Self-closers

67 Any such comments would most likely be found within CS Stokes' FRAs, which were provided with my First Statement – see paragraph 31 of my First Statement.

68 At Appendix 2 to this Second Statement, I list the occasions where I raised concerns about self-closers which a review of documents available to me has shown. There may be other occasions but I am not currently aware of them.

Question 22 – Observations on doors when completing FRAs

69 When I attended the Tower to carry out FRAs, there was no target number of doors to inspect, neither is such a target prescribed in the guidance. See page 43 of the LGA Guide, which refers to it being necessary to “*examine at least a sample of flat entrance doors*”.

70 As set out in paragraphs 57 – 59 of my First Statement, the checks carried out were more *ad hoc* in nature. In relation to the Tower, I knew that the vast majority of flat front doors had been installed in the manner discussed at paragraphs 57 – 66 above. However, if, on occasion when undertaking a FRA I had not been able to satisfy myself that I had examined a proper sample of flat doors, I would have said so in the relevant FRA.

71 Any issues I encountered would have been, and were, identified in CS Stokes' FRAs. I did not undertake, and there was no need to carry out, separate reporting. Any door inspections were part of the FRA process, unless I was specifically asked to attend a property to address an issue relating to doors, separately to the carrying out of FRAs.

72 Document *CST00002861* was a standard letter posted to residents in 2010, the year in which I began undertaking FRAs for the KCTMO as CS Stokes. This letter refers to me knocking on doors during FRA inspections, not to the KCTMO arranging certain inspections in advance. As far as I can recall, this was the only year such a letter was distributed. At no point was I aware of any prior arrangements or appointments being made neither would I expect them to have been made.

73 However, every time I attended a KCTMO property to undertake a FRA, I would knock on doors in an attempt to gain access, where possible, so as to inspect a sample of the doors from the inside, and to check self closing devices were present. I would also be looking to see that the inner face of the door was not damaged and that there were no other obvious deficiencies: this would include checking the fitting of any cold smoke seals, if fitted, to see that they were not damaged or missing.

Questions 23 and 28 – Original doors

Note: In the first instance, please note that the matters identified in Question 28 (vis-à-vis paragraph 87 (iv) of my First Statement) refer to original flat entrance doors and not (as per 'Question 27') the lift-lobby doors.

74 I did confirm to Ms Wray that the original flat entrance doors were nominally fire rated on the basis of the matters set out in an email dated 3 February 2016 (10:33) from Ms Wray to the KCTMO repairs team exhibited at **CSS2/27 (CST00030151)**. This email sets out the following:

“The definition of a Notional (fire) door is:

- 1. It fits well into the door frame;*
- 2. It is not damaged, there are no holes in the door, locks removed etc. door cracked;*
- 3. It is a timber door, which is solidly constructed;*
- 4. Any glass in the door is Georgian wired glass;*

Dated: 13 March 2020

5. *The letter box, if fitted, is in the lower half of the door and is not damaged, the letter box flap is in place etc., the letter box is preferably metal;*
6. *The width of the door is 44mm;*
7. *The door stops are 1 inch thick;*
8. *Hinges not damaged, screws missing or centre pin coming out;*
9. *The door frame is well fixed to the surrounding wall, both internally and externally, with no gaps between the door frame and the wall; and*
10. *Any other items fitted to the door are in place, the spy hole is in the door, there is not a hole through the door, the same for any door knockers etc..*

A certified 30 minute fire rated door will be marked as such on the head of the door, if it is an older door it may have a TRADA mark on it, bulls eye etc."

75 This is in line with paragraphs 62.17 and 62.18 of the LGA Guide which reads:

"62.17 It will not be practicable to test existing doors to confirm their actual fire resistance. Therefore, three options exist in relation to original fire-resisting doors that do not meet current benchmark standards. These are:

- accept the door as it is, provided it is a good fit in its frame and that it satisfied the standard applicable to fire-resisting doors at the time of construction of the building or manufacture of the door ('notional FD30' door)*

...

62.18 An upgraded FD30S door cannot be guaranteed to achieve the same performance as a replacement FD30S door, for which there will be a fire test certificate. This is to be expected and is reasonable provided that the door has sufficient thickness of timber (eg 44 millimetres). Simply fitting intumescent

Dated: 13 March 2020

strips and smoke seals to a thin door or one with panels will not render it suitably fire-resisting. Specialist advice may need to be sought in order to make an assessment of the likely benefits of upgrading existing fire-resisting doors. Guidance on upgrading fire-resisting doors is also published by the Timber Research and Development Association (TRADA)."

- 76 So far as I am aware, I never saw the Rand Associates survey referred to in the request. From recollection I reached this conclusion when carrying out my own inspection for the 2012 FRA and communicated my findings through the FRA.
- 77 My inspections were visual only and, in any event, I trusted that if RBKC's Building Control department ("**Building Control**") had required the doors to be replaced, it would have specified changes accordingly.

Question 24 – KCTMO fire safety strategy

- 78 On 18 January 2013 (17:03) (*CST00001187*), Ms Wray sent a copy of the draft fire safety policy to me, as well as to Adrian Bowman and Cyril Morris of the KCTMO saying:

"Attached is a very, very rough draft of this and I would be really grateful for your comments. Specifically, what else should I include, are there areas where more detail is required, any other appendices to be included etc. (The last page is a brain dump of other things I maybe should include - what do you think?)"

- 79 In response, I provided a marked up version of the document with my comments in *CST00002046* under cover of an email dated 1 February 2013 (12:37) – *CSS2/28 (CST00030180)*.
- 80 I was then at various points thereafter asked to comment on specific items, including:

Self closing devices

- i. As far as I can recall, the advice I gave in relation to self-closing devices extended to altering the highlighted text shown in *CST00002235* and *CST00002371*, which are referred to in the Request.

Legislation

- ii. On 7 December 2016 (07:03) I was sent an email by Ms Wray of the KCTMO in which she raised questions about the applicable legislation – *CSS2/29 (CST00030156)*. I replied the same day (12:46) with some additional wording – *CSS2/30 (CST00030148)*. This appears to have been included in the 2017 version referenced in the Request (*TMO00832724*).

81 It is possible that I was asked about other aspects of the strategy, but I cannot now recall, nor can I locate any further documents referencing this.

Question 25 – Flat entrance door review

82 I was specifically asked to attend Flat 16 of the Tower, as set out above, to observe the LHC inspection. See paragraph 89 of my First Statement and paragraph 60 onwards above.

83 As identified in paragraph 91 of my First Statement, I was also specifically asked to look at the front door to Flat 45 (as per *CST00001447* and *CST00001448*) independently, it seems, of carrying out a FRA. I cannot however recall precisely why I was asked to inspect this door and cannot recall (although may have been) if I was asked to inspect any other doors and if so with what result. Any concerns I discovered however would have been reported back to the KCTMO.

84 As a general point, if whilst undertaking a FRA I identified a flat door that had been changed, or appeared altered (and to which I could not gain access during my inspection) I would identify that door in the significant findings schedule for that particular FRA.

85 Whilst theoretically I could thereafter receive a specific instruction to go and inspect that door – pursuant to Part 2, Section 1.9 of my contract (see paragraph 24iv of my First Statement) – I do not now have any record of doing this. This may well have been because, as with other issues identified in my FRAs, necessary work was undertaken by the ESA team, or others at the KCTMO, under Ms Wray’s direction. If the flat was a tenanted flat, the KCTMO may undertake the work ‘in house’ as part of its responsibilities as a landlord. In such circumstances I would not be asked to undertake a follow-up visit.

86 In the Significant Findings Schedule to my 2016 FRA, for example, I raised the following issues with the doors to Flats 24 and 112:

12g	High	The flat entrance door of flat 24 is damaged with the letter box missing.	This door should be repaired and a new fire rated letter box fitted, alternatively a new self closing certified 30 minute fire rated door fitted with intumescent strips and cold smoke seals could be installed.
12h	High	The flat entrance door of flat 112 is being replaced, this new door is not marked as a fire rated door and it does not have a self closing device fitted to it. Cold smoke seals are fitted.	The occupier of flat 112 should be asked to confirm that the new flat entrance doors is a certified FD30 door, a self closing device should be fitted to this door.

I was not asked to return to consider the above before the Fire, nor is it within my knowledge as to whether or not these issues were rectified. Having marked these issues as being “High” priority, however, I would have expected them to be rectified swiftly by the KCTMO, or others on the KCTMO’s instruction.

Refurbishment Doors

Question 26 and 29 – Meeting minutes regarding strips and seals


87 Some confusion has arisen here for which I apologise.

88 The point I was trying to make at paragraph 95 of my First Statement is that, having considered and raised a question about strips and seals in relation to the new flat doors (see Item 2.01 in the referred minutes – *CST00003072*: “New front doors require one of the intumescent strips changed to a smoke seal”), I would also have expected

Building Control to raise any concerns they had in relation to the strips and seals (or lack thereof) on other doors within the building. These minutes recorded the matters that Building Control considered necessary to deal with. As there was no requirement in relation to strips and seals on the lift-lobby doors, I understood Building Control did not require such work.

89 A copy of these minutes were sent to me by David Hughes of Rydon on 4 February 2016 (16:17) – *CST00002085*, when I enquired about the lack of seals on the lower lift-lobby doors.

90 As a matter of caution, in my June 2016 FRA, I also noted that written confirmation of this should be sought from Building Control:

12c		Some of the new doors in this building are not fitted with cold smoke seals as required by the Building Regulations. The Building Control Officer has stated that smoke seals should not be fitted to these doors.	If this is the case the Building Control Officer should be asked to put this in writing because if this building is audited by the LFB under the Fire Safety Order then this document will be needed as evidence.
-----	--	--	---

91 On 20 July 2016 (17:02) – *CSS2/31 (CSTXXXXXXXX)* – Ms Wray forwarded me a chain of emails in response to this item of my June 2016 FRA. Included within this chain of emails was an email from Paul Hanson of Building Control dated 5 July 2016 (14:08), in which he confirmed that:

“due to the need for the powered lobby ventilation system to draw inlet air from the stairway, it is recommended that ‘smoke seals’ are not included on the doors between the stairway and lobby to enable the system to operate at full efficiency.”

92 In respect of those staircase doors on Floors 4 and above, these were existing doors. As far as I was aware, neither Building Control nor the LFB required any work to be undertaken to them. I asked questions of the KCTMO and Rydon, who informed me that the doors were not being required to be replaced or upgraded.

Questions 30 – 32

- 93 The request refers to various documents in which I raise questions and asks whether I received confirmation by return.
- 94 My standard practice was not to chase information but to raise it again in a subsequent FRA if it had not been addressed, unless of course CS Stokes was specifically instructed to consider a matter in the interim. Again, this approach was consistent with CS Stokes' contractual terms as discussed at paragraphs 28 – 30 of my First Statement. If, for example, an issue arose with a door that was on a tenanted flat, this might be dealt with by the KCTMO without further reference to me.
- 95 With reference to *Question 32a*, the Request is correct that the letter referred to is **CST00001769**. As to *Question 32b*, I did not request further information on the matters raised but would have checked them when carrying out the April 2016 FRA.

E - LIFTS

96 In this section I respond to *Questions 33 – 38*.

Questions 33 and 34 – Apex file

97 I received an email from Claire Williams of the KCTMO dated 19 September 2014 (10:55), followed up with another email dated 25 September 2014, which provided login access to an Artelia electronic dropbox site – email chain exhibited at **CSS2/32 (CST00030158)**. This is where I believe I will have accessed the Apex Health & Safety File (**CST00000022**).

98 If I did not access the document using this link, I presume the document was emailed to me in passing by someone at the KCTMO. I cannot however find any email providing this document to me so assume it is more likely that it was provided as per paragraph 97 above. I doubt I used this document as part of my fire risk assessment process, and have no recollection of doing so.

99 I did not, so far as I can recall, request further or indeed any, independent information regarding the lifts. This was because:

- i. The lifts were *in situ*, having been installed in 2005, and therefore will have had received Building Control sign-off in 2005 as compliant with the functional requirements of the Building Regulations. This would be so even though they were being installed as lifts in an existing building or classed as being modified (as opposed to being new lifts in new buildings) in 2005;
- ii. In 2010, I had been provided with confirmation that the lifts were firefighting lifts (see paragraphs 111 and 112 below);
- iii. I had a number of inspection certificates for the lifts prior to 2014 and the service log book in the lift motor room;
- iv. I was thus aware that the lifts were being regularly serviced and would therefore have expected those professionals carrying out inspections to raise any issues;

- v. When the lifts were altered during the refurbishment, I would have expected the relevant professionals carrying out the works to ensure that the lifts met the standard required by Building Control. Given that works were then signed off by Building Control, I reasonably assumed this was the case; and
- vi. At all times, and particularly during the refurbishment, I was aware that the LFB regularly visited the Tower, and I would have expected them to identify any issues as part of their s.7(2)(D) inspections.

I discuss this further below.

Questions 35 - 38 – Requirement and functions of a firefighting lift

100 The matters discussed in *Questions 35 – 38* are overlapping, and at times the answer to a later posed question assists in the answering of an earlier question. As such, in order to respond to these questions as clearly as I can, I have sub-divided my answers as follows:

- i. The relevant definitions of a “firefighting lift” – *Question 35(a) and 37*;
- ii. The lifts present in KCTMO buildings – *Question 35(b) and 35(d)*; and
- iii. The impact of the Refurbishment – *Question 35(c), 36 and 38*.

I hope this approach will answer the various question posed in the Request.

Relevant definitions

Question 35(a) and Question 37(a)

101 As set out above, my starting point was that, having been installed in 2005, the lifts would have had to meet the functional requirements of the Building Regulations to be signed off by Building Control.

102 In order to be signed off by Building Control, noting that the Tower was in excess of 18 metres high, and assuming an Approved Document route to compliance was being

used, a firefighting lift would have been required in order to comply with Building Regulation B5.

103 In terms of how that is to be assessed, Approved Document B (2000 Ed.) (“**ADB 2000**”) – the version of ADB in force at the time – did not directly refer to BS EN 81-72:2003 (“**EN81-72**”). As set out by Dr Lane in Appendix L to her Supplemental Report, however, EN 81 is cross referenced in BS5588-5:2004, which is referred to in ADB 2000².

104 At the time of the 2005 work on the lifts, paragraph 3.5 of EN81-72 defines a “firefighters lift” as:

“a lift installed primarily intended for passengers use which has additional protection, controls and signals which enable it to be used under the direct control of the fire service” [emphasis added].

105 By the time of the Refurbishment, an almost identical definition of a “fire-fighting” lift is found in both ADB2 and the LGA Guide:

“A lift, designed to have additional protection, with controls that enable it to be used under the direct control of the fire and rescue service when fighting a fire” [emphasis added].

A similar definition is also provided in BS 9991:2015:

“lift with protection measures, controls and signals that enable it to be used under the direct control of the fire and rescue service in fighting a fire” [emphasis added].

In all of the above definitions, as per my First Statement, the priority remains the Fire Service’s ability to control the lift in or when fighting a fire.

² For completeness, by the time of the Refurbishment, ADB2 specifically refers to BS EN81-72:2003.

106 However, Section 2 “Scope”, paragraph 1.2 of EN81-72 states that it does not apply to:

“...lifts installed in existing buildings’ or

‘...important modifications to existing lift[s] installed before the publication of this standard.”

It goes on to say, at paragraph 1.4:

‘[t]his document is applicable to new firefighters lifts in new buildings which are installed after the date of publication document by CEN [emphasis added]’.

It is not therefore correct to say that the definition in EN81-72 was a definition that the lifts “*had to meet and to which [my] assessments related*” (**Question 35 (a)**). The key would have been compliance with the functional requirements of the Building Regulations in 2005 when they were installed and Building Control approval in that regard.

107 I did, however, have EN81-72 in mind when considering the lifts as part of the FRAs I conducted. As EN81-72 says at the conclusion of 1.2, when considering situations in which it did not apply:

“... this standard may usefully be used as a basis.”

Consequently, I would have expected anyone assessing compliance with the functional requirements of the Building Regulation for a lift being installed in an existing building in 2005 (and/or for the LFB approving such an installation) to take EN81-72 into account when making that assessment. That assessment would also be subject to the constraints/construction of the existing building into which the lift was being installed.

108 This is the approach I would have expected Building Control (and the LFB when consulted on the matter, as I would have expected them to be) to have adopted when considering the lifts for sign off, in accordance with their respective obligations, for the purpose of the 2005 lift works passing the Building Regulations process.

Dated: 13 March 2020

109 This is what I was trying to convey in paragraph 125 of my First Statement by way of the relevance of EN 81.

Question 37(b)

110 I knew that EN81-72 had a requirement for a fire control switch and that the Tower lifts had such a facility – I discuss this further at paragraphs 125 – 128 below.

KCTMO lifts

Questions 35(b) and 35(d)

111 When Salvus carried out FRAs for the KCTMO, its MD, Andrew Furness, exchanged emails with Ms Wray, and said on 3 March 2010 (12:26) – (CST00001269):

“thank you for the information, we will include the following statement in relation to fire fighting lifts based upon the details attached

TMO has confirmed that lifts servicing the block (over 18m in height) meet the requirements for fire fighting lifts as per specification provided by TMO senior lift engineer

A comprehensive servicing and maintenance contract is in place, undertaken by competent engineers in line with current legal and insurance guidelines.

the lifts are included in the local estate inspection programmes

In our para relating to disabled persons the following will be included

During the production of any PEEP TMO will consider the use of the lift for evacuation purposes on a case by case principle

May i suggest that you keep the contents of your email to us on file and arrange to update the information should changes occur in your management of lifts.

Owray

Dated: 13 March 2020

The above, of course, only caters for blocks containing lifts over 18m, can you confirm that the latter 2 paragraphs relating to lifts are applicable to include in blocks under 18 m in height.

we will include these statements for all assessment reports for those blocks visited on or after the 4th March 2010 and suggest that as you work through the Action plan in relation to previous rxx's that you include these statement to indicate closure, thereby showing that TMO is actioning the findings of the pRA's thus complying with the requirements of the Fire safety order"

- 112 The above email comes further to an email from Ms Wray dated 3 March 2010 (10:16) – in the same email chain (**CST00001269**) – in which reference is made to specific criteria concerning the lifts installed in KCTMO blocks over 18 metres in height.
- 113 In response to **Question 35(b)(i)**, I assume that it was the FRA work of Salvus which led to the determining of this criteria. I did not have a role in compiling this information.
- 114 That same criteria are then repeated in the KCTMO's Fire Safety Policy (**TMO00830598**):

"18.2.1 As much of the housing stock is medium-rise and high-rise many of the blocks are served by one or more passenger lifts. Where appropriate "fire fighting lifts" are provided within TMO residential blocks. This is to satisfy the requirement of the Building Regulations which consider the height of the building etc. When lifts are installed they comply with the relevant standards at that time and when they are subsequently replaced the replacement lift is compliant with the standards current at the time of replacement. The criteria for a TMO fire fighting lift is set out below-

- 1. Minimum car size (1100mm wide x 1400mm deep) for 8 persons capacity (630kg).*
- 2. Dedicated power supply servicing lift (3 phase). Additionally, ancillary items such as lift alarm, lighting etc. are also served by their own dedicated power supply.*

3. *2-way communication on new lifts includes connection to Customer Service Centre / out of hours monitoring service when the lift alarm is activated.*
4. *Fireman's Control Switch fitted. When operated this causes the lift to return to ground floor and open to allow the fire fighters access. It stops landing calls being registered and allows the authorised person e.g. LFB operative to take control of the lifts (by applying a constant pressure on any call button).*
5. *Lift car and landing doors are composed of stainless steel that is not less than 16SWG thick and over 2 hours fire resistance.*

Additionally, the TMO

6. *Has a comprehensive servicing and maintenance contract in place for all the lifts. This includes monthly inspections.*
7. *Employs contract managers who are responsible for the supervision and monitoring of the contract / contractors.*
8. *Has the Council's Insurers, [REDACTED] carry out 6-monthly inspections which include a full safety check.*
9. *Neighbourhood Management staff (Estate Services Assistants, porters, inspectors and Estate Services Team Leaders) and Health & Safety staff carry out regular estate inspections which include visual inspection of the lift cards and testing the lift alarm*

*Attached at **Appendix 8** is a comprehensive list of all TMO lifts (firefighting lifts as described above are indicated by bold type)*

115 At Appendix 8 it reads (with text in bold):

Grenfell Tower, W11	Passenger Lift	H090	"A" L/H lift
Grenfell Tower, W11	Passenger Lift	H091	"B" R/H lift

- 116 In conjunction with my understanding that the 2005 lift works would have been signed off by Building Control (and therefore also considered and approved by the LFB – see also *(CST00002922)*, I therefore understood the lifts at the Tower to be ‘firefighting lifts’.
- 117 Further to my comments at paragraph 101 –107107 above, I did not understand the KCTMO criteria for firefighting lifts to “*differ substantially [from] EN81*” (*Question 35 (b) (ii)*). Rather, I considered it to be reflective of the fact that, as envisaged by EN81-72 itself and discussed above, in an existing building like the Tower, it would likely not be possible to install a lift which fully complied with the requirements in EN81-72. Importantly, neither did EN81-72 require such a lift to do so.
- 118 I therefore did not regard there to be any confusion to be present in this regard (*Question 35 (b) (iii)*) and took steps to observe there was no emergency trap door in the roof of the lift cars (referred to in my FRAs as a ‘roof hatch’) as to which see below.

Impact of the Refurbishment

Questions 35(c) and 36

- 119 During the Refurbishment, alterations were made to the lifts including shaft openings being made to the lower floors of the building, along with necessary alterations to the lift controls. In respect of those works, I understood the following:
- i. As with the original 2005 installed lifts, various professionals were involved in the works on the lifts, and those works were again subject to Building Control sign off and consideration by the LFB as part of the Building Regulations process;
 - ii. The LFB attended the Tower on various occasions, for example to carry out s.7(2)(d) visits, and at no point raised any concerns;
 - iii. The LFB were also given instruction on how to use the lifts – see for example my letter to Ms Williams dated 18 March 2014 (*CST00001093*). At no point was I made aware that the LFB had any concerns about the lifts;

- iv. At all times the lifts were serviced and at no point did the maintenance company raise any concerns about the lifts;
 - v. Save with respect of the lack of emergency trap door³, which I raised in my FRAs from 2012 onwards (see reference to the absence of a “roof hatch” for example in the 2016 FRA: section 19 (*CST00000100*)), there was nothing obviously presenting when I carried out my FRAs which caused me to reconsider whether the lifts were compliant fire-fighting lifts.
- 120 In light of the above, when asked by Ms Williams in March 2014 (see *CST00001426*) if the lifts were ‘firefighting lifts’, I had no reason not to confirm that this was the case.
- 121 I have also been referred to *CST00002920*, which is an email dated 6 June 2012 from Ms Wray to the LFB. In this email Ms Wray states: “[w]hilst it is acknowledged that our lifts do not fully satisfy all of the criteria for firefighting lifts we can confirm that they meet the followings...”, followed by a list of the same criteria discussed at paragraph 111 above. I believe this email refers (paragraph 3) back to an email of 8 July 2010 (*CST00002922*). For completeness, the email attaches a spreadsheet of documents which lists the KCTMO properties which have lifts which meet these criteria (*CST00002923*). This list includes the lifts at the Tower.
- 122 Of note, in *CST00002920*, the example raised of a missing feature is the lack of an emergency trap door, which is the same feature which I raised in relation to the Tower in my FRAs – see paragraph 117v above.
- 123 The opening submissions for Phase 2, Module 1 (BSR Team 1, Written Submissions, paragraph 5.6(1)) say that I was told by Max Fordham that it seemed not to be the case that the lifts were “*firefighting lifts*”. What the relevant document (*CST00002092*) actually says is:

³ At EN81-72 paragraph 5.4, the guidance with addresses the provision of “an emergency trap door” for the “Rescue of trapped firefighters in the lift car”.

“Both lifts within Grenfell are FF/Evac lifts. These are not up to current standards due to lack of escape hatch” [emphasis added].

Further to the matters discussed above, however, EN872 did not specifically apply to the Tower (it did not apply to existing buildings) but would be taken into account “...as a basis”. That did not mean however that they could not be described as fire fighting lifts nor that they were non-compliant with the Building Regulations.

124 In any event, as set out above, I identified the lack of an escape hatch in my FRAs from 2012 onwards and this would also have been obvious to the LFB when they carried out visits to the Tower. I understand that each of my FRAs had been seen by the LFB and no issue was raised about this. I do not believe the absence of an escape hatch has an obvious bearing on the GTI’s considerations.

Question 38

125 Importantly, at all times, as per the definitions set out in paragraphs 104 and 105 above, my primary concern was whether or not the lifts could be controlled by the Fire Service.

126 This is why, for example in the significant findings schedule to my 2016 FRA (CST00000101) I noted:

19f	High	It is not known if the fire service controls for the lifts been moved back down to the street level?	Can it be confirmed that the fire service controls for the lifts been moved back down to the street level? If not then this must be undertaken immediately.
-----	------	--	--

This is a good example of where a presenting issue arose, I raised a question accordingly.

127 I would not have checked the actual operation of a fire switch on the day of my FRA, but would have made sure there were records of monthly inspections of the lifts by competent lift engineers (selected by KCTMO). I would have expected those inspections to have included checking that whether or not the fire switch worked. I also understood that this would have been checked by ESAs and should have in any event have been checked by the LFB during their visits.

128 As with other issues (e.g. as per paragraph 86 above in relation to flat doors) this issue was marked “High” priority, I would have expected this to be dealt with swiftly by the KCTMO, or others at the KCTMO’s instruction.

F – OTHER MEASURES

129 In this section I respond to *Questions 39 – 53*.

Question 39 - AOV

130 I recall at certain points asking questions about the AOV system being introduced and note that on 19 September 2014 (12:42) – **CSS2/33 (CST00030136)** – I was provided access to the specification for the AOV system by Ms Williams. I partly wanted this information out of interest, and also, from a high level perspective, to understand the change that was being made.

131 At all times, however, I was reliant on Building Control’s assessment of the AOV in terms of compliance with the functional requirements of the Building Regulations. I was aware that this would have been based on its officers’ own expertise, in conjunction with information and submissions made to it by the various construction professionals involved in the refurbishment of the Tower.

132 In addition, I was aware that the LFB had attended the Tower and had been given the opportunity to have a demonstration of the installed AOV system.

Question 40 - External Walls of the Tower

133 Contrary to the assertion in *Question 40* of the Request, I did not undertake an “assessment of the external façade” – I noted what I had observed when I visited for the April 2014 FRA and made some observations accordingly.

134 As I made clear in my First Statement, I raised a query arising out of the test panel I observed when attending the Tower. As set out in my First Statement, I was given assurances as to the compliance of the materials and system used, and suggested that the KCTMO ensured Building Regulations compliance was obtained.

135 As set out in paragraph 80iv of my First Statement, I was subsequently made aware that Building Control had both a Letter of Comfort, and then a Completion certificate. Again, as set out in my First Statement, I therefore formed the view that the façade was

deemed compliant. I understand the RBKC has now made, as part of its Opening for Phase 2, a number of concessions about the adequacy of the Building Control process. I was not aware of this at the time and had no way of knowing that was the case.

136 Contrary to what has been suggested in Openings for Phase 2: Module 1, it was neither within my remit, nor my ability, as Fire Risk Assessor to make an assessment of the compliance of the façade. As accepted by many of the CPs at the end of Phase 1, and as discussed in paragraphs 145 and 146 of my First Statement, assessment of the façade is not covered under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005.

137 I did not request any documentation relating to the cladding, nor was I provided with any. This was due to the fact that, as set out at paragraph 36 of my First Statement, the external walls of the Tower do not fall within the purview of the Fire Risk Assessor.

138 I did not therefore request documentation concerning the compliance of the materials.

Questions 41 – 53 - Passive Fire Protection Measures

139 I did not make, nor was I required to make, any enquiries concerning insulation, cavity barriers, infill panels, the architectural crown, or indeed any other aspect of the façade. Again, as set out above and at paragraph 36 of my First Statement, as a fire risk assessor of a residential building, I was not required to consider and/or comment on the external façade of the Tower.

140 My limited observation and comment on the façade arose out of the sample panels that I observed – in particular the way they were fixed to external walls of the Tower – i.e. on timber frames – when attending the Tower for the purposes of carrying out the April 2014 FRA: see again paragraphs 114 to 123 of my First Statement.

G – DISABLED PEOPLE

141 In this section I respond to *Question 54*.

142 I was not required to carry out any Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans (“PEEPs”) in relation to the Tower as a matter of course but would if specifically requested to do so. In fact, my records show that I only carried out two PEEPs for the KCTMO in Spring 2014: 4 Markland House and 27 Gillray House. My understanding was that Ms Wray’s team generally carried out PEEPs in respect of the KCTMO’s housing stock.

143 I was at all times reliant on the KCTMO to provide me with information concerning any residents who may have had sensory, physical or any other impairment. Indeed, I understood from Ms Wray that the KCTMO had a:

“comprehensive programme to gather information about tenants including disabilities and their physical ability and mobility to respond to any emergency situations”.⁴

See my letter to Ms Wray dated 23 June 2010 in which I note that Ms Wray had shown me a suite of PEEPs which appeared to be “ones used as best practice in the H M Government Guidance” – *CST00001822*. These were generic and demonstrated that a system was in place. I do not believe this was the ‘TP tracker system’ and whilst I was told by Mrs Wray that the ‘TP tracker system’ was in existence in relation to individual residents, I was not asked to review or consider it.

144 I received no such information in relation to residents at the Tower, hence the comments made in my FRAs referred to in *Question 54*. I did not proactively seek information about residents but would have drawn attention to such an issue as part of the FRA if this was known about.

145 In my letter to Ms Wray dated 19 October 2016 (*CST00001198*), I included at page 12 a photograph showing a mobility scooter on the landing area outside Flat 9. The

⁴ This reference is to be found at (by for example) page 23 of the June 2016 FRA at section 13.

mobility scooter was being charged by way of a lead running out of the letterbox. I raised this primarily due to the fact that the lead kept the letterbox open thereby breaching the compartmentation protection provided by the door. I was also concerned that the mobility scooter created a potential block to egress from the flat and that it was a potential fire risk in the common parts of the Tower.

- 146 I assumed the KCTMO was aware of the needs of this flat's resident(s), and would have carried out a PEEP, if necessary. Flat 9 was one of the new flats and thus I would have concluded that the resident must have moved in recently. The fact that the resident had been given a flat on a lower floor also suggested that the KCTMO will have considered their particular circumstances.

Question 54 (e) and (f) – Information regarding lifts

- 147 In the first instance, there were no staff based at the Tower. It is therefore not clear to me which 'staff' this section of the question refers to.
- 148 In any event, the training of KCTMO staff was not the responsibility of CS Stokes as the fire risk assessor.
- 149 One would not usually expect to consider whether keys for the lift were available to 'staff', as the LFB would look to take control of the lifts as and when necessary, and they are responsible for their own keys. There may have been keys kept by someone at the KCTMO who was responsible for maintenance, but whether this is the case is not known to me.

H – OTHER

150 In this section I respond to *Questions 55 – 60*.

Question 55 – Exova Report

151 As set out in paragraphs 73 and 74 of my First Report, my discussions in early 2013 arose out of a discussion with Leadbitter – the then intended Main Contractor – as to whether my services would be required. I cannot recall precisely what I meant by “*where work may not be required*” but in any event the matter went no further given that Leadbitter were not eventually appointed.

Question 56 – Studio E drawings

152 As set out in paragraph 75 of my First Statement, I attended a meeting with Studio E to, as Claire Williams put it, “*download [my] historic knowledge*”. The plans referred to were on the table at that meeting and I simply requested a copy of the drawings following that meeting out of interest.

Question 57 – Discussion with Robert Speak

153 I am afraid I cannot recall the conversation referred to.

Question 58 - PIB

154 In this regard, I would refer to the remarks made by CS Stokes in its submissions to the GTI on Interim Recommendations dated 11 January 2019 (*INQ00000645*) – “**IR Submissions**”.

155 As set out in paragraph 14 of CS Stokes’ IR Submissions, there is a procedure for the LFB. If followed, this should have resulted in the LFB collecting and having available the type of information which would have been available in a Premises Information Box (“**PIB**”).

156 My concerns about PIBs, mindful of the information gathering process that the LFB should have been undertaking, and particularly noting that they were in frequent

attendance at the Tower throughout the refurbishment, were as set out in the IR Submissions:

- i. All relevant firefighting information should already have been obtained by the LFB. This should have included information about Site Staff and Emergency Contacts for the building (ORD – *LFB00003116* at page 5) and any information relevant to residents, which should include any mobility issues. Therefore, the LFB should not have required any further information than they already have to fight a high rise fire;
- ii. If when the LFB attend a fire incident there is an additional source of information in a PIB:
 - a. This risks introducing information which is either inconsistent with the information already obtained by the LFB, or which is out of date, and thus risks causing confusion that should be avoided at all costs; and/or
 - b. This risks adding nothing to the information which the LFB should already have, thus introducing the prospect of wasting valuable firefighting and rescue time unnecessarily in searching for information that the LFB already holds.

157 As was borne out in the Phase 1 evidence, there is no requirement to have a PIB for a large block of residential flats. Moreover, the LGA Guide addresses the issue of PIBs at page 120 paragraphs 79.10 – 79.12 and confirms this to be the case.

- i. At paragraph 79.10, Tower was not a “sheltered housing scheme”; therefore
- ii. At paragraph 79.11;

*“It is **not realistic** [my emphasis] to expect such an approach [provision of a PIB for a resident with particular mobility or other issues affecting their ability*

to escape] where there are disabled people and others requiring assistance in a 'general needs' block"

- iii. At paragraph 79.12, the guidance identifies that it can be of assistance to have plans on layout and services in *"large, more complex blocks of flats"*. I do not believe the Tower fell into that category and neither, as far as I am aware, did the LFB for that purpose. In any event, as far as I am aware, the LFB were provided with drawings / plans of the Tower as part of the refurbishment process, which they should therefore have had access to on the night of the Fire.

It is not therefore clear to my why in their opening oral submission on 30 January 2020, Counsel for BSR Team 1 said that CS Stokes *"overr[ode]the Fire Brigade's advice that a premises information box was required"* [emphasis added].⁵

158 Furthermore, it is also important to remember that as well having information available, the LFB need to know what to do with it. In a high pressure situation faced by the LFB, such as the one on 14 June 2017, on arrival at the fire, the LFB need to already have relevant information to hand so operations can commence without delay.

159 The collection and planning process the LFB, if undertaken, would have allowed them to objectively collect and process the information in advance, plan accordingly, so that they could access in the information on the way to the fire via a hand held device in the appliance before they even arrived.

160 I accept that as a backup store of information PIBs can be useful but unless regularly updated, it can be misleading and therefore, as per the LGA Guidance at 79.11, can *"...be more harmful than no information."*

161 Ultimately my view is that PIBs cannot replace what should be the LFB's advance cognitive processing of that information which it has gathered for itself.

⁵ See also LFB's Fire Safety Guidance Note No. 70 on PIBs which acknowledges that PIBs are voluntary, and gives examples of *"key information needed by operation crews at the time of an incident"*, all of which the LFB should already have had further to their s.7(2)(d) visits.

Question 59 – JW Objective setting

- 162 I have never seen the documents referred to (*TMO10041292*) and I would respectively suggest that the GTI should ask its author – Ms Wray – what was meant by the various comments made therein.
- 163 Whilst Ms Wray would seem to be referring to me when referencing the “Fire Consultant” – in the same paragraph she references “Carl” seemingly in the same context – I also note that on the next page Ms Wray specifically refers to the “Fire Risk Assessor”, which was my actual role.
- 164 I do not recall any specific conversations with Mr Gibson’s team and do not know who it is said I spoke to.
- 165 I do not have any recollection of such a conversation or involvement with Mr Gibson’s team and do not have any written letter of formal advice. I suspect the discussions referred to are conversations I would have had about specific matters raised in the FRAs which required action to be taken.
- 166 For the sake of completeness, I do not believe I was ever appointed as part of the team for the refurbishment project at Grenfell Tower (see paragraph 4 and 5 of the KCTMO’s written opening statement for Phase 2, Module 1). I carried out fire risk assessments as required and only ever assisted separately when asked to in accordance with my First Statement at paragraph 28.

Question 60 – Discussion with Simon Blake

- 167 Item 2.20 of the Progress Meeting No. 20 notes (*TMO10012397*), would appear to relate to Item 3.10.2 of Progress Meeting No. 19 (*ART00005313*). That item states:

“SB noted that the Inspector had identified areas of existing Fire Compartmentation which needed addressing. It was discussed and agreed that although these works are not required under the current contract it may be beneficial to the TMO to carry out these works to improve the condition of the

building. SB to draw up a proposal identifying scope, cost and programme implications of undertaking this additional work to be issued to CW and Artelia. CW will then review the necessity of these works with TMO Fire Risk Assessor and instruct accordingly."

168 I believe this relates to a question raised with me about electrical risers located on either side of the two lifts at each level. Because there was an unbroken concrete floor slab in place (i.e. there were no holes or gaps and I was not made aware of any intended works), I advised Simon Blake that no further work was required.

169 I outlined this advice in my June 2016 FRA (*CST00000430*) where I noted at section 14 on page 25 that:

"[O]n each of the flat/lift lobby areas there is an opening for the electrical riser, this riser is fire stopped at each floor level, the boarding covering this riser is not fire rated, and it does not need to be".

170 Had there been a breach in the floor slab (i.e. the presence of holes or gaps), I would have advised further work needed to be done.

171 When I attended Tower on 17 September 2018, I reviewed the riser slabs and observed that there were still no breaches.

172 As far as I can recall, I did speak to Claire Williams following my discussion with Simon Blake, and would have simply reiterated the above advice.

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

I believe the facts stated in this Witness Statement are true.

I confirm that I am willing for this Witness Statement to form part of the evidence before the GTI and be published on the GTI's website.

Signed: 
.....
CARL SPENCER STOKES
Dated: 13 March 2020

Appendix 1 – Qualifications

Date	Qualification	Evidence	Exhibit number
1993	Oxford Brookes University ‘Certificate in Management’	Cert No. 100091	CSS2/34 (CST)
9 November 2001	IOSH (‘Managing Safely’ Course)	Certificate No: 278, 864	CSS2/14 (CST00030167)
15 June 2005	NEBOSH (‘Level 3 Certificate in Occupational Health & Safety’)	Master Log Certificate Number: C 93734	CSS2/13 (CST00030176)
20 – 24 June 2005	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 10 : Life Safety Fire Safety Engineering endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe)	Issued by the Fire Protection Association	CSS2/6 (CST00030154)
27 June 2005	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 4: Fire-fighting Lifts, Atrium Buildings & Means of Escape for the Disabled endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe)	Issued by the Fire Protection Association	CSS2/7 (CST00030155)
14 - 18 November 2005	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 2: Underpinning Knowledge & Risk Assessment of Simple Premises endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe)	FPA/2593	CSS2/8 (CST00030165)
20 – 24 March 2006	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 3: Evaluate Design Submissions against Approved Document B endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe)	FPA/2640	CSS2/9 (CST00030145)

24 - 28 April 2006	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 5: Underpinning Knowledge & Risk Assessment of High Risk Premises endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe)	FPA/2645	CSS2/10 (CTS00030163)
June 2006	Certificate of Attendance at a CPD training session titled ‘It meets the Building Regulations – Surely it must be OK for the Fire Regulations – isn’t it?’	Issued by the Construction CPD Certification Service on behalf of Barbour	CSS2/35 (CST00030162)
29 June 2006	Certificate of Attendance and completion of ‘Legislative Developments for Sustainable Building’	Issued by the Construction CPD Certification Service authorised by Mitsubishi Electric Direct - Bristol	CSS2/36 (CST00030141)
12 th September 2006	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 8: Fire Safety during Building Works endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe)	FPA/4176	CSS2/11 (CST00030140)
14 November 2006	Diploma 367 awarded by the Fire Protection Association in recognition of having satisfied the requirements of the CFPA Europe Examination in Fire Prevention	Diploma No 367 issued by the Fire Protection Association	CSS2/5 (CST)
Course held between 10- 12 December 2007 but the Certificate is undated	Fire Risk Assessment Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005	Issued by ‘Northern Ireland Fire Safety Panel’ and ‘C.S Todd & Associates Ltd’	CSS2/3 (CST00030166)

December 2008	Level 7 BTEC Advanced Professional Certificate in Investigative Practice	21032B: M7719 AA02973:00000 0528:09:06:59 Issued 10 th January 2009	CSS2/37 (CST00030164)
27 May 2008	Certificate of Attendance at an approved Continuing Professional Development Activity held by The Institute of Fire Engineers 'Fire Safety in Open Air Events and Venues'	Endorsed by The Institute of Fire Engineers	CSS2/38 (CST00030168)
7 April 2009	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 4.2: Fire Safety and Hazardous Materials Sites	FPA 8441	CSS2/12 (CST00030143)
23 April 2009	Certificate of Attendance at a CPD Seminar by Colt International Ltd on Car Park Ventilation Systems	Construction CPD Certification Service issued on behalf of Colt International Limited	CSS2/39 (CST00030161)
23 April 2009	Certificate of Attendance at a CPD Seminar by Colt International Ltd on Shaft Ventilation in Residential & Commercial Buildings	Construction CPD Certification Service issued on behalf of Colt International Limited	CSS2/40 (CST)
24 April 2009	Certificate of Attendance at Means of Escape Publication Ltd's 'Introduction to Pr EN ISO BS 7010'	Issued on behalf of Means of Escape Publications Ltd	CSS2/41 (CST00030174)

19 May 2009	Certificate of Completion of "BS 5839 Part 1 -2002: Unit 1 – Fire Detection Design" FIA Training Course	Certificate No: 26213	CSS2/15 (CST00030172)
19 - 21 May 2009	Certificate of Continuing Professional Development for attendance at FIA/ABE Diploma in Fire Detection and Alarm Systems	Issued by the Association of Building Engineers	CSS2/42 (CST00030175)
22 September 2009	Certificate of Continuing Professional Development for attendance at NHBC Foundation Seminar: Open Plan Flat Layouts Assessing Life Safety in the Event of Fire	Issued by the Association of Building Engineers	CSS2/43 (CST00030144)
25 September 2009	Certificate of Membership of The Chartered Institute of Arbitrators	Membership No. 26934	CSS2/4 (CST00030150)
28 April 2010	Certificate of Completion of FIA Training Course BS 5266 Parts 1 (2005), 7 (1999) and 8 (2004) ICEL Competent Engineer Course	Certificate No. 21011	CSS2/17 (CST)
19 August 2010	3 Credits at Level Two on 'Trade Unions Today Pathway' course 'Preparing for Bargaining, Negotiation, Consultation *K/501/0198' provided by Leeds City College – Park Lane Campus	Issued by National Open College Network Certificate No. 4765927 Registration No. 9242865	CSS2/44 (CST00030137)
17 March 2011	Certificate of Attendance at the Fire Industry Association 2011 Conference: Driving Safety Forward	Issued by the Fire Industry Association	CSS2/45 (CST00030157)

7 October 2011	Certificate of Attendance at the Fire Industry Association's 'Fire Risk Assessor Update – CPD Day'	Issued by the Fire Industry Association	CSS2/46 (CST00030173)
29 November 2011	Certificate of Attendance at the Fire Industry Association's 'Fire Risk Assessor PEEPs – CPD Day'	Issued by the Fire Industry Association	CSS2/47 (CST00030169)
12 July 2012	Certificate of Attendance at the Fire Industry Association's 'Fire Risk Assessor 'The Law' – CPD Day'	Issued by the Fire Industry Association	CSS2/48 (CST00030170)
11 September 2012	Certificate of Completion of "BS 5839 Part 6 - 2004: Unit 11 – Domestic Dwellings"	00001797	CSS2/16 (CST00030159)
22 April 2015	Training Certificate for attendance at 'Fire Protection Measures – Understanding Your Responsibilities'	Issued by BM TRADA	CSS2/49 (CST00030147)
Undated	Certificate of Attendance at a CPD Seminar on 'Fire Safety for Deaf and Hard of Hearing People: The Law and the Solutions'	Construction CPD Certification Service certificate issued on behalf of Deaf Alerter Plc	CSS2/50 (CST00030179)

Appendix 2 – Self Closers

DOCUMENT	DATE	COMMENTS
Email to KCTMO (CST00001425)	25 July 2011	CS Stokes advises the TMO on 21 July 2011 that the self-closing device on three of the new flat entrance doors have come away from the doors. This follows a meeting on the previous day in which KCTMO confirms to LFB that the replacement doors fully meet the requirements of the building regulations – see <i>CST00002915</i> .
November 2012 FRA (CST00000729)	20 November 2012	In the schedule of significant findings for the November 2012 FRA, Line 12.b notes that there are holes in the flat entrance doors of Flats 166 and 202. In respect of Flat 166, a lock has been removed from the door. CS Stokes recommended that both flat entrance doors be repaired or replaced so that they are 30-minute fire rated doors fitted with self-closing devices complying with all the requirements of the Building Regulations.
Email to KCTMO (CST00002919)	22 July 2015	In an email to Adrian Bowman at KCTMO, CS notes that due to the occupants putting additional locks on the door of flat 45 this may no longer be considered to be a fire rated door. CS also notes in this email that the occupants had undertaken work on the door and had removed the self-closing device.
Letter to KCTMO (CST00000932)	28 July 2015	This letter relates to CS Stokes' inspection of Flat 45. CS Stokes notes that the concealed self-closing device was missing from this door and that two additional bolts had been fitted to the rear of the door and the inner part of the letterbox was missing.

<p>June 2016 FRA (CST00000100)</p>	<p>20 June 2016</p>	<p>Line 12h of the significant findings schedule of CS Stokes' June 2016 FRA notes that a new door was being installed for flat 112 that was not marked as being fire rated and had no self-closing device.</p> <p>CS Stokes recommends that confirmation was sought that the door had an FD30 rating and that a self-closing device be fitted.</p>
<p>Letter to KCTMO (CST00000199)</p>	<p>19 October 2016</p>	<p>This is a letter from CS Stokes to the KCTMO following the KCTMO's request that CS Stokes inspect the Tower before an audit by the LFB.</p> <p>At page 5, CS Stokes notes that the flat entrance door of flat 24 is damaged with the letterbox missing and advises that this door should be repaired and a new fire rated letterbox fitted, alternatively a new self-closing certified 30 minute fire rated door fitted with intumescent strips and cold smoke seals.</p> <p>CS further notes at page 5 that the flat entrance door of flat 112 is being replaced, that the new door is not marked as a fire rated door and it does not have a self-closing device fitted to it, although it does have cold smoke seals fitted. CS advises that the occupant of the flat should be asked to confirm that the new flat entrance door is a certified FD30 door, a self-closing device should be fitted to this door.</p>

**Index of Documents
referred to in the
Second Witness Statement
of
Carl Spencer Stokes**

Document Number	Description	GTI Reference
CSS2/1	The Request dated 21 November 2019	CST00030171
CSS2/2	The Supplemental Request dated 5 February 2020	CST00030178
CSS2/3	Fire Risk Assessment: Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 Certificate	CST00030166
CSS2/4	CIArb Annual Membership Subscription dated 25 September 2009	CST00030150
CSS2/5	Diploma 367 awarded by the Fire Protection Association in recognition of having satisfied the requirements of the CFPA Europe Examination in Fire Prevention dated 14 th November 2006	CST
CSS2/6	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 10 : Life Safety Fire Safety Engineering endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe) dated 20 th – 24 th June 2005	CST00030154
CSS2/7	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 4: Fire-fighting Lifts, Atrium Buildings & Means of Escape for the Disabled endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe) dated 27 June 2005	CST00030155
CSS2/8	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 2: Underpinning Knowledge & Risk Assessment of Simple Premises endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe) dated 14 - 18 November 2005	CST00030165

CSS2/9	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 3: Evaluate Design Submissions against Approved Document B endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe) dated 20 - 24 March 2006	CST00030145
CSS2/10	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 5: Underpinning Knowledge & Risk Assessment of High Risk Premises endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe) dated 24 - 28 April 2006	CST00030163
CSS2/11	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 8: Fire Safety during Building Works endorsed by the Confederation of Fire Protection Associations (Europe) dated 12 September 2006	CST00030140
CSS2/12	Fire Protection Association Certificate, NOS – 4.2: Fire Safety and Hazardous Material Sites dated 7 April 2009	CST00030143
CSS2/13	NEBOSH ('Level 3 Certificate in Occupational Health and Safety') dated 15 June 2005	CST00030176
CSS2/14	IOSH ('Managing Safely Course') dated 9 November 2001	CST00030167
CSS2/15	Certificate of Completion of "BS 5839 Part 1 - 2002: Unit 1 – Fire Detection Design" FIA Training Course dated 19 May 2009	CST00030172
CSS2/16	Certificate of Completion of "BS 5839 Part 6 - 2004: Unit 11 – Domestic Dwellings" dated 11 September 2012	CST00030159
CSS2/17	Competent Engineer BS 5266 Parts 1 (2005), 7 (1999) and 8 (2004) ICEL Competent Engineer Course	CST
CSS2/ 18	Chartered Institute of Arbitrators Membership receipt dated 7 January 2020	CST

CSS2/19	“The Fire Lecture 2014: High Rise – Not High Risk” lecture given by the Worshipful Company of Firefighters dated 28 May 2014	CST00030142
CSS2/20	C.S. Todd & Associates Ltd ‘Fire Safety in Purpose-Built Blocks of Flats’ hand out	CST00030160
CSS2/21	Email from LACoRS dated 21 January 2008	CST
CSS2/22	Local Government Improvement and Development Consultation Response in relation to ‘Fire Safety Guidance in Purpose Built Blocks of Flats’	CST
CSS2/23	Email from Janice Wray to Carl Stokes dated 2 October 2016 (14:21)	CST00030149
CSS2/24	Fire Safety Training - Powerpoint	CST00030177
CSS2/25	Email from Carl Stokes to Janice Wray dated 29 November 2016 (17:07)	CST00030138
CSS2/26	C S Stokes and Associates Limited Invoice dated 5 January 2017	CST
CSS2/27	Email from Janice Wray to the KCTMO repairs team dated 3 February 2016 (10:33)	CST00030151
CSS2/28	Email from Carl Stokes to Janice Wray dated 1 February 2013 (12:37)	CST00030180
CSS2/29	Email from Janice Wray to Carl Stokes dated 7 December 2016 (07:03)	CST00030156
CSS2/30	Email from Carl Stokes to Janice Wray dated 7 December 2016 (12:46)	CST00030148
CSS2/31	Email from Janice Wray to Carl Stokes dated 20 July 2016 (17:02)	CST

CSS2/32	Email from Claire Williams to Carl Stokes dated 25 September 2014 (10:55)	CST00030158
CSS2/33	Email from Claire Williams to Carl Stokes dated 19 September 2014 (12:42)	CST00030136
CSS2/34	Oxford Brookes University 'Certificate in Management'	CST
CSS2/35	Certificate of Attendance at a CPD training session titled 'It meets the Building Regulations – Surely it must be OK for the Fire Regulations – isn't it?' dated June 2006	CST00030162
CSS2/36	Certificate of Attendance and completion of 'Legislative Developments for Sustainable Building' dated 29 June 2006	CST00030141
CSS2/37	Level 7 BTEC Advanced Professional Certificate in Investigative Practice dated December 2008	CST00030164
CSS2/38	Certificate of Attendance at an approved Continuing Professional Development Activity held by The Institute of Fire Engineers 'Fire Safety in Open Air Events and Venues' dated 27 May 2008	CST00030168
CSS2/39	Certificate of Attendance at a CPD Seminar by Colt International Ltd on Car Park Ventilation Systems dated 23 April 2009	CST00030161
CSS2/40	Certificate of Attendance at a CPD Seminar by Colt International Ltd on Shaft Ventilation in Residential & Commercial Buildings dated 23 April 2009	CST
CSS2/41	Certificate of Attendance at Means of Escape Publication Ltd's 'Introduction to Pr EN ISO BS 7010' dated 24 April 2009	CST00030174

CSS2/42	Certificate of Continuing Professional Development for attendance at FIA/ABE Diploma in Fire Detection and Alarm Systems dated 19 - 21 May 2009	CST00030175
CSS2/43	Certificate of Continuing Professional Development for attendance at NHBC Foundation Seminar: Open Plan Flat Layouts Assessing Life Safety in the Event of Fire dated 22 September 2009	CST00030144
CSS2/44	3 Credits at Level Two on 'Trade Unions Today Pathway' course 'Preparing for Bargaining, Negotiation, Consultation *K/501/0198' provided by Leeds City College – Park Lane Campus dated 19 August 2010	CST00030137
CSS2/45	Certificate of Attendance at the Fire Industry Association 2011 Conference: Driving Safety Forward dated 17 March 2011	CST00030157
CSS2/46	Certificate of Attendance at the Fire Industry Association's 'Fire Risk Assessor Update – CPD Day' dated 7 October 2011	CST00030173
CSS2/47	Certificate of Attendance at the Fire Industry Association's 'Fire Risk Assessor PEEPs – CPD Day' dated 29 November 2011	CST00030169
CSS2/48	Certificate of Attendance at the Fire Industry Association's 'Fire Risk Assessor 'The Law' – CPD Day' dated 12 July 2012	CST00030170
CSS2/49	Training Certificate for attendance at 'Fire Protection Measures – Understanding Your Responsibilities' dated 22 April 2015	CST00030147
CSS2/50	Certificate of Attendance at a CPD Seminar on 'Fire Safety for Deaf and Hard of Hearing People: The Law and the Solutions' undated	CST00030179

CS2
Dated: 13 March 2020

IN THE MATTER
OF THE
GRENFELL TOWER PUBLIC INQUIRY

SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT
OF
CARL SPENCER STOKES
ON BEHALF OF
CS STOKES & ASSOICATES LIMITED
