
From: SWEENEY, John <SWEENEYJ@parliament.uk>
Sent: 24 April 2017 12:50
To: Lee Chapman
Subject: RE: Serious Concerns at Grenfell Tower

Dear Mr Chapman,

Thank you for your emails to Lady Borwick regarding ongoing issues at Grenfell Tower. I had hoped that with the serious investment after all these years of problems, the situation for the residents would have improved. Sadly, whilst there has certainly been improvement in most areas, it is evident that certain problems remain. Cllr Blakeman has done more on this than anyone over the years, and I have visited Grenfell Tower a number of times with Lady Borwick (and previously with Sir Malcolm) before, during and after the works. I have made contact with Cllr Blakeman again this morning, and she has sent me a half a dozen emails with the latest on the various concerns. Like you, she is frustrated by certain aspects, and I do feel it is important to bear in mind the distinction between not receiving support and not receiving the outcomes you are seeking. It would certainly be unfair to maintain the leaseholders are not receiving support from Cllr Blakeman.

I note you have written directly to the Borough and the TMO, and I have asked both to copy us into their response to you. However, in going forward it would be helpful to have clarification from the leaseholders on the following:

1. I suspect the reason the old gas pipes cannot be used, and the reason the new pipes cannot be recessed is for the same reason the new central heating pipes could not be recessed previously: there are no gaps between the walls or floors, and your floor is your downstairs neighbour's roof. The original heating (and presumably gas) pipes were laid into the concrete when it was first set, but if there is a leak somewhere the old pipes cannot be accessed to trace it, so new ones must presumably be laid. Rydons were understandably nervous about altering the structure of the building when laying the new heating pipes (the old ones had furred up with limescale over the years), so the only alternative as I understand it was to place the pipes outside of the

walls, which admittedly does not look pleasant. I presume it is the same with the new gas pipes. Of course, there would be little benefit in our writing to the TMO simply to say that residents are concerned about the pipe without giving a detailed explanation of those concerns - could you give a bit more detail on what specifically concerns the residents about the safety of the new pipe? More accurately, in what way is the new pipe laid outside the wall a danger compared to the old one laid inside? If you have any evidence to support the argument, that would be enormously helpful.

2. Presumably the leaseholders would expect the TMO to fund the independent report?
3. Would the same be true for the cost of hiring a concierge? Presumably the leaseholders would not accept an increase in service charges as a result?
4. Between what hours would the leaseholders expect the concierge to be on duty?
5. In a similar vein, presumably the leaseholders would reject an increase in service charges to pay for the installation and monitoring of better CCTV?

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

John Sweeney

Office of Lady Borwick MP

House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA

Tel: [REDACTED] | john.sweeney@parliament.uk

Newsletter: Sign up to receive our monthly newsletter here <http://victoriaborwick.london/> or by responding to this email with 'Subscribe' in the subject line. This data will not be shared with any external organisations.

Casework: In order to raise your concern with the appropriate authority, we may need to share your contact details with Government departments, the Royal Borough or other similar organisations so that we can obtain a suitable response. Please let me know if you would prefer that we did not.

SA/124

ATT06

From: SWEENEY, John <SWEENEYJ@parliament.uk>
Sent: 26 April 2017 15:33
To: Lee Chapman
Cc: [REDACTED] <GrenfellLeaseholdersAssociation@hotmail.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Serious Concerns at Grenfell Tower

Dear Mr Chapman,

Many thanks for this clarification, which I shall ensure Lady Borwick sees.

I would give my suggestion on the installation of the gas pipes a fair dose of salt as it is mostly guesswork relative to my understanding of the heating pipe installation. I suspect this is the reason, but there may be other factors.

We have expressed Lady Borwick's renewed concern to the Borough, and they have promised to respond to your approach. I look forward to receiving it.

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

John Sweeney
Office of Lady Borwick MP
House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA
Tel: [REDACTED] | john.sweeney@parliament.uk

From: Lee Chapman [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 April 2017 13:21
To: SWEENEY, John <SWEENEYJ@parliament.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED] <GrenfellLeaseholdersAssociation@hotmail.co.uk>
Subject: Re: Serious Concerns at Grenfell Tower

Dear Mr Sweeney,

Thanks for taking the time to help with this issue, it is greatly appreciated.

Firstly, I would like to highlight the fact that I stated we have had "no further support", rather than no support. I fully appreciate the efforts made, but I do feel that that you will find some correlation between get a desire

The matter is on how to get to a good resolution with all parties for the good of the tower and more widely the community. I have a number of properties in the South East and regrettably this one seem plighted by more issues than others.

SA/124

Thanks for requesting that the Borough and TMO copy you in to future correspondence I feel that the more comprehensive the understanding, the greater the chance we can agree.

1) Thanks for your description of the cause of the new pipes, we have not ever received information for the Borough or TMO regarding the reason therefore i appreciate what information you have given us.

In terms of installing the new gas pipe inside a property, I would have thought it would be pretty evident regarding the issues around this. Given that it is a gas pipe and not a hot water pipe and the risks of a pipe being compromised, where it is exposed.

2)Yes leaseholders would expect the TMO to fund the report, as if there is nothing to hide, why wouldn't they, at least this would give them some further independent reassurance.

3)In terms of the cost of concierge, the vast majority would support this. When costs are involved, this would be later conversation after careful evaluation as I believe it would be in RBKC interest to protect their assets.

4)Again, linked to 3, subject to further conversation.

5)Increase in service charge for CCTV would need to be evaluated on cost Vs benefit. Given that there is current CCTV on an access by archive system.

Once again, I must stress that we are not trying to cause problems, be awkward nor are we trying to change the world. However, we do believe that we are trying to assist both our members and the RBKC in protecting our properties and building so it is fit for purpose long-term not short term.

It is regretful that in the short period I have lived in the building I have seen a huge initial investment, but little effort to prolong the life of the building and create a sense of pride.

Thanks for your time once again, please do let me know if you have any new information to share and I will come back to you with some detail on point number 1.

Kind Regards,

Lee Chapman

Secretary of the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association