

# FW: Tenant Management Organisation Response's

Keith Mott

Sat 13/11/2010 22:52

To: Shah Ahmed [REDACTED]

📎 1 attachments (28 KB)

TMO Responses ref LFB.doc;

---

From: [REDACTED]  
To: collette.o'hara@london-fire.gov.uk  
CC: grenfellleaseholdersassociation@hotmail.co.uk  
Date: Tue, 9 Nov 2010 12:57:22 +0000  
Subject: Tenant Management Organisation Response's

Hello Collette,

It's Keith Mott from the Grenfell Tower Leaseholder Association. Firstly let me apologise for not getting the email to you yesterday, I did not have all the documents on me to give you their responses in a correct manner.

I have attached the file with the said responses and questions we would like you to help us answer. I have also copied this email to Shah Ahmed who is the Chairman and is also involved in getting a correct steer in regards to the safety of Grenfell Tower and its residents.

It is easy for us to type the response's and send them to you but we do have the original letters to show you; and at some point meet with you to discuss action plans for the safety of the block as we believe the TMO's main worry is the profit it makes and not the welfare of the residents.

If possible would Mr. Ahmed and I be able to meet with you on Thursday afternoon or Friday morning? We will bring the original documentation as proof that we are not simply stirring up trouble but have genuine concerns. We believe that they have put the blame at your feet as to try and deflect blame from themselves; which is a slur to the professionalism of the London Fire Brigade!

We will be setting up a meeting with Mr. Anthony Parkes; the finance director of the TMO at some point in the near future; and we would appreciate if you agree with our issues that you will come along to the meeting to give our concerns more credibility. If you could please reply and let me know about the possibility of meeting on Thursday that would be great, or should you wish to talk my mobile number is [REDACTED]

Many thanks for your time with this matter,

Keith Mott

---

CHELSEA FC PLC is registered in England and Wales. Company No. 02536231. Registered office: Stamford Bridge, Fulham Road, London SW6 1HS, United Kingdom.

The information contained in this e-mail or in any attachments is confidential and is intended solely for the named addressee only. Access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify Chelsea FC plc immediately by returning this e-mail

SA/25

IWS00001351/1  
IWS000

The first response we had from Daniel Wood dated 20<sup>th</sup> August 2010 was:

*'There was a minor fault with the smoke vents associated with the Fire Alarm that was identified on the service visit prior to the Fire. An order had been issued for the system to be repaired and the remedial works that were agreed included a complete overhaul and clean of all intake and extract vents and when works are completed the system will be fully operational.*

*The system was operation correctly but there was a problem with the seals on the vents not closing tightly. This allowed some smoke to seep out on floors above the fire but has now been rectified.*

*The alarm system is not designed to alert all residents in the event of a fire. The system has a smoke detector on each landing which activates the alarm and opens the smoke vents on that floor only. There is only one sounder in the entrance lobby which when activated alerts people of the activation and they should not enter the building. Residents already in the building are advised to stay in their flats until given further instructions by the Fire Officers'.*

The second response from Anthony Parkes dated 21<sup>st</sup> August 2010 was:

*'...I can confirm that the fire alarm was functioning and that the vents were working at the time of the fire. The smoke vent opened on a specific floor, but the seal to the smoke vents on other floors leaked. This would not have been so serious if the fire brigade turned on the manual smoke vent fan which would have drawn smoke away. Regrettably, this did not happen as officers who attended did not know how it worked. We have discussed this with the LFB and clarified how to operate the vent fans, the controls are well labelled on the ground floor. To prevent this confusion again we are presently looking to upgrade the smoke vent system to work automatically when the alarm sounds.*

*Please rest assured that the system is checked regularly and inspection reports are completed.*

*After further investigation, the only issue identified was the loose seals to the smoke vents on the other floors.*

*There was a separate leak to a heating pipe in the duct where the alarm panel was fitted and this damaged the old panel and required us to replace the panel with a new one. The new panel was larger than the old and did not fit in the duct; there was also a need to relocate away from the source of water'.*

The third response, again from Anthony Parkes dated 27<sup>th</sup> October 2010 was:

*'The system is designed to open a vent on the floor where a fire occurs allowing natural ventilation to help clear smoke to that floor. This functioned correctly,*

SA/25



*however, a small amount of smoke, when entering the vent, escaped onto other floors where the seals were not quite tight enough. So the mechanism actuated correctly.*

*A fault was noted on the panel. This was traced to a water leak above the panel. When replacing the water damaged panel the new panel was bigger so it was better to re-locate the panel than remove all the pipework.*

*We have not put a new fire alarm system in; furthermore, I can confirm that the LFB have been shown a number of times how and where the controls to the mechanical fan are.*

*This system is only activated once the fire is under control, otherwise it would pull additional air onto the source of the fire.*

*The recent Fire Risk Assessment of the communal areas of Grenfell Tower confirmed that the evacuation strategy for this block – in common with the overwhelming majority of RBKC's residential blocks – is "stay put" or what the fire brigade would refer to "defend in place". Specifically, as the block is a purpose-built block of self-contained dwellings the level of compartmentation means that if a fire breaks out elsewhere in the block residents should be safe to stay within their home with their front door closed. Clearly, this is only advice and residents have discretion to decide whether they should stay in their home or whether they would feel safer evacuating the building. Where they do evacuate then clearly they should close their front entrance door, use the staircase and not return to the building until the Fire Brigade advise that it is safe to do so – which is the advice given in the old fire procedure notices which are still in place throughout the block?*

#### Questions from Letter 1

1 Was it a minor fault if smoke seeps through seals that had not closed tightly?

#### Questions from Letter 2

1 Is it correct that officers who attended the incident did not know how the manual smoke vent fan? Would they have needed to use the fan if the fire alarm and vents were functioning at the time of the fire?

2 The TMO are looking to upgrade the smoke vent system to work automatically when the alarm sounds. Would you agree with us that there is no need to upgrade the system, if in the TMO's letters 1 and 3 the system functioned correctly?

3 The system is checked regularly and inspection reports completed. How often in your professional opinion should they be inspected and would that include testing, checking and maintenance of the vents?

4 Was any water damage or leaking water noticed by London Fire Brigade officers at the time of the incident, again in your professional opinion should a fire alarm panel be

SA/25

accessible for a member of security/London Fire Brigade to check at the time of an incident?

Questions from Letter 3

1 If a 'small' amount of smoke escaped onto other floors, how much smoke would it take to set off smoke on the floor above; then how much smoke in total would that be to also be the same amount to reach the other floors up to the 15<sup>th</sup> from the 6<sup>th</sup>?

2 If a 'small' amount of smoke escapes out to other floors through the vents, in your opinion, is the system working correctly?

3 Do you agree that defend in place is the correct procedure for Grenfell Tower?

We had a separate query regarding the Recycling procedure that the TMO had put in place. Residents were instructed to leave bags of recycling on their relevant floors communal area; we are of the opinion that the TMO were instructed NOT to tell residents to do this as it was a potential fire risk; needless to say it was these bags that were set on fire on the incident of the 30<sup>th</sup> April 2010.

Would you agree that the residents should not have been instructed to carry out that procedure?

SA/25