
From: srumble@kctmo.org.uk
To: [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, 13 Aug 2012 12:29:55 +0100
Subject: RA Status

Good Morning Eddie,

I have been contacted by Yvonne Birch with regards to you wanting to set up an resident association for the Tower. As there is already a residents association for Lancaster West I am unsure as to why you would want to set up another?

Could you not send a representative from the tower to the current residents association?

Siobhan Rumble
Neighbourhood Manager – Lancaster West Estate



w: www.kctmo.org.uk
a: Grenfell Tower, Grenfell Road, London, W11 1TQ
 Before printing, please think about the environment

From: Eddie daffarn [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2012 1:19 PM
To: Siobhan Rumble
Cc: Francis verity action group; councillor blakeman; caeli rbkc engagement team; Janet Edwards; teresa miles emb; christine von richer RA
Subject: RE: RA Status

Dear Siobhan,

Thank you for your email.

Please can you set up a meeting so that members of the Grenfell Action Group can discuss the reasons why we wish to be recognised as a separate RA on Lancaster West with yourself, Yvonne Birch and Janet Edwards?

The Grenfell Action Group may also request the presence of Caeli Christianson from Kensington and Chelsea Council's Resident Engagement Team who is familiar with our Groups history and future aims.

There seems to be a lot of confusion as to the TMO's understanding of who the Grenfell Action Group are and who we seek to represent which a meeting should help clarify.

The Grenfell Action Group has a two year history of working harmoniously with the existing Lanc West RA and other stakeholders but we believe that we have a fundamental right to be recognised as a separate RA type organisation acting as a positive and productive force for promoting the Estate's diverse resident's views.

Please provide me with some dates when this meeting could take place, if you find this an agreeable way forward?

Kind regards,
Edward Daffarn

Grenfell Action Group
<http://grenfellactiongroup.wordpress.com/>

From: Eddie daffarn [<mailto:> [REDACTED]]
Sent: 21 August 2012 09:43
To: Janet Edwards
Cc: teresa miles emb; Siobhan Rumble; caeli rbkc engagement team
Subject: Re: Grenfell Action Group

Dear Janet,
Thank you for taking the time to meet with Teresa Miles and I yesterday.
The Grenfell Action Group would like you to put in writing the TMOs reasons for refusing to recognise us as a legitimate RA operating on Lancaster West Estate.
Despite your assertions to the contrary, there is no reference (explicit or otherwise) in the "Guide to your Resident Association and Local Compact Groups" that states that only one RA type group can operate in a locality.
We, therefore assume the decision by the TMO to deny the Grenfell Action Group RA status was taken informally and without guidance.
Under FOI please can you send us the names of TMO officers present and the minutes of the meeting where this matter was discussed and the decision to deny us RA status made?
The Grenfell Action Group believe that the TMO should do everything in their powers to encourage resident participation and not act to exclude those who wish to have their voice heard.
We believe it is highly discriminatory and unjust of the TMO not to formally recognise our existence and the Grenfell Action Group will be taking legal advice with regards the probity of the TMOs decision.
Thank you for your assistance with this matter,
Kind regards,
Edward Daffarn
Grenfell Action Group
<http://grenfellactiongroup.wordpress.com/>

From: Janet Edwards [<mailto:jedwards@kctmo.org.uk>]
Sent: 22 August 2012 16:33
To: 'Eddie daffarn'
Cc: 'teresa miles emb'; Rumble, Siobhan: RBKCTMO Ltd; Angela Bosnjak-Szekeres; Christianson, Caeli: CP-PPU; Yvonne Birch; Bangura, Mamusu: RBKCTMO Ltd
Subject: RE: Grenfell Action Group

Dear Eddie

Please see below notes of the meeting held on Monday 20 August at which we discussed your request to formally recognise the Grenfell Tower Action Group as an RA. The main points raised by you were as follows:

- 1) that the GTA Group was established approximately two years ago in order to formally raise concerns about the building of the Academy on a site adjacent to Grenfell Tower;
- 2) that you felt that the Group were not consulted by the Council on the building of the Academy;
- 3) that the GTA Group enjoyed a harmonious relationship with the existing RA, although there were fundamental differences in the way both groups operated;
- 4) that the GTA Group wanted to be recognised as a Residents' Association by the TMO (in the same way that the Group were being recognised by RBKC Community

Engagement Team) as the Group also dealt with various residents and estate matters which you felt were not being dealt with effectively by the existing RA;

In response to the points raised by you (above), you were advised of the following:

- 1) that as there was currently an RA in existence on the estate, the TMO could not recognise the Group as a formal RA.
- 2) That the Group consider becoming a sub-group of the existing RA, in order to highlight and raise concerns relating to issues affecting residents on the estate.
- 3) That the TMO were happy to attend meetings and events organised by your Group on receipt of an invitation, and that they were happy to provide any necessary support and advice to the Group as required.
- 4) That RBKC could recognise the Group by means of adding the Group to the database to be consulted on matters relating to the RBKC community.

I have forwarded your FOI request to our Company Secretary, and have been advised that as the TMO does not recognise more than one RA covering the same estate, by custom and practice this was not a formal meeting or discussion. In addition, this point has not been expressly covered in our literature or in any published guidance I can find. The reason that this is not stated, is that it is generally given as self evident that only one group can claim to represent residents of one estate.

In order to clarify this further I have sought advice from TPAS (Tenancy Participation Advisory Service) for their opinion on this matter. Their advice was as follows:

We would discourage any landlord from supporting and recognizing two TRAs on the same estate. Relations between the two groups may well be amicable at present but in our experience conflict at some point is almost inevitable at which point the landlord will be called upon to arbitrate.

Then there's the question of which group best represents the estate and from which views would be sought if consultation where required.

Then there's how it can be justified from a VFM position, if both are funded.

Unless the groups represent different people altogether we would encourage them to unite under the auspices of one group and refuse to offer recognition to any rival group.

I hope this clarifies our position on this matter.

Janet Edwards
Resident Engagement Manager
K&C TMO
292a Kensal Road
London W10 5BE

Tel: [redacted] begin_of_the_skype_highlighting [redacted]
[redacted] end_of_the_skype_highlighting
e-mail: jedwards@kctmo.org.uk



From: Caeli.Christianson@rbkc.gov.uk
To: jedwards@kctmo.org.uk; [redacted]
CC: [redacted]; srumble@kctmo.org.uk; abosnjakszekeres@kctmo.org.uk;

ybirch@kctmo.org.uk; mbangura@kctmo.org.uk

Subject: RE: Grenfell Action Group

Date: Wed, 22 Aug 2012 15:39:13 +0000

Dear Eddie/all,

Only thing to add from me is to clarify that TPAS is the national body and primary authority on best practice regarding Tenants, Landlords and the Government. They do research with these groups, represent interests and provide ongoing guidance. They are an independent body and work with housing associations, tenant management organisations and tenant and resident associations across England. You can learn more about them here:

<http://www.tpas.org.uk/>

Best,

Caeli

Caeli Christianson | Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Community Engagement Project Officer | caeli.christianson@rbkc.gov.uk | [REDACTED]

begin_of_the_skype_highlighting [REDACTED] end_of_the_skype_highlighting |

www.citylivinglocallife.org | Town Hall, Hornton Street, London W8 7NX

From: Eddie daffarn [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

Sent: 24 August 2012 13:24

To: Christianson, Caeli: CP-PPU

Cc: teresa miles emb; Francis verity action group

Subject: RE: Grenfell Action Group

Dear Caeli,

I have just spoken to Jon Warnock who is the Head Policy Advisor at TPAS.

Jon has indicated that he was not supplied with a rounded picture before he responded to Janet Edwards earlier enquiry when he recommended for the TMO to exclude the Grenfell Action Group from formal recognition.

In light of getting a balanced view, Jon has decided to review his decision and write to Janet Edwards informing her that it is now TPAS's position that it is "incumbent" on the TMO to recognise the Grenfell Action Group.

We will see what happens.....

Have a lovely weekend,

Best,

Edward Daffarn

Grenfell Action Group

<http://grenfellaactiongroup.wordpress.com/>

From: Jon Warnock [<mailto:Jon.Warnock@tpas.org.uk>]

Sent: 03 September 2012 10:21

To: jedwards@kctmo.org

Cc: Eddie daffarn

Subject: Grenfell Action Group

Good morning Janet

You will recall that you sought guidance from TPAS recently regarding the establishment and support of a second residents association on one of your estates and that we advised against supporting a second RA due to problems of antipathy and conflict that commonly results. There are of course limitations to the advice we can give in regard to such matters without being in possession of the full

details. In these circumstances we give a general view that reflects an aggregate position. There will of course always be exceptions to that position.

Having subsequently been contacted by Edward Daffron from the Grenfell Action Group I am of the opinion that this case is the exception. Although he expressed what appear to be legitimate concerns about the ability of the existing RA to represent the interests of all residents on the estate Mr Daffron is adamant that his group is not 'a rival' to Lancaster West RA and in fact intends to work in collaboration with them.

I am sufficiently convinced by the argument put forward to conclude that you should seek to find a way to support Grenfell Action Group and establish a harmonious position between it and the existing group. I would suggest a tripartite agreement between the two groups and KCTMO which sets out the respective roles and responsibilities but focuses heavily on the collaborative nature of the relationship. I would also set out a dispute resolution process that could be pursued if relations between the groups should deteriorate. You may want to consider arbitration and mediation as the final stages of this process. As you may know, TPAS are experienced in both these disciplines and we would be happy to be named in the process if all parties were in agreement.

I hope this helps to clarify our position and I am sorry if our original advice has caused any confusion. From our point of view this situation has made it clear that we need to add a disclaimer to the advice we offer making it clear that it is based only the information provided to us and the situation on the ground can often be far more complex than we appreciate.

Please contact me if you wish to discuss any of the above.

Regards

Jon

Jon Warnock
Head of Consultancy
TPAS Consultancy

Quality Assured Scrutiny (QAS) is the framework of standards and new tenant scrutiny accreditation from TPAS, HouseMark and CIH. For further information and to download the briefing paper visit: www.tpas.org.uk/qualityassuredscrutiny

From: Yvonne Birch [mailto:ybirch@kctmo.org.uk]

Sent: 08 October 2012 14:05

To: 'Eddie daffarn'

Cc: Francis verity action group; jon tpas; caeli rbkc engagement team; Siobhan Rumble

Subject: RE: Grenfell Action Group

Dear Eddie

I am sorry that due to annual leave you have had to wait so long for a reply to your emails requesting that the TMO recognises the Grenfell Action Group as an additional recognised Residents Association for Lancaster West.

However we have now had an opportunity to consider all the aspects and I have to tell you that we stand by our original decision that it is not good practice to have 2 residents associations on an estate that represent the views of all residents.

We have discussed our reasons at our previous meeting and although we have now had additional advice from TPAS we do not believe that the arrangements suggested in terms of tripartite agreement with the TMO requiring a dispute resolution process including arbitration and mediation are a workable option. We also have to consider that in addition to the existing RA residents also elect an Estate Management Board that works on behalf of the estate.

I am sorry if you are disappointed with this but I can assure you that the TMO will continue to respond to your group and are happy to attend meetings and consider any support that you may need.

Yvonne Birch
Director of People and Performance

t: [REDACTED]

m. [REDACTED]



w: www.kctmo.org.uk

a: 346 Kensington High Street, London, W14 8NS