

11 July 2015

Dear David

Thank you for these letters, which do clarify things.

I was advised that the TMO would not engage with Pilgrim Tucker as she has no formal right to represent Grenfell Tower residents. The correct representational route is via the Residents' Association and/or the ward councillors. I understand that the residents were at that stage using neither mechanism. (Incidentally, I am a Unite Labour councillor).

However, I do agree it was discourteous of the TMO not to write and say this. It certainly delayed most of you from engaging with the ward councillors. Similarly, I understand that the TMO will not engage with you because you are a sub-tenant. Their argument is that you should raise these issues with Tunde and he should then raise them with the TMO. Again, it was discourteous not to advise you accordingly, but they should have responded immediately to the attempted break-in at your flat.

I recognise that we have not yet put up new notices setting out our revised councillors' surgery arrangements at the Leisure Centre, but during the General Election campaign we did put out several Notting Dale and other campaign newsletters through every door, which included our new surgery details. Indeed, several Grenfell Tower residents did come to see us and we took their individual concerns to the TMO as required, most of which were resolved satisfactorily - other than the request to have the HIU unit in the kitchen.

Subsequently Pilgrim Tucker asked for a meeting with me, which I agreed, at which I advised her that the reason she was getting no joy from the TMO was as set out above. I told her that the correct route was through either the RA or the councillors, and perhaps it is this that then prompted you all to come to our surgery? We were then able to progress matters and I hope we can progress things even further following on from today's meeting.

I propose to draw up a short note of what happened at the meeting and have it delivered to every household in the Tower so that everyone is updated. We will include in that note details of our surgeries, so that residents can come and see us if they have concerns with which we can assist.

Incidentally, your point about the stair access is well made. This was also raised by both the Residents' Association and the ward councillors with the TMO at the time when the ramp from the walkway to the ground was removed.

I checked the original planning permission to see if it had been agreed to remove the ramp and it had - unfortunately this item was buried deep in the document and was extremely vague. I then sought legal advice about the reduced disability access to the walkway and I also took Kiran Singh, Siobhan Rumble and a young mother with a child in a pushchair on a walkabout to see how the extended walk to the station end of the walkway disadvantages residents with mobility issues, heavy shopping and small children. Sadly, the legal advice was that disability access is not a requirement because of the age of the buildings, which I personally think is outrageous.

We asked the planners why they had approved the removal of the ramp without looking at the consequences and their response was somewhat unsympathetic. They made the point that disability

access remains at the station end of the walkway.

We also asked for a lift to be installed from the ground floor to the walkway as a part of the refurbishment of the Tower and were told (a) that it was not practical; and when we pointed out that there had been a lift there in the distant past, that (b) they would not put one in because it was likely to be vandalised. So I am afraid we lost that one too.

I thought today's meeting was very helpful and was very relieved that Mr. Daffarn was for once very restrained. This also helped matters - and I think Mr. Maddison was rather surprised at the strength of feelings expressed. We will urge him to reflect constructively on what he heard.

Kind regards.

Judith and Robert