

WITNESS STATEMENT

Criminal Procedure Rules, r27.2; Criminal Justice Act 1967, s.9; Magistrates' Courts Act 1980, s.5b

Statement of: DADABHOY, SUHAIL

Age if under 18: Over 18 (if over 18 insert 'over 18')

Occupation: FIRE ENGINEERING LIAISON OFFICER

This statement (consisting of 7 page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature: S DADABHOY

Date: 14/09/2020

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded ☐ (supply witness details on rear)

This statement is further to statements I have already provided, in relation to the Grenfell Tower investigation, to the police in and the Grenfell Tower Public Inquiry dated, 01/02/2019 and 02/08/2019.

I am happy with the contents of those statements and I am aware that information and excerpts from those statements will be referred to and incorporated within this statement.

In this statement I will mention the following colleagues from the LFB: Steve LUMB, Lynsey SEAL, Nick COMERY, Gareth STEELE, Dan HALLISSEY, Rebecca BURTON, Hayden JULIAN and David GREEN.

I will also mention Janice WRAY and Claire WILLIAMS from the Kensington & Chelsea Tenants Management Organisation (KCTMO), and their Fire Risk Assessor, Carl STOKES.

I will also make reference to published articles, presentations and reports, relating to the matters being discussed, by authors who are not personally known by me.

I Suhail Farook DADABHOY have been employed by the London fire Brigade, (LFB), since 2004 as Fire Safety Inspecting Officer (FSIO). My current role is as a Transport FSIO, within the Transport Team, Business Support Group (BSG), based at LFB Headquarters.

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

I have been trained by the LFB for that role and undertake ongoing development in fire safety. I have completed my Fire Safety Diploma (level 4) and studying for a Fire Risk Engineering, BEng (Hons) degree. The London Fire Brigade is sponsoring my studies, to support my role in fire engineering consultations, which form integral parts of most transport infrastructure projects.

I was based within the LFB Hammersmith & Fulham Borough fire safety team since starting in the LFB until my elected transfer to the Transport Team BSG in September 2015. The LFB Hammersmith & Fulham Borough fire safety team was incorporated with the Brigade's Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea (RBKC) team, to form a larger Fire Safety Team in April 2012. The Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea Fire Safety Team (TEAM) are part of the LFB Fire safety regulatory framework that covers the London area.

The Team consists of LFB FSIO's, who principally carry out inspections of commercial premises within the London Boroughs of Hammersmith and Fulham and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, in accordance with the fire safety legislation, the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 (RRO).

The Order empowers the LFB, as the enforcing authority, to carry out inspections and consultations with other agencies and authorities.

As of April 2012, my desk was located on the third floor, within the fire safety team offices within Kensington Fire Station. As part of my day to day duties, I would check fire incidents within the two London boroughs, assess if post fire inspections were required. These could be any fire scenario from smoke to a fully developed fire, the address of the premises would be checked against the FARYNOR system for details around the last inspection (if one was ever carried out) and depending on comments made by the attending fire crew as to whether we would need to visit the site. I also carried out research in preparation to carry out fire safety inspections of commercial premises. I would also undertake a duty officer role for the team, this would involve contacting every member on duty to ensure they were safe and on route to their respective destinations. The team duty officer would also field calls and assist with

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

OFFICIAL

enquires from the public. This was on rotation within the borough and a larger pan London rotation where I would conduct the role from LFB HQ.

In my early days as an FSIO, there would be joint site visits at specific locations such as retirement homes alongside the local station if an audit or inspection would be required. This was in line with the policy at the time to improve the communication and working understanding between fire safety and those who are operational. This only occurred a handful of times and would sometime be coincidental if I was at a premises and a crew arrived to do a 72d visit. A direction from the LFB that comes around every now and then to improve the relationship between the different teams would be a pre-arranged joint visit. We would have to arrange it by inviting the other department personally. Within the transport team, we don't do this. There is an understanding that we invite crews to attend and conduct a visit at relevant transport hubs.

The process now, is that if we spot an issue at a site that requires a station based crew to attend then I will complete a station notification form and our written recommendations are emailed over to the Station Commander, Borough Commander, Fire safety admin and Transport admin. Any major problems that are passed over, the local crew should amend this information on the MDT system. I tend to include pictures with the narrative to give a clear understanding for those that attend to rectify the problem. If the problem is down to the person in charge then I would send it over to the relevant department within either TFL, Network Rail, Thames Water etc. The notification would still get copied to the local station commander and my team leaderships so they were aware.

If an audit or inspection isn't up to the standard expected within the role then the job can be reviewed and the team leader will have two options in this situation. They can either go out again with the person who did the initial visit and use this as learning to assist where there may be gaps in the knowledge of the FSIO or they may ask another FSIO instead. This may be some personality clash at the site between various parties on the day of a visit so another FSIO would be asked to check the premises instead. There are times where things are missed but again, this is used as a way to learn and develop your fire safety knowledge.

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

OFFICIAL

My experience as a FSIO, gave me the privilege to inspect special premises under the following designations; Diplomatic Missions (Foreign Embassies), Football Stadium (Chelsea, Fulham and QPR), Heritage Buildings (Museums of South Kensington) and all the Schools within both London boroughs.

As part of my day to day duties, I would liaise with watches based at fire stations, local authority teams, housing providers & responsible persons. I was also the officer responsible for reducing false and unwanted fire alarm activations that lead to brigade attendance. I officially started this role on 6th September 2007, when I presented the Action Plan to the then Borough Commander Steve LUMB at Hammersmith Fire Station.

My first bi-monthly meeting with the Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation (KCTMO) took place on 16th October 2012 at 11:00 (according to my Outlook 2010 Calendar entry) at their offices (The Network Hub, 300 Kensal Road, W10 5BE). The meeting invite was organised by my then Team Leader Nicholas COMERY. The invite was sent to me on Wednesday 26th September 2012 at 16:13 and I accepted 27th September 2012 at 06:36. The bi-monthly LFB and KCTMO liaison meeting was chaired by Janice WRAY (Health, Safety and Facilities Manager KCTMO)

I would go on and attend most of the meetings with my Team Leader until my final bi monthly LFB and KCTMO liaison meeting on 19th August 2015 at 10:00-11:30. The Station Manager of North Kensington fire station Dan HALLISSEY also attended the bi monthly meetings.

My principle role was to prepare and discuss fire alarm actuations at KCTMO supported housing schemes. My aim was to explore methods to reduce false alarm activations at the schemes, which were leading to brigade attendance. The properties were small flats with full smoke detection systems for vulnerable older persons with varying abilities and disabilities. I regularly discussed various options to reduce false alarms with the KCTMO in the liaison meetings, including reviewing the placement of smoke detectors and various modern types of detectors. I would look at the relevant Fire Risk assessments (FRA) conducted on behalf of the local authority by their assessor Carl STOKES. These are vital pieces of information that we use as they identify significant findings. Without pointing the finger at individuals, in my experience an FRA can be conducted to benefit an authority using the control measures based on the significant findings. I also conducted tenant education campaigns, which involved short presentations

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

OFFICIAL

for tenants and a discussion prior to an inspection at the scheme. The policy to replace leaseholder flat front doors with certified 30 minute fire doors was a continual agenda item. The KCTMO would provide a status of their efforts and difficulties negotiating with leaseholders. To my best recollection, the KCTMO were moving forward, albeit slowly and exploring various legal means to do so. Other issues that I have seen were discussed during these meetings where the dry rising main, premises information plates and the door closers at Grenfell tower. Unfortunately due to the time passed since attending I don't recall any details around these topics.

Having reviewed the KCTMO bi-monthly meeting minutes for April 2014, I vaguely recollect a discussion with Claire WILLIAMS KCTMO on smoke ventilation calculations for a proposed system at Grenfell Tower. The minutes state that I advised her that I was Fire Engineering Liaison Officer (FELO) for the borough team. I was advised by Claire WILLIAMS that a smoke calculation proposal for Grenfell Tower would be forwarded for consideration. Having reviewed the KCTMO bi-monthly meeting minutes for 2014, I am quoted advising the chair of the meeting, that previously discussed smoke calculations for Grenfell Tower had not been forwarded. Therefore no further progress has been made. I am also quoted as stating that my FELO role provides a conduit to the LFB Fire Engineering Team. I do not recollect receiving the smoke ventilation calculation pre-proposal for Grenfell Tower from Clare WILLIAMS KCTMO. To the best of my knowledge, no informal or formal consultation took place on the matter with myself and the KCTMO.

Having reviewed the KCTMO bi-monthly meeting minutes for September 2014, Claire WILLIAMS confirmed that works at Grenfell Tower were in progress, including the ventilation system. The ventilation system was being 'upgraded/refurbished' with plans, still being finalised and an estimated completion date of Christmas 2014. To the best of my recollection, no discussion with regards to the smoke calculation pre-proposal for Grenfell Tower from Clare WILLIAMS KCTMO took place at this meeting. The Minutes state that the fire risk assessor Carl STOKES was overseeing the fire risks during works. The minutes also state that contractors, Rydon were liaising with local Station Manager Dan HALLISSEY (North Kensington Fire Station) to ensure LFB fire appliance access during works. I do not have any specific memory of this meeting, but I do not have any reason to think the minutes are wrong. Occasionally I would contact the local crews at North Kensington Fire Station to discuss a particular

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

supported housing premises, which the crews had become familiar with due to the levels of fire alarm activations. I don't know who exactly the FELO for Grenfell Tower was.

As part of my duties and in accordance with Fire Safety Information & Guidance Note (FSIGN 501), I dealt with consultations of LFB under section 15 of the Building Act 1984, the Building (Approved inspectors etc.) Regulations 2000 Regulation 13 and Articles 45 and 46 of the Order. The duty to consult rests in all cases with the Building Control Bodies (BCB).

The Building Control Bodies (BCB) either Local Authority Building Control Authorities or Approved Inspectors, would submit building consultations in the form of a document comprising of a cover sheet detailing their identity, location and intent under the legislation to consult the fire authority. The series of documents, typically included a fire strategy that details the existing physical site, existing fire safety measures and the proposed changes. The proposed material changes in the report, typically outline the impact on fire safety, therefore leading to either enhancements to fire safety measures, or maintenance to ensure the same standard of fire safety is maintained. Where proposed changes reduce the level of fire safety protection, the proposal may be rejected or re-evaluated with specific compensatory features (e.g. site specific suppression or ventilation systems etc.). As part of my consultation by BCB's, I have a statutory responsibility to consider two primary areas of the building regulations (Means of warning and escape, and Access and facilities for the fire and rescue service).

One of the principle guidance document used by BCB's and the LFB is the Approved Document B Volume 2: Buildings other than Dwelling Houses· 2006 edition incorporating 2007, 2010 and 2013 amendments (ADBV2). ADBV2 outlines the guidance on the two primary areas of the building regulations concerned in the consultation. Section B1 Means of warning and escape, and Section B5 Access and facilities for the fire and rescue service. ADBV2 defines - Section B1 - Means of warning and escape 'the building shall be designed and constructed so that there are appropriate provisions for the early warning of fire, and appropriate means of escape in case of fire from the building to place of safety outside the building capable of being safely and effectively use at all times.

ADBV2 defines - Section B5- Access and facilities for the fire and rescue service;

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

OFFICIAL

- a) The building shall be design and constructed so as to provide reasonable facilities to assist firefighters in the protection of life.
- b) Reasonable provision shall be made within the site of the building to enable fire appliances to gain access to the building

As an LFB FSIO consulting with a BCB, it is expected that the BCB has reviewed the proposal it has received from the client and ensured that it complies with B1 and 85 guidance set out in ADBV2 or equivalent. In all cases it is expected the BCB has provided sufficient information and comments, stating acceptance, rejection or acceptance under specific conditions. It is my duty to review the B1 and B5 elements of the proposal and compare the comments of the BCB and this is done using my knowledge and experience independently to what has been written. The outcome of my consultation, would result in a Portable Document File (PDF) letter with comments, which I would email to the BCB as an attachment and cc FSR Admin (LFB Fire Safety Regulation Administration Team mailbox). The policy at the time (December 2014) was for FSR Admin to upload the email and PDF to the fire safety portal as a permanent record and close the job process.

These type of building consultation tasks are classified as D Jobs within the LFB and raised on the FARYNOR computer database and listed on my electronic workload. I carried out 99 individual D Jobs during the timeframe of April 2014 to March 2015.

The way that my role uses this system is essentially to manage my personal workload showing 'live' jobs that are in progress and a history of completed jobs, there is access to raise and close jobs within the scope of the role. I have review and edit authorisation for the created jobs when an email notification comes in. The jobs have different classifications depending on the task required, for example an audit would be classed as an FS01 job, and consultations with local authorities or the public are 'E' jobs.

I began to review D Job Number 1456940 on the 12th December 2014 (FARYNOR file number 12/020696), Grenfell Tower, Grenfell Road, London W11 1TH. This was the only consultation job relating to Grenfell Tower that I worked on.

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

OFFICIAL

The proposed works stated on the RBKC cover sheet (dated 11th November 2014 - LFB date stamped 18th November 2014) included, their intent to consult under article 45 of the 'Order for new floor areas, new over cladding & windows, new heating system, reconfigured podium and entrance. BCB will often outline all proposed works in their titles (e.g. like new heating systems and windows) The BCB form, Section 5 - Fire Brigade comments, specifically stipulates that the brigade should comment on the Means of warning and escape, and Access and facilities for the fire and rescue service. Although the BCB provide and enclose bespoke forms, the LFB will always respond to B1 and B5 D Job consultations on LFB template letters.

Enclosed with the RBKC cover sheet was the following documents: 1279(05)101 REV00, 1279(05)102 Rev00, 1279(06)100 Rev00, 1279(08) 101 issue 01, 1279(08) 100 issue 01. Also included: Memorandum – B1 Means of Escape Observations and Outline Fire Safety Strategy.

I reviewed the B1 Means of Escape Observations and Outline Fire Safety Strategy and concurred with the RBKC Building Control Officers observations and conditions outlined in the internal Memorandum on 12th December 2014. The BCB officer surmised that 'RBKC are not in a position to approve the proposals at this stage due to the need for the design team to establish an acceptable extract rate for the powered lobby ventilation system and the provision of ventilated lobby protection to all stairway connections to residential and other uses'. Each smoke ventilation system will be bespoke to the building based on calculations depending on the volume area of what you are protecting, in the case of Grenfell it would be a staircase and where the inlets would be positioned. A small built premises could be fitted with a standard 'off the shelf' system if necessary but for a tall building these wouldn't be sufficient as the volume requirements could mean that the extraction fan fitted would either be under or over powered. An under powered system wouldn't do its job properly in protecting areas and an over powered system would prevent doors from being opened due to the positive pressure system. This would fall within our remit and the BCB suggestions as a fire safety strategy.

I considered the means of escape elements proposed in the Exova Grenfell Outline Fire Safety Strategy as compliant on conditions and observations set out by the BCB officer. I considered the British standard escaping lighting proposed in the Exova Grenfell Outline Fire Safety Strategy as compliant. The means of warning elements proposed in the Exova Grenfell Outline Fire Safety Strategy, focusses on the proposed

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

OFFICIAL

Nursery and Office accommodation. The proposal states that these occupancies will be provided with standalone manual (break glass call point) fire alarm systems with no smoke detection in accordance with British standards (BS 5839:1 (M)). New apartments would be provided with one or more interlinked mains powered smoke alarms with an integral stand-by supply in accordance with British standards (BS 5839:6 (LD3)). I considered this element compliant, on conditions and observations set out by the BCB officer.

The Access and facilities for the fire and rescue service elements proposed in the Exova Grenfell Outline Fire Safety Strategy, outline a new dry rising inlet within 18m of a possible fire appliances location. The strategy further outlines if the ground floor entry is used by crews, therefore the stair would be used to access the mezzanine floors. The existing stairs form part of the fire-lighting shaft serving the building, therefore will be constructed to a 120 minute fire resisting standard to comply with B5. The strategy document further outlines locations and their conforming fire resisting standards. I considered these elements compliant, on conditions and observations set out by the BCB officer. To the best of my recollection at the time, I considered the proposal compliant, on condition the BCB officer's conditions were met. The principle BCB condition was a fully detailed and calculated smoke ventilation proposal that could justify B1 and B5 compliance.

I prepared an official response letter from the brigade's word letter template wizard to draft a D Job building consultation response stating that the fire authority was satisfied with the proposals, subject to 'The Building Control Officers observations and conditions'. The D Job response letter was sent as a PDF file via email to Mr HOBAN RBKC Building Control Officer (building.control@rbkc.gov.uk) and cc'd to FSR-Admin Support at 08:12 on 12th December 2014. The job progress sheet on FARYNOR step 50.00 was entered as 12/12/2014 'Email BCO/Approved Inspector'. In accordance with policy at the time (December 2014), FSR Admin would have uploaded the email and PDF to the fire safety portal as a permanent record and closed the job process.

On my return to duty in the New Year (January 2015), the D Job was still open on my electronic FARYNOR Workload. Occasionally jobs may remain open, if FSR Admin have overlooked or missed the open job. In this case I assumed FSR Admin had missed closing out the job and because my open jobs are not considered in monthly quota targets, I completed the job on FARYNOR 06/01/2015.

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

OFFICIAL

I was advised in June 2017 that the original email I sent the BCB had been traced, but the PDF response letter attachment was missing.

To the best of my recollection, an attachment was sent, but due to the passage of time, I do not have a definite recollection. It is possible that I may have not attached the letter and therefore I asked if my emails in the days and weeks after the 12th of December 2014 contained the missing attachment. I can confirm that Lynsey SEAL in the Fire Engineering team advised me that the original email that I sent to the Building Control Bodies had been traced, but that the PDF response letter attachment was missing. Several members of the LFB have since asked me to produce this document but it hasn't been possible due to the system in place. When these emails are sent, any documents attached will be held in a 'holding drive' which then cleanses itself once the system is restarted so tracing it back would only be possible if the recipient responded by stating that there was no attachment. On the occasions this happened, I would re write and review the email/documents and follow the same distribution process. Its human error so does obviously happen, but with this particular email it has never been queried with me until the background information for Grenfell was being looked into.

In the role of Fire Engineering Liaison Officer (FELO), there are quarterly Continual Progression Development (CPD) events hosted by the LFB where we would have various presentations and talks covering relevant areas and topics we should be made aware of. I was asked during this interview around a specific CPD in July 2016 presented by David GREEN from the Fire Engineering team titled 'Facades on Tall Buildings'. It is possible that I would have been in attendance for this talk but don't recall it from memory. When these days are completed, any relevant fire safety presentations are stored within the fire safety folders on our internal SharePoint programme for access in the future if required. The information we receive on the CPD days would usually be shared during a team meeting internally.

The only time I've ever directly delivered a presentation to watches at a fire station was when the RRO first came out and the LFB wanted operational firefighters to have an understanding of fire safety and fire risk assessments. These were arranged personally by myself within my local borough at the time.

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Statement of: DADABHOY, SUHAIL

Form MG11(T)

Page 11 of 11

The documents I have referred to and the consultation document pack from the BCB have previously been exhibited to the MPS by my LFB colleague Lynsey SEAL under her details as LAS/17 to LAS/21.

Signature: S DADABHOY
2021

Signature witnessed by:

OFFICIAL