

# GRENFELL TOWER INQUIRY

Osborne Berry Installations Limited  
(Osborne Berry)

---

## Opening Submissions for Phase 2 Module 3

---

### Introduction

1. The witness accounts for Phase 2 Module 3 that include complaints regarding the topic of windows, in Osborne Berry's submission fall into two categories:
  - a. Issues with the tilt and turn window mechanisms; and/or
  - b. Draughts and gaps around the windows caused by the internal window reveal work.
2. The Inquiry has heard evidence on these points at various stages in Phase 2 Module 1<sup>1</sup>, and Mark Osborne and Graham Berry have given evidence to the Inquiry to clarify the work that was completed by them, and work that was completed by others<sup>2</sup>.

### Tilt and turn windows

3. Mark Osborne and Graham Berry were involved in responding to reported defects with the tilt and turn window mechanisms when requested by Harley. In Osborne Berry's experience, tilt and turn windows can present operational problems to those not used to operating them. Notably many of the disclosed witnesses in this topic report no problems in operating the installed windows; others seem to repeatedly struggle to operate them.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, Stephen Blake (inquiry Transcript Day 29, Pages 179-181); Gary Martin (Inquiry Transcript Day 30, Pages 90-91).

<sup>2</sup> On days 43 and 44 respectively.

4. When required to by Harley, Osborne Berry attended the flats at Grenfell Tower where defects with the tilt and turn windows were reported. The reported defects with the windows parts and mechanisms were resolved on each occasion by replacing broken parts or adjusting the mechanisms.
5. The issues disclosed in the witness statements regarding the tilt and turn windows tended to involve user problems with the mechanisms of the windows, and the manufacturer-provided parts of the windows themselves, rather than problems with process of the installation of the windows units by Osborne Berry.
6. In Mr. Towner's witness statement<sup>3</sup>, he refers to an email of the 16<sup>th</sup> October 2015 from Chris Holt to Ben Bailey, cc'ing Lynda Prentice and Simon Lawrence at Rydon where there had been concern raised regarding some of the window handles not being completely vertical when in a locked position facing down. The email reports how Mark Osborne (in the email referred to as 'Taff' ) had been asked about this and had responded that the handles were within the required tolerances and suggested that a visit by the window manufacturer might be appropriate if any further reassurances on that issue were required. This email provides an example of how Osborne Berry were involved in providing assistance during the defects process over and above the simple replacement or fixing of broken parts, and that they would refer parties to the window manufacturer when issues regarding the manufacture (rather than the installation) of the windows arose.

#### Draughts and gaps caused by the internal window reveal work

7. The Inquiry has heard evidence in Phase 2 Module 1<sup>4</sup> about the internal window reveal work being completed by SD Plastering as directed by Rydon, rather than Osborne Berry as sub-contractors of Harley. Numerous witnesses<sup>5</sup> report in their witness statements observing the internal window reveal work being completed, noting the

---

<sup>3</sup> Luke Towner {IWS00001705\_0002}.

<sup>4</sup> Fox example, see evidence of Mark Dixon (Inquiry Transcript Day 44, page 91 onwards).

<sup>5</sup> Including Wintom Temesgen {IWS00001800}, and Marcio Gomes {IWS00001734}.

cutting of the rigid foam insulation packing, installation of plastic windowsills and silicone work.

8. We respectfully submit that the complaints involving gaps and draughts around the windows are as a consequence of the internal window reveal work, which was completed by SD Plastering upon the instruction of Rydon, rather than the installation of the window units themselves (work that was completed by Osborne Berry).
9. Osborne Berry were not involved in any of the remedial work regarding gaps, or draughts because this related to internal window reveal work. Osborne Berry were therefore not the workmen referred to in several of the disclosed witness statements using expanding foam to fill gaps around windows in response to reported draughts<sup>6</sup>, or using silicone to do similar.

### Conclusion

10. The Inquiry is invited to conclude that the identified defects with the tilt and turn windows tended to be as a consequence of either:
  - a. Problems with the mechanisms and/or handles as a result of the manufacturing process, rather than the installation process; or
  - b. Issues arising out of user unfamiliarity with the correct method of operating the tilt and turn windows.
11. Further, the Inquiry is invited to conclude that the issues involving draughts and gaps in the window reveals were as a consequence of the internal window reveal work, rather than the window installation itself, and that any remedial work in this regard was not required to be (and nor was it) completed by Osborne Berry.

Osborne Berry Installations Limited  
Stephen Rimmer LLP

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, David Collins {IWS00002334\_0022}.