

**GRENFELL TOWER
PUBLIC INQUIRY**

**Witness Statement of
Rock Feilding-Mellen**

I, Rock Feilding-Mellen, WILL SAY:

1. I make this Witness Statement further to receipt of the Rule 9 letter from the Public Inquiry dated 12 July 2018 and to provide assistance to the Public Inquiry.
2. The matters contained in this statement are either known to me or are ones which I believe (in which case I have specifically said so) or are derived from records including computer records maintained by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea ('the Borough', 'RBKC', 'the Council,') and to which I have access and with which I am familiar and which I believe to be accurate.
3. I have made a statement to the Police. I consent to my Police statement being disclosed to the Public Inquiry for use in evidence.
4. In this statement, if I do not speak to any particular issue as set out in the Rule 9 letter, it is not because I do not think those questions are important, but because I do not know the answers and do not wish to make assumptions. I will only speak about matters that I have personal knowledge of.
5. However, before I start I want to express once again my sincere condolences to all those who lost loved ones, or who lost their homes and possessions, in that terrible fire on 14th June 2017. Like everyone who lived near the tower and who witnessed the tragedy, I will have to live with the memories of that early morning for the rest of my life. Even

10. All councillors must perform their role as a ward councillor, representing the best interests of the ward as a whole within the Town Hall and also dealing with case work from individual residents or households living in the ward. As a ward councillor, I got a good understanding of the issues facing people living within the ward through a range of media: I received many emails or letters from residents about problems they wanted help with; I met residents at surgeries or ward meetings that we held; I attended meetings of Residents Associations; I canvassed the streets with my fellow ward councillors, knocking on doors and asking residents what issues they might need our help with; and I attended a host of other meetings, such as with the local Police or with local charities to discuss a range of issues.
11. In addition to that, councillors were given various roles within the Town Hall, which broadly speaking were divided into “the Cabinet” and “backbenchers”.
12. The Leader of the Council was elected by the full Council, but that effectively meant being elected by the majority group, which during my time on the Council was always the Conservative group. The Leader would then appoint between seven and nine other councillors to form the Cabinet, with each Cabinet Member representing the Cabinet’s political supervision over a department or departments within the Council.
13. The Cabinet formed the political executive, which provided strategic direction to the council as an organisation. The Cabinet set policies, priorities and objectives and approved major projects and budgets. Most big decisions were taken by the Cabinet acting collectively. Decisions relating to any expenditure over a particular value, as set by the Council’s Constitution, had to be taken by the Cabinet, as well as other particularly important or potentially controversial decisions. However, smaller decisions could be delegated in accordance with the Constitution to individual Cabinet Members through the Key Decision process (which, after Triborough, was sometimes referred to as the Executive Decision process). All decisions had to be published on the Forward Plan and then made available for public scrutiny before they could be taken.
14. It is important to recognise how the roles and responsibilities of councillors are different from those of the Council’s professional officers. Councillors are elected representatives, who are often part-time and might have other jobs as well, while Council officers are typically full-time professionals, akin to the civil servants in

national government. Councillors set policies based on what they believe to be in the best interests of the community they represent and based on the advice provided by the Council's officers, who are the professional experts in their given fields. As well as providing that advice, the officers are also responsible for the implementation of the Council's policies and the day-to-day management of the Council's frontline services.

15. While I was a councillor at RBKC, the Cabinet would determine the Council's overall direction of travel and strategies, according to its political objectives and priorities, which would reflect the manifesto commitments made at the last set of elections. The Council officers would then formulate detailed policies and implementation plans for achieving those strategies, which would need to be approved by the Cabinet. When the Cabinet made decisions, they were based on recommendations and advice set out in reports that were prepared by the Council officers, who were the expert practitioners in the relevant field of any particular decision. Where these reports included budgets for a given business plan or project, those budgets were costed and prepared by the Council officers. If the Cabinet was unconvinced by the advice or disagreed with a particular recommendation, it could refuse or defer that decision, but as far as I recall the approved decisions were always based on recommendations that the relevant officers were professionally satisfied with. Once the Cabinet had made its decision to approve a policy or a project, the actual implementation of those policies or projects was managed by the Council officers.
16. If a councillor was not a member of the Cabinet, there were other roles and responsibilities that backbenchers took on in addition to their role as ward councillors. All backbenchers had to sit on at least one Scrutiny Committee. The specific functions and remits of the different Scrutiny Committees were set out in the Constitution, as updated from time to time, but broadly speaking the job of a Scrutiny Committee, and hence of the councillors sitting on that committee, was to examine the performance and question the direction of the various Council departments. Scrutiny Committees were not decision-making committees. A Scrutiny Committee could "call in" decisions it didn't approve of, which would delay the implementation of such a decision until the relevant decision-maker had reconsidered whether to go ahead with that decision or not; or it could make recommendations for policy changes or budget changes for the Cabinet to consider.

17. As well as sitting on at least one Scrutiny Committee, backbenchers were also expected to sit on either the Planning Committee or the Licensing Committee. There were also numerous other committees that backbenchers could sit on, such as the Audit & Transparency Committee, the Administration Committee, the Investment Committee, and so on.
18. During my time on the Council, I performed a variety of these roles. As a backbencher, I sat on the Public Realm Scrutiny Committee between 2006-10, and then on the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee between 2010-11, and I sat on the Planning Committee between 2006-11.
19. In the Spring of 2011, Councillor Merrick Cockell, who was then the Leader of the Council, appointed me to the Cabinet as the Cabinet Member for Civil Society. In that role, I had political oversight of the Council teams responsible for community engagement, community safety (including liaising with the local police and fire brigade), the local voluntary sector, and economic development. I remained in that position until May 2013.
20. When the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project was first approved by the Cabinet in 2012, I was the Cabinet Member for Civil Society. As such I was part of the Cabinet which took the collective decision to approve the funding and overall objectives for that project.
21. In May 2013, Councillor Nick Paget-Brown was elected Leader of the Council and he appointed me as his Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property, and Regeneration. I remained in that post until the end of June 2017, after which time I became and remained a backbencher until stepping down from the Council in May 2018.
22. My impression was that different councillors tended to gravitate towards different issues and departments within the Council for a variety of reasons, typically depending on their personal interests, their relevant experience, and also what sort of casework they most frequently got from the residents living in their ward. From my earliest days on the Council, social housing was one of the issues I chose to focus on.

23. The fact that I was elected in St Charles ward with its many social housing estates, some managed by the Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) and others managed by a range of housing associations, meant that I quickly became familiar with many of the problems and difficulties faced by social housing tenants. However, while many tenants needed and requested help in dealing with a whole host of issues and complaints, I quickly realised and appreciated that most of the tenants I met wanted to stay in the area, which they loved, but just wanted their specific problems fixed.
24. At this point, it is worth mentioning another constraint that I became aware of during those first few years. For the majority of my time on the Council, it was normally in a very strong financial position. Most of the Council's frontline services were paid for from what was called the General Fund, which had significant reserves for most of the time I was a councillor. However, all the Council's social housing (and the ancillary commercial property on the Council estates) was held within what was called the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), and I do not remember the HRA ever having enough money in it to undertake all the capital works that were required.
25. It was generally understood within the Council that it was a statutory requirement for the HRA to be ring-fenced and kept entirely separate from the General Fund. In other words, I always believed we were not allowed to use money from the General Fund to cross-subsidise the HRA or vice versa.
26. The HRA was effectively a closed loop. The money in the HRA came from the rental income paid by the social and commercial tenants on its estates, and that same money had to be used to cover all its various liabilities, including repairs and maintenance, housing management services, debt and interest payments, and any other costs or investments, including any major capital works. If more money was spent on any one of those various costs, rents would need to be increased or there would be less left over to cover the other costs. Equally, if more money was spent on one building or estate, there would be less left over for all the other buildings or estates within the HRA portfolio.

Governance/ Management

27. I have structured my statement in accordance with the Rule 9 letter issues, with one exception. I have placed the Governance/ Management section at the beginning for clarity and to provide important background information and context to the sections that follow.
28. I knew that Grenfell Tower was owned by the Council and that it was held within the HRA, like all the Council's social housing. I also knew that the social tenants had tenancy agreements with the Council. However, the TMO had been set up in the mid-1990s under the "Right to Manage" legislation and since then had been responsible for managing the entire HRA portfolio in accordance with the terms of the Modular Management Agreement (MMA) between the TMO and the Council. The TMO was a separate legal entity with its own board of directors, the majority of whom had to be Council tenants or leaseholders.
29. The Council continued to control the HRA on a strategic level. Based on the advice of Council officers, the Cabinet would approve the HRA business plans and large projects and it would make decisions about future strategic plans for the HRA as a whole or for specific estates or blocks. But once the Cabinet had approved the HRA's business plan or the budget for a specific project, the actual implementation of such a plan and housing management of the entire HRA housing stock (including the discharge of fire safety responsibilities) was delegated to the TMO, as were major capital works projects like the Grenfell Tower refurbishment.
30. In terms of the discharge of RBKC's responsibilities as a landlord, as councillors we generally relied on Council officers to ensure that the Council's legal, governance and management responsibilities were properly discharged. In relation to the TMO's performance against its duties and responsibilities as the Council's managing agent, we relied primarily on Housing officers, as professionals in their field, who monitored the TMO against the requirements of the MMA, to check and keep the Cabinet and Scrutiny Committee informed of any potential problems or shortcomings. In return, councillors were able to question officers about their findings. We did not rely exclusively on reports directly from the TMO because any such direct information was supplemented with the assessment and advice of the Council's Housing department.

31. I have seen a Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee report by me as Cabinet Member for Housing, prepared on my behalf by Council officers, dated 10 July 2014 (exhibited at **RFM1**). The report's purpose was to provide members of the Scrutiny Committee with an update on what housing services had achieved in 2013/2014 and the objectives for the housing department in 2014/2015. On page 3, the report noted that the "Council has increased its main HRA Programme over the next 5 years to £61m which equates to a 5 year increase of £25m. In addition, the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower and a number of Hidden Homes projects are being managed by the TMO." As this report noted, councillors understood that the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project was being managed by the TMO and not by the Council itself.
32. Throughout my time on the Council, councillors received multiple reports and emails from Housing officers or from the TMO that provided us with reassurance that the TMO took its fire safety responsibilities seriously and was discharging them. Please see paragraphs 68 to 76 for more detail. Moreover, we were further reassured by the fact that the TMO was a tenant-led and not-for-profit organisation.
33. In terms of any other fires in Grenfell Tower or other similar high rise blocks, I was copied into an email in 2013 (discussed in detail at paragraph 97), which made mention of an earlier fire at Grenfell in 2010, but I knew nothing more than what was said in that email. I am also aware of the following two fires at other blocks in the borough.

Adair Tower fire

34. On 30 November 2015 I was copied in to an email from Councillor Paget-Brown to himself entitled Notes for Party Meeting – 30 Nov 2015 (exhibited at **RFM2**), regarding the fire at Adair Tower. It stated "... This could have been a very serious incident but for the response of the emergency services who were able to treat neighbours suffering from smoke inhalation promptly. Many Housing Department and TMO staff as well as our Emergency Officer came in to help tenants over the weekend and acted very efficiently to ensure that none of the 12 households were without accommodation that night. I have written to thank them all."
35. Most Cabinet Members would meet with the senior officers from the departments they oversaw at what were called Policy Board meetings. At these meetings, officers would update the Cabinet Member about live issues and might also seek their feedback on

draft reports that were due to go to Cabinet or a Scrutiny Committee. There was a Housing Policy Board on 3 December 2015 (Minutes at **RFM3**), where Adair Tower was mentioned. It was reported by Laura Johnson, who was the Director of Housing at RBKC for the duration of my time on the Cabinet, that the London Fire Brigade (LFB) had informed the Council that "They will be serving two enforcement notices on Hazelwood Tower and Adair Tower following the fire on 31 October". The minutes also noted that the TMO will be replacing all doors in the towers to ensure that they are self-closing and that the LFB will be looking at the ventilation system in the whole of Adair Tower. This shows that whilst I, as Cabinet Member for Housing, was notified of the enforcement notices, I was told it was the responsibility of the TMO, not the Council, to take the necessary actions.

Trellick Tower fire

36. On 20 April 2017 I received an email from Laura Johnson, in relation to a fire at Trellick Tower (**RFM4**). Laura Johnson informed me, as the Cabinet Member for Housing, that there had been a fire at Trellick Tower the previous night and she was forwarding on an email from David Kerry, who was the Contingency Planning Manager at RBKC, with further details. Laura Johnson states that "Both myself and the TMO were notified last night and there was good communication between the two organisations and LFB to resolve the situation." In my email to Laura Johnson later that day, I thanked her for letting me know and expressed my relief that nobody was badly hurt. I asked whether or not the fire had given any cause to worry about the safety of the building or the procedure in place when a fire results. I also asked whether the incident had provided good reassurance that the correct procedures and safety mechanisms were in place and asked Laura Johnson to keep me posted as she found out more.
37. On 21 April 2017 I received a response to my email of the previous day from Laura Johnson (**RFM5**) in relation to the fire at Trellick Tower. Laura Johnson attached a response that the TMO had put together in relation to the fire, entitled "V2 Trellick Tower fire (incl. water pressure) Q&As". She explained there had been a media enquiry as to whether the wet risers were working properly and this had been followed up with the TMO by both the Council and LFB. Laura Johnson explained that prior to the fire the wet risers were tested and working correctly and had all the required certification.

Laura Johnson confirmed she had asked the TMO to provide an update at the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee.

38. I have seen a draft report in relation to the fire at Trellick Tower (RFM6). That draft was written by Janice Wray, Health and Safety Manager at the TMO, and dated 24 April 2017. It was then used by Laura Johnson to write a report for the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee (RFM7). It stated, “The LFB responded quickly and extinguished the fire. The LFB evacuated some residents and other residents chose to evacuate themselves. The LFB alerted RBKC and the Emergency Planning Team sent a Liaison Officer to the scene. TMO were alerted and sent the duty Estate Services Assistant to the scene. Officers liaised with the emergency services and appraised senior duty staff who kept the TMO Chief Executive and the Director of Housing appraised. No further RBKC or TMO Officers were required to attend the scene as the residents who evacuated were allowed to return to the building at approximately 11.20pm - once the fire brigade had completed the necessary safety checks. No one was injured during this incident. Further, the fire did not spread and was contained within the flat of origin indicating that the levels of compartmentation - both between neighbouring flats and also between the flat and the communal areas – are of the required level.” The report concluded that whilst it is always a concern to have a fire, “what is clear in the review of the incident to date is that all the work undertaken by the TMO to ensure that adequate fire procedures and fire safety systems at this block worked well on the day. Additionally, partnership working with RBKC and the London Fire Brigade had a positive impact on minimising the disruption to residents enabling them to return to their homes within two hours of the fire.”
39. On 2 May 2017 I was forwarded an email by Laura Johnson from Robert Black, who was the Chief Executive at the TMO, entitled "Follow up with LFB" (RFM8). This report from Robert Black updated Amanda Johnson, Head of Housing Commissioning at RBKC, and Laura Johnson following the meeting the TMO had with LFB officers at Trellick Tower the previous week. Mr Black stated that he met with LFB officers to identify if any actions were required after the fire at Trellick to improve the procedures, specifically relating to the wet rising main, and the operation of the firefighting lifts. Both the TMO and the LFB sought to identify weaknesses in their procedures, and a willingness to improve is shown. The report concluded, “We have agreed to investigate

better signage within the wet riser pump room so that if LFB needed to attend this location they would be absolutely clear about what procedure to follow, however, there were no other actions arising from yesterday and all crews (from Chelsea, Paddington & North Kensington) and Officers (Station Manager and Fire Safety Inspecting Officers) who attended left happy that systems are operational and they are clear about procedure to follow". Laura Johnson told me that she will report on this matter at the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee and I thanked her saying that I was reassured by the information provided. The matter was raised at the 4 May 2017 Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee where Laura Johnson's report was presented.

40. These events confirmed to me that the TMO were actively managing and discharging the fire safety responsibilities across the HRA portfolio. They were then feeding that information back to RBKC officers, who in turn kept both the Cabinet Member for Housing and the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee updated.

Grenfell Tower's original design, construction, composition

41. I am unable to say anything about this issue as I had no knowledge or involvement in it.

Subsequent modifications prior to the most recent

42. I have no specific recollection of any subsequent modifications to Grenfell Tower after the original construction until the major refurbishment project of 2012-16. However, while attending meetings of the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, I became aware that there had been a programme to ensure all flat entrance doors across the entire HRA portfolio met fire safety regulations. That programme should have included the flats in Grenfell Tower but I do not remember any specific mention of that building in particular.

Modifications to the interior of the building 2012-2016

43. The Rule 9 letter asks a number of detailed questions about the modifications to the interior of the building during the 2012-2016 refurbishment project, many of which I am unable to answer. I have already explained that, under the terms of the MMA, the TMO was responsible for specifying, procuring and implementing the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project. As a councillor, I did not have and was not expected to have technical expertise relating to construction regulations and technical requirements, and so I am unable to comment on the extent to which the refurbishment (internal and external) was compliant with regulations, legislation, British Standards or industry best practice. That all fell within the responsibility of the TMO and their consultants and contractors and, as I understand it now, was also checked and signed off by RBKC Building Control.
44. The information I can provide in response to these questions stems from my position on the Cabinet, first as Cabinet Member for Civil Society (2011-13) and then as Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration (2013-17), but during the refurbishment project the primary concern of the Cabinet was with overall objectives, overall budget, and overall programme – beyond that the detailed specification and implementation of the project was the responsibility of the TMO together with their consultants and contractors.
45. In May 2012, while Councillor Tim Coleridge was the Cabinet Member for Housing and Property, Laura Johnson brought a report on the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project to the Cabinet (**RFM9**). It proposed “the use of capital receipts from the sale of vacant basement spaces at Elm Park Gardens be used for investment in new affordable homes and major improvements to existing affordable homes.” It stated that the Lancaster West Estate, where Grenfell Tower is located, was identified by the TMO as “having significant investment needs, particularly around the common areas, heating and hot water system, and windows,” and that Grenfell Tower had the potential for the addition of a number of affordable homes. The TMO Board had approved the submission of a funding bid to the Council for the proposals at Grenfell Tower as a suitable site for this investment.

46. That report recommended “renovation, regeneration and conversion works” to Grenfell Tower and set out why the investment was needed. The main objectives were: to improve the comfort of the existing flats by installing a new heating and hot water system that could be controlled individually by each flat; to reduce fuel poverty and contribute towards the Council’s carbon reduction targets by improving the building’s thermal efficiency through replacement windows and new external cladding; to deliver much needed new social housing units through converting unused space at the lower levels of the tower into new flats, as part of the “Hidden Homes” initiative; and to improve the overall appearance of the tower to complement the very significant capital investment already planned for the new Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre (KALC) project next to the tower. The Cabinet approved the recommendation by the Director of Housing for a budget of £6.9 million for the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project. This decision released the funding needed by the TMO to take the project forward.
47. I then ceased to have much further involvement in the Grenfell Tower project up until May 2013, when I became Cabinet Member for Housing, Property, and Regeneration. In this role, I then received more regular updates and emails about the project.
48. An early Cabinet meeting in my tenure as Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration took place in July 2013, where the Cabinet approved the recommendation to increase the budget for the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project from £6.9m to £9.7m (**RFM10**) based on advice from the TMO and officers. Para 3.15 of that report stated: “In order to achieve efficiencies and minimise disruption to residents, it is planned to undertake additional works at Grenfell Tower as part of the same project. The estimated cost of the overall scheme is £9.7 million, although won’t be confirmed until the tendering process is completed later in the year.”
49. A draft report by the Director of Housing, "Grenfell Tower Major Works & Hidden Homes Project" came to my Policy Board in advance of the Cabinet meeting on 19 June 2014 (**RFM11**). In this draft report, version dated 3 June 2014, at para 6.2, it stated “It is recommended that the capital budget for this project is increased from £9.7 million to £10.1 million. This increase in provision can be met from a draw down from the HRA working balance.” This would have enabled a contingency of approximately £400,000 (para 8.3).

50. At the Policy Board meeting on Thursday 5 June 2014 (minutes of which are exhibited at **RFM12**), we discussed the draft report to Cabinet and I stated that the report "needed to explain the increased budget allocation and justify the difference". The minutes of the meeting noted that the Policy Board discussed the contingency and recommended increasing the budget from £9.7m to £10.3m; in other words, after the discussion at Policy Board it was decided to ask Cabinet to approve a larger contingency of £600,000. The minutes also noted that I asked that "officers outline the list of items that would be lost from the scheme should approval to award the increased budget not be given by Cabinet". This was to ensure that if Cabinet was minded not to allow the increased budget, we would be made aware of what impact or risks this would have on the refurbishment project. The increase in budget was not for substantive works costs which had already been budgeted for. It was a contingency, and the money was there to be used, in case, for example, more expensive materials would be needed to discharge planning requirements. At no point was I or the wider Cabinet warned that the safety of the tower might be put at risk if the increase in budget was not approved.
51. The final report (**RFM13**) entitled "Grenfell Tower Major Works & Hidden Homes Project", which went to the Cabinet meeting on 19 June 2014, updated the Cabinet on the major works and additional 7 Hidden Homes at Grenfell Tower. Given that this would have been the third time Cabinet discussed the Grenfell Tower budget, this report gave a useful recap of what had happened to date with regards this project.
52. Paragraph 2.6 of the report states that "Part of the proposed investment included wider community benefits, the re-provision of new premises for the Grenfell Under 3s Nursery and the Dale Boxing Club who have a long history at Grenfell Tower and are well supported by the local community. In addition, redundant areas in the lower levels of the building offered the opportunity for new Hidden Homes. Consultation with residents in March 2012 produced overwhelming support for the proposals."
53. By the time I became the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration, the TMO had already appointed most of their consultant team, including Studio E as the architects and Artelia as the costs consultants / CDM co-ordinator. The TMO then managed the procurement process for finding and appointing Rydon as the main contractor. Paragraph 2.10 of the "Grenfell Tower Major Works & Hidden Homes Project" report, explained that an Open Journal of the European Union (OJEU) tender

process was carried out with 16 contractors bidding and that Rydon “submitted the most economically advantageous tender, scoring highest on both price and quality.” The original intention was that KALC and the Grenfell Tower refurbishment would have the same design team and contractor to deliver continuity however, it became apparent that it would not be possible to agree a contract price within the agreed budget and so the TMO, in consultation with the Council, took the decision to appoint a separate contractor through a competitive tender process.

54. The report also noted that the planning application for the works had been approved on 10 January 2014 and that a Pre Contract Agreement in the sum of £350,000 was put in place with Rydon to resolve a number of matters, which included, “...planning conditions to be discharged in relation to the detailed design and materials of a number of items, including the new windows and the cladding material and fixing method. Subject to agreement with planning, these could result in increased cost, we would therefore like to be prudent and plan for this possibility.” (Para 3.1)
55. Para 3.2 continued, "While the agreed tender means that the work can be done within the agreed budget of £9.7 million, that leaves absolutely no contingency. On any complicated refurbishment project like this, with works being done around tenants remaining in situ, it would be prudent to include a contingency of at least 5%; however, with the additional risks to budget outlined in para 3.1, it would be prudent to include a contingency of at least 6% in this case. It is therefore recommended that the budget for this scheme is increased to £10.3 million.”
56. The report then set out the two options before Cabinet: to increase the budget or not. If not, the likelihood was that a reduction in the specification of the project would have to occur to accommodate the lack of contingency. This could mean removing the additional 7 “hidden homes” provision, or if the impact was sufficiently significant, re-tendering the scheme altogether. On the other hand, if the budget was increased, and the contingency ended up not being needed, then there was the possibility of office space in the tower or a further two hidden homes being delivered.
57. Cabinet approved this increase in the budget up to £10.3m. After that, the budget remained at that level for the duration of the project. I am not aware of the Council being asked for any more increases to this project’s budget after that.

58. The safety of residents was always of the utmost concern to the Council. There was never any suggestion that the Cabinet was being asked to make a decision that could put their safety at risk. The Cabinet approved all requests for increases to the budget, and we would have been even more willing to increase the budget had we been told it was necessary to ensure residents' safety. While I was on the Cabinet, we were never advised that there might be any conflict between budget constraints and the fire safety of the tower resulting from its refurbishment. Safety was always a priority, and had savings to the budget been required, we were told they could have been found elsewhere on the specification, for example by reducing the number of Hidden Homes.

Modifications to the exterior of the building 2012-2016

59. As I have already explained, the TMO and its consultants and contractors led on the specification, procurement and implementation of the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project, and so I am unable to provide answers to the majority of questions about the exterior modifications made during that refurbishment.
60. My only involvement in the modifications to the exterior of the building was in July 2014, when I became involved in a discussion between the TMO and the RBKC Planning department about the choice of colour for the cladding and its fixing system. I became involved in this discussion because I had received numerous emails from residents of the tower complaining about the delay to the refurbishment project. I established that the delay in discharging the planning conditions was due to a disagreement about the colour and fixing method for the cladding. Therefore, I made enquiries as to how this impasse could be resolved.
61. By July 2014, I had already been receiving complaints about the lack of progress being made on the refurbishment project for more than a year – see paragraph 84 of this statement for more detail. I was very much aware residents wanted the project to get going, that they had been raising their concerns for a long time and were increasingly frustrated, and so this was my motivation for getting involved in the discussion about the external appearance of the cladding.

62. Starting from 10 July 2014, there was a series of emails between Peter Maddison and David Gibson from the TMO, Bruce Sounes, who was the project architect, Jonathan Bore, the Executive Director of Planning at RBKC, and me (emails dated between 10 July 2014 and 29 July 2014 exhibited at **RFM14-38**). In these emails it is clear that the issues under consideration relate to the aesthetic appearance of the cladding – both its colour and its fixing method – and not about the technical qualities or characteristics of the cladding. I knew that Planning (as opposed to Building Control, which was a different function within the Council) was concerned with how the building would look and that my subjective opinion was as valid as anyone else’s, and so I was willing to express my view about these aesthetic options. Had the issues under consideration been more technical in nature, I would have deferred entirely to the views of the relevant experts.
63. During this extensive exchange of emails about the options relating to the colour and the fixing method for the cladding, Peter Maddison made a passing reference in one email about the possibility of using aluminium rather than zinc cladding. On 21 July 2014, he said “We [the TMO] were hoping to achieve savings by negotiating with the Planners over the cladding material (aluminium instead of zinc)...” (**RFM29**). I had no knowledge of the significance of or the differences between the technical properties of those two types of metal cladding, and nor was my opinion sought, because I had no relevant technical expertise. I do not remember even noting that possibility at the time; indeed, I did not reply to that specific email or make any comment on that specific possibility. As already noted, my interest in this discussion was in trying to help resolve the planning issues, which concerned the colour and the fixing method of the cladding, not the type of material.
64. A few months later, a report went out in my name, as the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration, to the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee on 6 November 2014 (**RFM39**). This report would have been prepared by officers but checked and presented by me. The report’s purpose was to provide members of the Scrutiny Committee with an update on key areas within my portfolio. The first item in my report is an update on Grenfell Tower which explains that:
- 64.1 The TMO received "materials planning condition discharge" from planners on 30 September, which allows the "smoke silver metallic" colour cladding to be

ordered. This means the cladding can be ordered in time to keep with the programme.

64.2 Work to fix the external cladding frame to building will start W/C 6 Oct and should be concluded in mid Dec. This will be the noisiest part of the programme of works.

64.3 The project is on budget and there are no variants to report at present.

65. That was my final involvement with any external modification to Grenfell Tower.

The Fire and Safety measures within the building at the time of the fire

66. It was and remains my understanding that the TMO was responsible for fire safety measures in all housing units across the HRA portfolio, including at Grenfell Tower. and so I cannot comment on whether the fire safety measures within the building at the time were compliant with relevant building regulations, fire regulations, British Standards, other legislation, guidance or industry practice, or whether they were adequate.

67. I can only speak to the assurances given to the Council by the TMO, which were either made in emails or were included in reports presented to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee from time to time. The TMO kept the Council informed and updated on fire safety issues across the housing stock. The Council sought and received regular reassurance that the TMO was performing these fire safety related responsibilities satisfactorily.

68. The Cabinet and the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, which I normally attended as the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration, relied on reports and reassurances from the Council's Housing department. As councillors, we felt able to rely on what the TMO was telling us because it had gone through the 'filter' of the Housing department, which was effectively an independent check on what the TMO said, and which monitored the performance of the TMO against the MMA. These reports and reassurances combined to provide us with the reasonable impression that fire safety measures within Grenfell Tower, and more widely across the entire HRA

portfolio, were being appropriately managed by the TMO, which had contracted with independent fire consultants and which had regular meetings with the LFB.

69. I have seen the report for the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee on 10 July 2014 by the Director of Housing and Town Clerk and Executive Director of Finance (RFM40). This is a report on the TMO's Performance Review 2013/2014 and the TMO's Performance Agreement 2014/2015. I note that in the executive summary at 2.2 it stated that this was another good year for the TMO, with "continued work around fire safety." On page 16 at Section 2.9 Health and Safety, it noted that "the TMO continues to work with the London Fire Brigade (LFB) and RBKC to ensure that residents are safe and the risk of fire in blocks is minimised. The process of communal area Fire Risk Assessment (FRAs) and their reviews continue. Further significant progress has been made to address the recommendations made by the FRAs".

70. The health and safety section of this report continued, stating that there are obvious benefits for residents to have early warning of fire within their home hence that it is the TMO's intention to increase the number of dwellings which have hard wired automatic fire protection installed. The report stated that "the programme to replace non fire-rated tenants' flat entrance doors has been successfully concluded". The report is very detailed in relation to health and safety and specifically fire safety. Further issues noted include that the TMO has worked with the Council's legal services to address the issues associated with non-compliant leaseholder flat entrance doors and that the TMO meets with the LFB on a bi-monthly basis to discuss fire safety issues and reduce the likelihood and severity of any fires that occur. The health and safety section of the report also confirms that a major electrical inspection programme covering wiring inspections in communal areas and dwellings continued to improve the fire safety of blocks. Looking forward to the following year, at para 3.6 on page 24 of the report it stated that "intensive work in the area of fire safety will continue" and that this will include the ongoing programme of fire risk assessments and reviews and the TMO will continue to liaise closely with the LFB. It is noted that the TMO would continue to work with leaseholders to deal with any remaining non-compliant flat entrance doors. This report shows that fire safety was very much the TMO's responsibility, and that in the Housing department's opinion, they were undertaking the necessary actions to ensure the residents were safe.

71. The next year, a report by the Director of Housing and Town Clerk and Executive Director of Finance for the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee on 9 July 2015 (RFM41) covered the TMO Performance Review for 2014/15 and the TMO Performance Agreement for 2015/2016 setting out the performance expectations for the coming year. In the Executive Summary at 2.2.1 it is stated that "It has been another strong year for the TMO in terms of delivery of housing services." At para 3.7.1, it states that a Health and Safety Action Plan had been introduced to facilitate monitoring of compliance with legislation and good practice by the TMO H&S Committee, the programme of FRAs and review required by the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety Order) was ongoing, and notes that the recommendations of the best practice guidance had been adopted with regard to frequency. The closer scrutiny of fire safety issues had been facilitated by regular LFB liaison meetings. Specifically for Grenfell, the report noted: "Close liaison with LFB with regard to works at Grenfell Tower- local operational crews regularly attend the block and liaise with the contractors, Rydon, on progress of works, impact on fire-fighting etc." This report continued to provide overall reassurance that the TMO was discharging the responsibilities for fire safety across the HRA housing stock, including for the major refurbishment works at Grenfell.
72. The following year, a report by the Director of Housing and Town Clerk and Executive Director of Finance for the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee on 13 July 2016 (RFM42) covered the TMO Performance Review for 2015/16 and the TMO Performance Agreement for 2016/17. In the Executive Summary (para 2.2.1), it stated, "Performance across the three key areas is to be commended as there has been considerable success... The workstreams which form KCTMO's core business around welfare reform, resident engagement and health and safety continue to be delivered enabling the Council to meet its statutory duties and strategic aims." Regarding Health and Safety, the bi-monthly meetings between the TMO and LFB continued, as did the programme of FRAs, which "continued to adhere to best practice guidelines and comply with LFB requirements". It also stated that an RBKC internal audit of TMO health and safety gave a rating of "Substantial Assurance," an improvement from the 2013/2014 internal audit. I noted that a professional Housing officer was satisfied with the TMO's performance, in giving them a positive review. The report noted that "two Enforcement Notices were served on TMO/RBKC by the LFB" after the Adair Tower fire. In response, TMO and RBKC had determined to ensure all doors at both Adair

Tower and Hazlewood Tower (its sister block) were sufficiently fire-rated and had self-closers, and the report noted that contractors were currently on site at the two blocks, carrying out the required works. The TMO also engaged the services of Exova, a specialist fire engineering consultancy as a result of the Enforcement Notices, who liaised with the LFB and recommended works to ensure compliance. These works were underway at the time of the report. This showed the TMO, in consultation with the Council, reacting to the Enforcement Notices, again providing assurance that they were discharging the fire safety responsibilities across the HRA.

73. Looking forward to the next year, the report at para 3.6 on page 29 stated that the Enforcement notices would be complied with, the programme of FRAs would continue, “with more work to ensure actions and recommendations from these are consistently completed in a timely manner”, regular LFB meetings were to continue, the fire safety approach adopted at Grenfell Tower would be extended to all major works projects, and they would work with the LFB to prioritise high rise blocks for familiarisation exercises.
74. In addition to the reports that went to the HPSC, as the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration, I would also be provided with updates about relevant news from or progress by the TMO in relation how it was discharging its fire safety responsibilities.
75. For example, on 26 February 2014 Laura Johnson forwarded to me an email (**RFM43**) with correspondence to her from Janice Wray at the TMO. Janice Wray updated Laura Johnson on her discussions with LFB relating to the installation of sprinklers in sheltered accommodation. The email said, "The LFB are anxious for us to focus our efforts particularly on improving the fire safety of the most vulnerable residents." Janice Wray also said, "We now receive regular information from the LFB on their attendance at fires and false alarms at our premises and this is analysed for any trends and should further help to identify any high-risk dwellings." She also explained that the TMO meets with the LFB on a bi-monthly basis and at their last meeting she reiterated the TMO's position on sprinklers (that the approach would be to consider installation of sprinklers within an individual flat if the degree of fire risk was considered to be very high) and LFB confirmed they were happy with the approach.

This added to the impression that the TMO was managing fire safety in accordance with LFB requirements.

76. Then on 17 July 2014 I was forwarded an email from Laura Johnson, along with Councillor Marshall (**RFM44**). It was reassurance from Laura Johnson that the Council and the TMO were aware of the advice coming from LFB following the Lakanal House fire and we were reassured the TMO were on top of it. In her email, Laura Johnson explained that she was forwarding documents that the Fire Brigade had produced along with the accompanying email. Laura Johnson says that "I hope that we have provided Scrutiny Committee with sufficient information on fire safety and the measures that the Council and TMO are taking to ensure the health and safety of the Council tenants and leaseholders but if as a result of reading the information attached you would like any further update please let me know and we can provide a further update." I do not recall having any further questions at that time.

Inspections

77. Beyond any inspections mentioned elsewhere in this evidence, I have no knowledge of any specific inspections relating to the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower, other than that I was aware that Building Control should have made inspections to sign off the project.

Communications with Residents

78. I believe that for Council tenants or leaseholders wanting to raise concerns or issues regarding their housing, their block, or their estate the formal complaints process was managed by the TMO. It was a three-stage process, meaning that if the complainant was not satisfied by the initial response from the TMO, the complaint could then be escalated two more times for review at a higher level within the TMO. If the complainant was still not satisfied after exhausting that three-stage process, they could refer the complaint to the independent Housing Ombudsman. As the Cabinet Member for Housing, I was not normally involved in complaints going through the TMO's formal process, but I do remember one complaint from a resident of Grenfell Tower

being referred to the Housing Ombudsman, and I refer to that in more detail in paragraph 95.

79. Tenants and leaseholders could also raise issues of concern with their local ward councillors, or they could present a petition to the Council, which would normally result in the relevant Council department or scrutiny committee reviewing the issue and providing a response.
80. In addition to these formal processes, many tenants and leaseholders used to send emails or letters complaining about certain issues directly to senior executives in the TMO or to senior councillors or Council officers, and sometimes to their MP.
81. There was a widely respected convention within the Council that councillors would only deal with case-work from residents within their own ward. However, as a Cabinet Member responsible for a department, one was often written to directly or copied in on emails complaining about issues relevant to one's department.
82. During my time as the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration, I made a considerable effort to keep abreast of the issues and concerns being raised by residents across the HRA estate, including any issues relating to Grenfell Tower. I did this through receiving reports and updates from Housing officers, through attending meetings of the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, through attendance at other meetings and consultation events up and down the borough, and by trying to keep track of the many emails I was sent or copied in on. I did not normally reply directly to emails on which I was only copied in, but if I wanted more information or reassurance that the issues raised in such emails were being dealt with, I tended to email one of the relevant officers asking them to look into the issue and report back to me.
83. During my time as the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration, I was made aware of various different concerns of and complaints from residents of Grenfell Tower, many of which had nothing to do with fire safety. In reviewing the correspondence and communications I was a party to, I have not found any issues that were raised by residents but which were not followed up and being dealt with by the relevant people at either the TMO or in the Council.

84. From my appointment to that role in 2013 right up until the refurbishment project commenced on site, there were numerous emails complaining about the start of the project being delayed and even questioning whether the project was going to go ahead at all. I had a meeting with Edward Daffarn and Tunde Awoderu, who were a tenant and a leaseholder in Grenfell Tower, together with Councillor Blakeman, one of their ward councillors, Peter Maddison from the TMO, and Laura Johnson on 19 July 2013, at which I tried to explain the process that the project had to go through before it could start on site and to reassure them that there was no intention of suspending the project (Councillor Blakeman's notes of meeting included in email chain at **RFM45**). In June 2014, I received an email from the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association (GTLA) demanding that "Grenfell Tower regeneration project MUST START NOW", and so I asked Laura Johnson to draft a reply for me (**RFM46**). I replied to the GTLA on 13 June 2014 (**RFM45**), explaining what progress had been made during the previous year and reassuring residents that they would be kept updated on next steps through a newsletter from the TMO.
85. Once Rydon commenced work on site, I became aware of various complaints about the management of the project, as well as about the behaviour and attitude of both Rydon and the TMO. I noted that the TMO was responding to these complaints; for example, in July 2015, there was an email exchange between Councillor Blakeman and Peter Maddison (**RFM47** and **RFM48**), in which he responded to the concerns that had been expressed. Nevertheless, the complaints continued, and on 2 December 2015 there was a motion about the Grenfell Tower debated at full Council, and then a petition signed by 60 people was handed in by Councillor Blakeman requesting that the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee undertake an urgent review of the TMO and Rydon's management of the refurbishment project (**RFM49**).
86. The petitioners recognised that the refurbishment project was intended to make the tower fit for the 21st Century, but they complained that the TMO and Rydon had failed to consult with residents thoroughly and ignored many of the residents' day-to-day concerns, which had had a very detrimental impact on their living conditions during the refurbishment works. The petitioners suggested that it would be important for lessons to be learnt from this project before the Council embarked on other refurbishment or regeneration projects elsewhere in the borough. To be clear, the petition made no

reference to any fire or safety risks resulting from the refurbishment project. This petition was addressed to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee and its response is discussed in more detail at paragraphs 91 and 92 of my statement.

87. I have been shown a briefing note entitled Grenfell Tower Refurbishment (**RFM50**), dated 24 December 2015. This document was prepared by Peter Maddison as a response to the petition submitted by Councillor Blakeman and sent to Councillors Mackover, Marshall, Paget-Brown and myself, Laura Johnson, Amanda Johnson, as well as Victoria Borwick and John Sweeney from Parliament, and Robert Black and Sacha Jevans at the TMO. The briefing note set out the background to the works and what had been done in relation to resident engagement. It noted that Rydon had a site office within Grenfell Tower with resident liaison staff to ensure that residents were informed and consulted. It also explained that there had been public meetings, drop in sessions open to all residents, Rydon coffee mornings, a monthly newsletter as well as one-to-one resident consultation. There was also a specific complaints procedure for this project to be used if necessary.
88. The document noted that there seemed to be two main issues raised by the Resident Compact, which was a group of Grenfell Tower residents, where no resolution had yet been agreed. Neither of these were related to fire safety. These were: an allegation that TMO and Rydon harassed and bullied residents over the duration of the works; and dissatisfaction about the location of the Heat Interface Units in the flats. The document addressed compensation and, in relation to progress of works and quality control, it stated that there was an inspection by Rydon's site staff followed by an inspection by the TMO's Clerk of Works, but at that time, the handover of work was still underway, and only 31 properties had been signed off. The report noted that the Clerk of Works checked every window and talked to residents about the operation of the heating system. Residents were also told that the works were covered by a 12-month defect guarantee period during which time Rydon was responsible for the maintenance of any work carried out.
89. The briefing note also reported that, as a result of the petition, the TMO had undertaken a door-knocking exercise "to take stock of any current issues facing residents in relation to the refurbishment works." They spoke to 77 households out of 120. 36 of those households had signed the petition. The results were as follows:

- 89.1 90% confirmed that the improvements to the heating and hot water were working effectively.
- 89.2 85% confirmed that they understood how to operate the new heating system
- 89.3 83% were happy with the new windows
- 89.4 97% confirmed that they understood how to operate the windows
90. It was noted that none of the residents spoken to at the door-knocking exercise raised any issues relating to “bullying” or “harassment.” The briefing note stated that the specific issues raised, such as the five households who reported drafts around the new windows, would be addressed in the New Year.
91. Also as a result of this petition, the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee invited Edward Daffarn to address the Committee at their meeting on 6 January 2016. I was unable to attend that meeting myself, but from the minutes (**RFM51**) I can see that Mr Daffarn raised issues about: the lack of consultation and resident engagement; the placement of the Heat Interface Unit (HIU) boilers; bullying and harassment from contractors; lack of response to legitimate complaints; poor workmanship and site management, specifically citing examples of flats that had been left without hot water or a working toilet; and the lack of adequate compensation for residents of the tower, suggesting that each household should receive £1,500 compensation.
92. The minutes also noted that the TMO Board would be conducting its own review into these complaints and so the Chairman of the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee agreed that the Committee would set up its own Working Group to ensure appropriate lessons were learnt for future projects, but that the establishment of this Working Group would be subject to other Working Groups concluding their existing workloads first and also subject to the findings of the review to be conducted by the TMO Board itself.
93. The TMO Board set up its own review group, which reported its findings on 31 March 2016, entitled Grenfell Tower Board Review (**RFM52**). The report was authored by Paula Fance, an independent member of the TMO Board. At para 2.6, it stated that all members of the TMO Board were invited to express an interest to joining the review group and lists those who put themselves forward. At para 6.2 it stated "Throughout the project to date KCTMO have received seven formal complaints from four residents

which included one resident making four complaints. In addition to this there were a number of enquiries received from Ward Councillors on behalf of residents." The report continues at 6.3 "The Group reviewed all of the complaints and enquiries and was satisfied that KCTMO had responded adequately. The Board could find no evidence that substantiated allegations of 'threats, lies and intimidation' by either Rydon or KCTMO staff." The report also noted at 7.2 that it found that the example of poor workmanship, which was referred to before the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee, was work in progress and therefore this was misleading. The report concluded by making five recommendations:

- 93.1 the names and addresses of those attending public meetings should be recorded and minutes taken of each meeting;
 - 93.2 where projects span more than 12 months the initial resident profile survey information should be repeated on a 6 monthly basis;
 - 93.3 where residents have language requirements and have chosen to use family members to help them translate then this information should be recorded so that translation services can be provided if necessary;
 - 93.4 a procedure is drafted to outline the different stages involved in gaining access to properties to avoid any misunderstanding and ensure that the process is always followed; and
 - 93.5 the full report to be shared with RBKC.
94. In May 2016, the TMO shared this report with the Council's Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, but did not give permission for it to be discussed during the public part of the meeting. I remember that many councillors, including Councillor Blakeman, made it clear during the meeting that they thought the report should be made public; however, that was a decision that could only be taken by the TMO Board. Eventually, the TMO agreed that the report would be made public and on 19 May 2016 I emailed some of the residents, who had made the complaints, telling them that the report would be made available for them to review (**RFM53**).
95. At least one of the tower's residents was not satisfied with the findings of this report and must have complained to the independent Housing Ombudsman. On 2 May 2017,

Robert Black emailed me, copying in Councillor Paget-Brown (**RFM54**) to inform us that Mr Daffarn had been to the Ombudsman seeking a full investigation into his complaints in relation to access to his property during the refurbishment works, and how the TMO complaints procedure had dealt with him. Mr Black explained that “This and other aspects resulting in a stage 3 complaint heard by my Board panel and eventually the Board review of the project which was reported to Scrutiny. The outcome enclosed confirm the Ombudsman found no maladministration in both cases and reports the KCTMO behaved in a reasonable manner. If you consider the time and accusations we received by this resident it is a great outcome for us which I am really pleased with and thought you might find it interesting”.

Fire Safety Related Complaints

96. Of the complaints that I had knowledge of, those that were related to fire safety mainly focussed on two major issues: power surges in 2013 and a new gas pipe being installed by National Grid in 2017. These will be explained in detail below.
97. In addition to those two issues, I believe the only other mentions of fire safety related issues that I was party to, related to emails from the GTLA. On 29 September 2016, I was copied into an email from the GTLA to Councillor Blakeman along with many other recipients (**RFM55**). The email raised a number of issues/concerns including the lack of a fire drill at Grenfell Tower and concerns about regular lift breakdowns and malfunctions, as well as complaints about the quality of work done on decorating the staircase and a request for a concierge and security guard. It said that there was an inconsistency between LFB and the Fire Risk Assessments for Grenfell Tower by Carl Stokes in relation to an incident dated 30 April 2010. The email stated that the residents believed a fire drill was overdue. The GTLA requested that the TMO and RBKC look into this as a matter of urgency and asked Judith Blakeman, as their Local Councillor, to find out what went wrong. I forwarded the email to Laura Johnson asking for her to reply to it (**RFM56**).
98. Councillor Blakeman responded to this email on 4 October 2016, attaching an “Outstanding Issues Matrix May 2016 (August 2016)” document (email at **RFM57**, attachment at **RFM58**). This matrix showed a variety of different issues with responses from “TMO/ Rydon/ RBKC”. One such outstanding issue was, “Fire alarm and smoke

vents: these works have not been completed. Some of the vents in the hallways are very noisy, sounding like an aircraft taking off. When they are switched off, the hot water cuts out. The Fire Brigade have visited and the outcome of their inspection should be communicated to everyone. Residents needful [sic] information about the procedures in place should there be an emergency.” The “TMO/Rydon/RBKC” response column in the matrix stated, “The smoke vent system has ventilation levels set by Building Regulations. At the entrance lobby the vents were reset after commissioning, which means that if they are triggered by the smoke alarm – then they are not so noisy, but still effective. The smoke detection system was mentioned in the April newsletter, as someone smoking in a lobby had triggered the alarm. In the May 2016 newsletter, the ‘stay put’ policy was reiterated as requested by the Fire Brigade in case of fire.” From this, it appeared to me that these outstanding issues were being dealt with through the appropriate channels.

Power Surges

99. Much of the correspondence from residents that was specifically concerned about fire risks in the tower followed on from a series of power surges in 2013. As soon as I heard about these worries I thought they sounded serious and made sure that I was kept updated about how they were being handled right up until I was assured that the issue had been resolved. However, I went on [REDACTED] leave for about 6 weeks from the end of July 2013, so I did not always respond or react during that period.
100. I was first emailed about power surges on 24 May 2013 (**RFM59**) which would be around the time I came in to post as the new Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration. Laura Johnson forwarded me an email chain starting with a complaint by Shah Ahmed on behalf of the GTLA, dated 13 May 2013. She confirmed that the TMO was investigating and would be contacting residents.
101. On 3 June 2013, Laura Johnson emailed me with a further update, attaching a briefing (**RFM60**). I think the briefing was prepared by the TMO (to the Council – i.e. not the residents) and confirmed there had been another power surge on 29 May affecting 40 properties in Grenfell Tower. It said that the problem had been identified and the building had been made safe but further work would be done to ensure a permanent fix.

The briefing note also said that the TMO would be working with residents to assess the damage and determine a course of action. An out-of-hours helpline was given to support any residents who needed it. I did not simply accept this briefing note at face value and I responded to Laura Johnson on the same day, asking whether we could confirm the power surges were not caused by the neighbouring KALC project and also saying we needed more information about the residents affected.

102. Laura Johnson replied later on the same day (**RFM62**) addressing my questions, saying the TMO believed the cause of the power surges was a loose connection, they had implemented a temporary fix but the team was still working on resolving the issue. The matter of residents' compensation was still being looked in to.
103. The next day, on 4 June 2013, Laura Johnson sent me a "more comprehensive response on why there was a problem with power surges in Grenfell Tower" (**RFM62**). Again, I read the information sent to me and replied to Laura Johnson that day, saying it was still not clear to me what caused the power surges, and Laura Johnson replied on 5 June 2013 saying that further investigation would hopefully determine the cause (**RFM63**).
104. On 16 June 2013, along with a large number of councillors and others, I was copied into an email from Tunde Awoderu on behalf of the GTLA to Councillor Blakeman (**RFM64**). He enquired about compensation for the large number (60 plus) of residents affected by the power surge, many without "essential daily [electrical] appliances". There was mention of an Estate officer of the Lancaster West Estate Management Board (EMB)/TMO inspecting properties and damaged electrical appliances, but there had been no update after two weeks. He asked what steps were then being taken and "how you [Councillor Blakeman] intend to obtain a detailed report of the severe power surges?" He also complained of the delay to the refurbishment project at Grenfell in this email (Email chain at **RFM65**).
105. On 17 June 2013, Councillor Blakeman forwarded this email to Robert Black, Laura Johnson and me, copying in a large number of others, requesting problems to be rectified and explanations given. On 21 June 2013, Peter Maddison replied to Councillor Blakeman on Robert Black's behalf, copying myself and others in, stating that the TMO were actively investigating the cause of the power surges and had kept residents informed in writing and through face-to-face contact. He explained what steps

had been taken to rectify the issue. He also explained that residents had been advised to contact their own insurers and that the TMO would collect the information and pass it on to its insurers (Email chain at **RFM65**).

106. On 24 June 2013, I was forwarded an email by Councillor Lindsay (a conservative councillor for a neighbouring ward to Notting Barns, which is where Grenfell Tower is – I am not sure why he was emailed), asking for my help in responding to a query from Edward Daffarn, in relation to compensation and an explanation for the damage caused by the power surges at Grenfell Tower, amongst other concerns (**RFM66**). I forwarded the email on to Laura Johnson and asked her to prepare a reply. She confirmed she had already received the email from other councillors and was in the process of drafting a response. Councillor Mills also forwarded a similar email to me. I responded stating that the TMO were looking into the issue of power surges and were trying to get to the bottom of the cause of them (**RFM67**).
107. On 25 June 2013, Councillor Borwick forwarded me another email from Edward Daffarn, and asked me to meet with him. Laura Johnson emailed Councillor Borwick on 28 June 2013, copying in me, Robert Black and Peter Maddison (**RFM68**) with her response to those complaints, as well as an email chain with Robert Black's response to Councillor Borwick. Laura Johnson stated that she understood that I was already in the process of arranging a meeting with Mr Daffarn. This meeting did then take place on 19 July 2013, and minutes of the meeting were circulated afterwards by Laura Johnson to me and Councillor Paget-Brown, copying in Peter Maddison (**RFM69**).
108. A petition was then presented by Councillor Blakeman to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee on 16th July 2013, signed by 94 signatories regarding the "Power Surges and Delays to the Regeneration Project". I was present at this meeting. (**RFM70**). The petition's complaints and requests covered a range of issues, including: a concern that Peter Maddison of the TMO had not taken the power surges seriously; a request that households affected by the power surges be given compensation; a request for clarity about the different roles and responsibilities between the TMO and the Lancaster West Estate Management Board (EMB), as well as a request for changes in how the TMO was run; and a request that Leadbitter (who was the main contractor on the KALC project) be appointed as contractor for the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project so that it could start immediately (**RFM71**). Asha Gupta, the Principal

Governance Administrator at RBKC, formally acknowledged the petition to Councillor Blakeman on 17 July 2013, stating it had been referred to Laura Johnson and would be responded to within six weeks (**RFM72**). The petition and formal acknowledgement was forwarded to myself and other councillors when Asha Gupta sent it to Laura Johnson. (**RFM73**). She stated that the Scrutiny Committee would have three days to comment on a draft response before it was sent out.

109. On 25th July Laura Johnson circulated a draft response to the petition to me and a number of other councillors, asking for any comments or questions before the response was finalised and returned to the petitioners. (**RFM 74** and **RFM 75**).
110. On 6 August 2013, I replied setting out a number of questions and issues that I thought needed clarifying before the response could be finalised (**RFM76**). On 20 August 2013, Celia Caliskan responded to my queries of 6 August 2013, attaching an amended draft response. I replied on 23 August raising further queries. I asked for clarity on how many residents were affected by the power surges and questions about the planning application for the refurbishment project. I was sent the final draft of response by Amanda Johnson on 27 August 2013 (Email chain at **RFM 77**). I replied on the same day stating I was content for that version of the response to the petition to be sent out. (**RFM78**)
111. On 22 August 2013, I was emailed by Councillor Marshall, Chair of the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee forwarding an email he had received from Edward Daffarn on 19 August 2013 (**RFM79** and **RFM80**). Mr Daffarn stated that the TMO had not given a satisfactory explanation for the power surges, that there was too long a delay before the problem was rectified and that affected residents were not being compensated. Councillor Marshall asked for some more information to determine what the truth of the matter was as he appeared to be being told different information by the TMO and officers on the one hand and by the residents on the other. He stated that “I do feel this is a valid case for some proper scrutiny.” Councillor Tony Holt, who was an engineer of some kind and who had been copied into Councillor Marshall’s email to me, replied the next day, copying me in, saying in his view the people in charge should engage a specialist to do tests about the power surges. Councillors asked about this at the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee on 4 September 2013 and the minutes of that meeting (**RFM81**) confirmed that “Mr Maddison reassured the Vice Chairman

that expertise from qualified electrical engineers had been used from the outset in establishing the cause of the Grenfell Tower power surge”.

112. On 28 August 2013, the final response to the petition was sent to Councillor Blakeman, signed by Laura Johnson, stating that “Since Mr Maddison became aware of the problem he has ensured that appropriate action has been taken to ensure that this problem is addressed and we have no evidence to support the view that he has failed to take the health and safety of residents seriously.” She also addressed compensation, offering a goodwill payment of £200 per affected household, set out the chain of responsibility between the TMO, the EMB and RBKC and gave a full explanation of delays to the refurbishment project (**RFM82**).
113. On 6 September 2013, Roger Keane, General Needs Housing Commissioner at RBKC, sent an email to Councillor Marshall, copying in Peter Maddison, Amanda Johnson and myself. This included an email chain with the request from Edward Daffarn sent on 19 August 2013 to Councillor Marshall as mentioned above. Roger Keane attached a briefing note prepared by Peter Maddison, and forwarded an email from the Council’s Insurance Officer stating why compensation could not be given when the Council/TMO had not been found liable for the power surges. Peter Maddison’s briefing note set out what work had been carried out to investigate and remedy the cause of the power surges since the TMO were first made aware of the issue in May, and why compensation could not be paid but noting that a £200 gesture of goodwill payment would be made instead. (**RFM83** and **RFM84**). The briefing note stated that “The TMO worked with our contractors and UK Power Networks to eliminate possibilities and pinpoint the actual cause of the problem. We also worked with the Fire Brigade to undertake further checks and ensure residents were safe” before confirming that “the faulty electrical connection was renewed completely and a surge protection device has been installed at the base of the tower, which will stop any future external power surges.” With regards to the specialist contractor used by the TMO, the briefing note reassured readers that the contractor, RGE, was “qualified to carry out all works to current British standards”. With the response to the petition sent, and having received this briefing from Peter Maddison, I was satisfied the matter was concluded.

Tower. In the email, Tunde Awoderu demanded that the head of the TMO and I attend a meeting with the residents so that they could air their "genuine issues and concerns". Mr Awoderu on behalf of the GTLA emailed Millicent Williams again on 16 March 2017 (to which I am copied in, amongst many others), in response to her reply that she would provide a fuller response in due course, asking to see the health and safety certificate obtained by National Grid or TMO prior to installing the pipe (**RFM87**). In the email, Mr Awoderu said that "leadership of the KCTMO must find an immediate remedy to the serious concerns and secure the building by tonight. If you feel that we are overstating our claim of 'health and safety' concerns we request that the KCTMO invite the independent adjudicator to investigate the gas pipe immediately."

117. On 16 March 2017, I forwarded the email to Robert Black at TMO and Laura Johnson. I asked for a briefing on what the issues at Grenfell Tower were and I said that I could meet with Mr Black, Ms Johnson and the residents if required (**RFM88**).
118. On the same day 16 March 2017, I received a response from Laura Johnson in which she set out the process to be followed when complaints like this were received. (**RFM88**). From this, I took Laura Johnson's suggestion to be that I should not meet with the residents yet, but should first let due process run its course. I accepted that advice but asked her to reply to the residents explaining just that and reassuring them that their concerns were being looked into.
119. On 16 March 2017 the GTLA sent an email (which I was not copied into) to Councillor Blakeman (**RFM89**). In this email, the GTLA forwarded their email to Millicent Williams of 16 March 2007 expressing their concerns about the gas pipe. Mr Awoderu wrote "Would you go to bed knowing your building is unsafe and fire risk hazard?" On 17 March 2017 Councillor Blakeman responded to Mr Awoderu copying me and others in. Councillor Blakeman said that she was more than willing to attend the meeting that Millicent Williams had suggested as the first step to discuss the issues.
120. On 20 March 2017 I forwarded Councillor Blakeman's email to Laura Johnson and asked her to respond on behalf of RBKC "before too long" (**RFM90**). Laura Johnson responded to the GTLA on the same day, copying me in, along with Robert Black and Councillor Paget-Brown (**RFM91**). Laura Johnson acknowledged the residents' concern about the gas pipe at Grenfell Tower. She also said that RBKC would never

put the residents of its housing at risk and that the TMO had reassured the Council that the pipework was safe. Laura Johnson made reference to the meeting with councillors and senior management from both the Council and the TMO that had been requested but said that it was preferable to wait for the outcome of the residents' complaints to the TMO. Laura Johnson explained that both the Council and the TMO received a number of complaints about the housing service and that there was a process in place to manage the complaints and responses would come back to residents within an agreed period of time and that the TMO were dealing with the complaint under its complaints process. Laura Johnson stated that RBKC had been in contact with the TMO to follow up on when the TMO's response would be available and she had been reassured that a response was being drafted. Laura Johnson declined the meeting at this stage on our behalf, but said that once the TMO response had been received, she would see if any further action needed to be taken.

121. Also on 20 March 2017, Lee Chapman, Secretary of the GTLA, emailed Millicent Williams copying in a large number of recipients including me, saying that he was writing to support the issues raised by Mr Awoderu (**RFM92**). In his email, he stated "We are sincerely concerned as residents living in the tower and that the fire risk that the recent installation of gas pipes has brought to the building. It is not just the installation itself that causes some alarm, but it is the risk that exposed pipes of any kind can cause to residents. The fact that these pipes have natural gas, which I am sure you will understand is extremely combustible makes us feel in great danger in the event that one of the pipes being compromised."
122. On 22 March 2017, I was copied into an email from Tunde Awoderu of the GTLA to Laura Johnson (**RFM93**) saying that they were asking for evidence that in the borough or elsewhere in the United Kingdom a gas pipe has been exposed in such a manner, installed in a building's only staircase.
123. On 22 March 2017, I forwarded this response to Laura Johnson saying that "given the concerns and anxiety being expressed about the safety of the gas pipe can you get TMO to confirm when its safety and appropriateness was tested and confirmed by a duly certified independent expert?" (**RFM94**). I wanted extra reassurance that the residents' concerns had been heard and adequately dealt with and, specifically, I wanted to be

sure that the gas pipe did not pose a risk and that an appropriately qualified expert had looked at the pipe to confirm that.

124. On 22 March 2017, I was copied into an email from Laura Johnson to the GTLA. In her cover email (**RFM95**), Laura Johnson stated that she would encourage the GTLA to report outstanding issues with repairs and maintenance "through the usual channels and KCTMO will endeavour to respond as soon as possible." In her detailed response (**RFM96**), Ms Johnson explained that "National Grid have a statutory authority to provide and maintain a gas supply. They are also responsible for ensuring that their supply is safe and meets current regulations. National Grid have confirmed that they consider the installation of the new mains in the communal stairwell is safe and meets with health and safety requirements. KCTMO does not have a contractual relationship with National Grid and do not have direct control on the work that they carry out. However, KCTMO's Fire Safety Advisor has reviewed National Grid's proposals and has followed up with a fire safety inspection and report which has been submitted to National Grid for attention. The Fire Safety Advisor was not concerned about the location of the mains itself, however, he did identify a number of issues relating to the quality of some of the finishing of the works and has asked National Grid to address these matters as part of their work."
125. On 22 March 2017, I was sent another email by Laura Johnson which was a reply to my earlier email of the same day, which had asked for her to confirm with the TMO that the gas pipe safety and appropriateness had been tested by a duly certified independent expert (**RFM97**). Laura Johnson, in her email to me, stated "The issue of the pipe is addressed in the letter to Grenfell Leaseholders Association today following conversations KCTMO have had with National Grid about location and safety." This reassurance from Laura Johnson confirmed that the TMO and their independent expert were liaising with National Grid to address the residents' concerns.
126. On 22 March 2017, I was copied in to a response from Councillor Blakeman to Laura Johnson following Laura Johnson's email and letter to the GTLA earlier on 22 March 2017 (**RFM98**). Councillor Blakeman thanked Laura Johnson for her response and said that she had agreed to attend a meeting with the TMO but had had no response from the GTLA in relation to her providing dates of availability. Councillor Blakeman also stated that "I think residents will be reassured only if they have a report from the

London Fire Brigade on the safety of the gas pipes. The major fear relates to the ongoing anti-social behaviour in the stairwell and the fact that the valve may be vulnerable to interference."

127. On 22 March 2017 I emailed Laura Johnson in reply to her email of the same day asking whether the Council had seen independent confirmation that the pipes met all statutory safety requirements (**RFM99**).
128. On 22 March 2017, Laura Johnson replied to Councillor Blakeman's email of the same day, saying that she would leave Mr Black at the TMO to respond on the issue of anti-social behaviour and how this could impact on the gas pipe (**RFM100**).
129. On 28 March 2017, I was sent an email by Robert Black at the TMO (**RFM101**). He said that there had been a number of emails sent by two leaseholders in Grenfell Tower requesting a meeting and that he had discussed this with Laura Johnson and they had agreed there was no requirement for the meeting, that the residents were not following due process in relation to this matter and that local staff had offered to meet with these residents.
130. Mr Black attached a reply to the points raised by the residents and said that "We did this as we have had so many emails repeating the same thing". Mr Black also explained that "My review confirms we had very little outstanding issues but a lot around their concerns about the gas pipe work which the National Grid (NG) was installing. I am pleased to say that we met with NG yesterday which clarified a number of points around the pipework which will now be boxed in with fire resistant material therefore complying with any H&S legislation and we will raise this with the Fire Brigade when we have our regular meeting with them this week so this should address all the concerns." I was reassured that these important issues were being raised with both the National Grid (who were responsible for the works) and the Fire Brigade (as requested by the residents) in relation to the gas pipe issue.
131. The letter attached to Mr Black's email, (**RFM102**) was addressed to Mr Awoderu and Mr Chapman. It referred to their emails of 7 March, 13 March, 15 March, 16 March, 20 March and 22 March on behalf of the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association. To ensure that all matters raised had been addressed, Mr Black summarised the TMO's understanding of the GTLA's concerns. In relation to the gas pipework, the letter

explained that the TMO employed a competent and experienced health and safety professional and that in addition to this, there was support from a competent independent consultant who undertakes the estate's fire risk assessments and provides a range of fire safety inspections, advice and guidance as necessary. Mr Black's letter also said that it was the TMO's intention to raise this matter with the Fire Brigade at its next scheduled liaison meeting on 29 March. I was assured by this detailed letter that the TMO had answered the questions raised by the residents and that the TMO was acting appropriately to resolve the issue. I was aware that the TMO had spoken to a fire safety consultant and it had been agreed by the National Grid that the gas pipe would be boxed in. I am now aware that the pipe was not boxed in by the time of the fire in June 2017, but at the time I was under the impression that the National Grid would get the pipe boxed in imminently and had committed to do so.

132. On 20 April 2017, I was copied into an email from the GTLA to Laura Johnson and Sacha Jevans, also copied to numerous others (**RFM103**). The email stated that 90% of the residents wanted an independent advisor to investigate the root cause of "major gas leakages in Grenfell Tower" and the need to stop further extension of the gas pipework on the north and east side of the building until the investigation is completed. The residents called for an independent investigation by an independent adjudicator, health and safety inspector and fire brigade inspectors funded by RBKC and the TMO. They also said that they intended to take legal advice.
133. On 13 May 2017, I was copied, along with many others, into an email from GTLA to the TMO Complaints Team (RFM104), regarding the investigation by the Complaints Team into the gas pipe issue instigated by the GTLA. The email made reference to the GTLA not being satisfied with the previous TMO investigation and so progressing it to stage 2.
134. On 18 May 2017, I was sent an email addressed to Laura Johnson from Councillor Blakeman (**RFM105**). Councillor Blakeman stated that she understood that the Health & Safety Executive was in touch with National Grid expressing their concerns about the way National Grid were acting. On 17 May 2017, Judith Blakeman had copied me into an email expressing outrage that National Grid was demanding access to every flat to undertake works that seemingly the TMO knew little of.

135. On 22 May 2017, Laura Johnson emailed me about the National Grid issue and the works National Grid was proposing to undertake at Grenfell Tower (**RFM106**). Laura Johnson said she had made enquiries with the TMO and understood that TMO officers had met with National Grid on 27 March 2017 to discuss the work at Grenfell Tower. Laura Johnson also stated that National Grid had been and continued to be a law unto themselves and despite repeated requests from the TMO to act in a more consultative and collaborative manner, this had not happened. She said the TMO was chasing National Grid for a date to meet to discuss works but the National Grid had not yet been forthcoming. Laura Johnson's email ended saying that National Grid "As a pan-UK organisation don't feel the need to be sensitive to local housing management difficulties."
136. On the same day, 22 May 2017, I responded saying that it was extraordinary behaviour by National Grid and querying whether they really had the right to access the Council's buildings and tenants' homes whenever they deemed appropriate. I queried whether we had sought proper legal advice on their powers and asked whether we needed to get our MP involved. Later on 22 May 2017, Laura Johnson replied saying that they did have the powers I was questioning due to them being an organisation dealing with gas supply and the potential dangers thereby posed. Laura Johnson explained that the TMO was very frustrated, in part because residents did not distinguish between National Grid and the TMO and the TMO felt it was being blamed for something it could do little about.
137. On 23 May 2017, Councillor Paget-Brown responded to my email to Laura Johnson of 22 May 2017 also saying that National Grid's behaviour seemed extraordinary and it would be good to get Victoria Borwick, who was then the MP for Kensington, to raise the matter directly with National Grid and, if necessary, to raise the issue in Parliament. I replied and copied in Laura Johnson asking her to prepare a note to be sent to Victoria Borwick asking her to bring some "pressure to bear on NG from Parliament." (**RFM107**).
138. After that, I was still waiting for further news about this issue and expecting Laura Johnson to send a briefing note to Victoria Borwick, when the tragic fire broke out on 14 June 2017.

Fire advice to residents 2012 to 14 June 2017

139. I am personally not aware of what specific fire advice was given to the residents of Grenfell Tower. As far as I am aware this was the responsibility of the TMO. My general understanding was that there was a "stay put" policy in force at all high-rise blocks, including Grenfell, in the event of a fire. I was never given any reason to suspect the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower would undermine the validity of the 'stay put' policy in any way. I am unable to comment any further on this issue.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

I am willing for my statement to the Public Inquiry to form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and for it to be published on the Inquiry's web site.

Full name: ROCK FEILDING-MELLEN

Position or office held: Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration, RBKC

Signed:



Date: 18 October 2018

GRENFELL TOWER PUBLIC INQUIRY

INDEX TO WITNESS STATEMENT OF ROCK FEILDING-MELLEN

RFM/	Document	FORT	URN
1.	Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee 10 July 2014, Cabinet Member's Report for Housing and Property	FORT01031370	RBK00003279
2.	Email from Cllr Paget-Brown dated 30 Nov 2015, with Subject line: Notes for Part Meeting 30 Nov 2015	FORT01156829	Not disclosed
3.	Housing Policy Board Minutes, 3 December 2015	FORT01215765	RBK01215765
4.	Email from Laura Johnson, Director of Housing to Rock Feilding-Mellen, Subject line: Fire in Trellick Tower, Supplemental. Dated 20 Apr 2017.	FORT00429199	RBK00001846
5.	Email from Laura Johnson to Rock Feilding-Mellen, dated 21 Apr 2017, Subject line: RE: Fire in Trellick Tower- Supplemental	FORT01066117	RBK00003412
6.	Draft Report on Trellick Tower by Janice Wray at TMO, dated 24 Apr 2017	FORT01113009	RBK00003527
7.	Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, Report by the Director of Housing, Fire at Trellick Tower, 4 May 2017	FORT00229906	RBK00001185
8.	Email chain with Laura Johnson, Robert Black and Rock Feilding-Mellen. Subject line: Follow Up with LFB. 2 May 2017.	FORT00534944	RBK00002150
9.	Cabinet Meeting, Report by Director of Housing, Use of Capital Receipts Arising from the Sale of Basement Spaces at Elm Park Gardens, 2 May 2012	FORT00109574	RBK00029027
10.	Cabinet Meeting, Report by Director of Housing, 18 July 2013, Budget Monitoring 2013/14- Quarter 1	FORT00418638	RBK00013783
11.	Cabinet Meeting, Director of Housing, Draft Report, 3 June 2014, Grenfell Tower Major Works & Hidden Homes Project, for 19 June 2014 Cabinet Meeting	FORT01150089	RBK00003613

12.	Housing and Economic Development Policy Board Minutes, 5 June 2014	FORT01184745	RBK00003688
13.	Cabinet Meeting, Report by Director of Housing, 19 June 2014 Grenfell Tower Major Works and Hidden Homes Project	FORTH0002452	Uploaded via egress
14.	Email from Peter Maddison to Rock Feilding-Mellen on 10 July 2014. Subject line: 'Visit to Grenfell to View Cladding Sample.'	FORT01179732	RBK00003676
15.	Email chain between Peter Maddison and Rock Feilding Mellen dated from 10 July to 11 July 2014. Subject line: 'Re. 'Visit to Grenfell to View Cladding Sample.'	FORT01178643	RBK00003673
16.	Email chain between Peter Maddison and Rock Feilding Mellen dated from 10 July to 15 July 2014. Subject line: 'Re. Visit to Grenfell to View Cladding Sample.'	FORT01098617	RBK00003500
17.	Email from Bruce Soanes at Studio E to Rock Feilding-Mellen, dated 15 July 2014, copying in Sarah Scannell, RBKC Planning and Clare Williams. Subject line: 'Grenfell Tower Planning.'	FORT01080202	Uploaded via egress
18.	Email from Peter Maddison to Rock Feilding-Mellen, copying David Gibson at TMO, dated 16 July 2014. Subject line: 'Grenfell Tower- Meeting with Planners.'	FORT01151900	Uploaded via egress
19.	Email from Rock Feilding-Mellen to Jonathan Bore at RBKC, dated 16 July 2014. Subject line: 'FW: Grenfell Tower- Meeting with Planners.' Forwards an email from Peter Maddison to RFM, dated 16 July 2014.	FORT01201988	RBK00003732
20.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen and Bruce Soanes at Studio E from 15 July 2014 to 18 July 2014, copying in Peter Maddison. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01126157	RBK00003559
21.	Email chain between Peter Maddison, Rock Feilding-Mellen and Bruce Soanes at Studio E from 15 July 2014 to 18 July 2014. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01175545	RBK00003671
22.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen, Peter Maddison, and Bruce Soanes at Studio E from 15 July 2014 to 18 July 2014. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01181917	RBK00003682
23.	Email chain between Johnathan Bore and Rock Feilding-Mellen from 16 July 2014 to 18 July 2014 at 12:35. Subject line: 'Grenfell Tower-Meeting with Planners.'	FORT01062374	Uploaded via egress
24.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen and Johnathan Bore from 16 July 2014 to 18	FORT01062240	Uploaded via egress

	July 2014 at 13:56. Subject line: 'Grenfell Tower-Meeting with Planners.'		
25.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen and Johnathan Bore from 16 July 2014 to 18 July 2014 at 13:57. Subject line: 'Grenfell Tower-Meeting with Planners.'	FORT01212743	RBK00003754
26.	Email chain between Johnathan Bore and Rock Feilding-Mellen from 16 July 2014 to 18 July 2014 at 16:30. Subject line: 'Grenfell Tower-Meeting with Planners.'	FORT01051151	RBK00003347
27.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen and Johnathan Bore from 16 July 2014 to 18 July 2014 at 18:42. Subject line: 'Grenfell Tower-Meeting with Planners.'	FORT01116283	Uploaded via egress
28.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen and Peter Maddison from 15 July 2014 to 18 July 2014 at 19:21. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01159051	RBK00003632
29.	Email chain between Peter Maddison and Rock Feilding-Mellen from 15 July 2014 to 21 July 2014 at 10:06. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01051123	RBK00003346
30.	Email from Johnathan Bore to Rock Feilding-Mellen, copying in Graham Stallwood at RBKC and Erin Lawn at RBKC, dated 21 July 2014 at 16:10. Subject line: 'Dukes Lodge and Grenfell Tower.'	FORT01152759	Uploaded via egress
31.	Email from Rock Feilding-Mellen to Johnathan Bore, copying in Graham Stallwood at RBKC and Erin Lawn at RBKC, dated 21 July 2014 at 16:18. Subject line: 'Dukes Lodge and Grenfell Tower.'	FORT01186780	Uploaded via egress
32.	Email chain between Peter Maddison to Rock Feilding-Mellen, copying David Gibson at TMO, from 15 July 2014 to 24 July 2014 at 16:33. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01156575	RBK00003626
33.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen to Peter Maddison, copying David Gibson, from 15 July 2014 to 24 July at 23:35. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01113630	RBK00003531
34.	Email chain between Peter Maddison to Rock Feilding-Mellen, copying David Gibson at TMO and Bruce Soanes at Studio E, from 15 July 2014 to 25 July 2014 at 09:39. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01067335	RBK00003415
35.	Email chain between David Gibson, Peter Maddison and Rock Feilding-Mellen from	FORT01075766	RBK00003436

	15 July 2014 to 29 July 2014 at 11:30. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'		
36.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen to David Gibson, copying Peter Maddison from 15 July 2014 to 29 July at 12:06. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01133453	RBK00003572
37.	Email chain between David Gibson, Peter Maddison and Rock Feilding-Mellen from 15 July 2014 to 29 July 2014 at 12:26. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01144207	Uploaded via egress
38.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen to David Gibson, copying Peter Maddison from 15 July 2014 to 29 July at 12:40. Subject line: 'Re. Grenfell Tower Cladding.'	FORT01104750	RBK00003508
39.	Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee 6 Nov 2014, Report from the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Corporate Property and Economic Regeneration	FORT01134105	RBK00003583
40.	Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee 10 July 2014, Director of Housing and Town Clerk and Executive Director of Finance, Report on TMO's Performance Review 2013/14 and TMO's Performance Agreement 2014/15	FORT01117618	RBK00003535
41.	Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee 9 July 2015, Director of Housing and Town Clerk and Executive Director of Finance, Report on TMO's Performance Review 2014/15 and TMO's Performance Agreement 2015/16	FORT01164530	RBK00003649
42.	Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee 13 July 2016, Director of Housing and Town Clerk and Executive Director of Finance, Report on TMO's Performance Review 2015/16 and TMO's Performance Agreement 2016/17	FORT00052268	RBK00000589
43.	Email from Janice Wray to Laura Johnson, dated 24 Feb 2014, Subject line: 'Fire Brigade Letter re: sprinklers'.	FORT00426663	RBK00013870
44.	Email from Laura Johnson to Rock Feilding-Mellen and Councillor Marshall, dated 17 July 2014, Subject line: 'FW: Two new guides for councillors about fire safety and knowtheplan'	FORT01041700	RBK00003314
45.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen and the GTLA, dated 13 June 2014, copying in many other recipients, Subject line: 'Re: Grenfell Tower regeneration project MUST START NOW'	FORT01177760	Uploaded via egress

46.	Email from Rock Feilding-Mellen to Laura Johnson, dated 09 June 2014, Subject line: 'Re: Grenfell Tower regeneration project MUST START NOW'	FORT01199467	RBK00000059
47.	Email chain between Councillor Blakeman and Peter Maddison at TMO, copying in Rock Feilding-Mellen, Robert Black, Councillor Lasharie and Claire Williams, dated 29 Jun 2015- 2 July 2015, Subject line: 'RE: Grenfell Tower.'	FORT01166598	RBK00003655
48.	Attachment to email chain between Councillor Blakeman and Peter Maddison at TMO, copying in Rock Feilding-Mellen, Robert Black, Councillor Lasharie and Claire Williams, dated 29 Jun 2015- 2 July 2015, Subject line: 'RE: Grenfell Tower.' Response by Peter Maddison to Councillor Blakeman's queries.	FORT01166599	RBK00003656
49.	Petition by 60 Grenfell Tower residents asking the Chairman of the Housing and Scrutiny Committee to undertake urgent scrutiny of the TMO and Rydon, presented to the Council on 2 Dec 2015	FORT00178582	RBK00000975
50.	Briefing note prepared by Peter Maddison entitled Grenfell Tower Refurbishment, dated 24 Dec 2015.	FORT01094271	RBK00003490
51.	Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee Minutes, 6 Jan 2016	FORT00001940	RBK00000338
52.	Grenfell Tower Board Review, 16 March 2016	FORT01107184	RBK00003513
53.	Email from Rock Feilding-Mellen to Laura Johnson, Cllr Paget-Brown and Nicholas Holgate, forwarding an email he sent to David Collins, Edward Daffarn, Robert Black, John Sweeney, Cllr Blakeman and Thea Baillie, 19 May 2016	FORT01067396	RBK00013966
54.	Email chain between Robert Black to Rock Feilding-Mellen, copying in Cllr Paget-Brown and Nicholas Holgate. Subject line: "RE: HO Investigation- Mr Daffarn 134 Grenfell Tower.' Dated 2 May 2017	FORT00995795	RBK00003151
55.	Email from the GTLA to Cllr Blakeman, copying in Rock Feilding-Mellen and others, dated 29 Sep 2016. Subject line: "Grenfell Tower refurbishment- mission unaccomplished by the KCTMO and their appointed contractor Rydon."	FORT01030048	RBK00003271
56.	Email from Rock Feilding-Mellen to Laura Johnson on 30 Sept 2016, forwarding email from the GTLA dated 29 Sep 2016. Subject	FORT01046136	RBK00003333

	line: "Grenfell Tower refurbishment-mission unaccomplished by the KCTMO and their appointed contractor Rydon."		
57.	Email from Cllr Blakeman to the GTLA, copying in Rock Feilding-Mellen amongst others, dated 04 Oct 2016. Subject line: "RE: Grenfell Tower refurbishment- mission unaccomplished by the KCTMO and their appointed contractor Rydon."	FORT01042824	RBK00003321
58.	Attachment to email from Cllr Blakeman to the GTLA, copying in Rock Feilding-Mellen amongst others, dated 04 Oct 2016. Subject line: "RE: Grenfell Tower refurbishment-mission unaccomplished by the KCTMO and their appointed contractor Rydon." Entitled "Outstanding Issues Matric May 2016"	FORT01042825	RBK00003322
59.	Email from Laura Johnson to Rock Feilding-Mellen on 24 May 2013. Subject line: "FW: Loss of water at GT and Power Surge."	FORT01183302	RBK00003684
60.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen and Laura Johnson, on 03 June 2016. Subject line: "Grenfell Tower update." Forwards email from Thea McNaught Reynolds at the TMO.	FORT01149676	Uploaded via egress
61.	Email chain between Laura Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen, on 03 June 2016. Subject line: "Grenfell Tower update." Forwards email from Thea McNaught Reynolds at the TMO.	FORT01067173	RBK00000023
62.	Email chain between Laura Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen, on 04 June 2016. Subject line: "FW: Grenfell Tower update."	FORT01209574	Uploaded via egress
63.	Email chain between Laura Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen, on 05 June 2016. Subject line: "FW: Grenfell Tower update."	FORT01155646	Uploaded via egress
64.	Email from GTLA to Cllr Blakeman, copying in large number of others, dated 16 June 2013. Subject line: "CATASTROPHIC POWER SURGES AT GRENFELL TOWER ON MAY 2013 AND THE SERIOUSLY DELAYED START TO THE REGENERATION PROJECT OF GT WHICH SHOULD BE IN TANDEM WITH KALC PROJECT."	FORT01166626	RBK00003657
65.	Email chain between Cllr Blakeman, Robert Black, Peter Maddison, Laura Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen, dated between 16 June 2013 to 21 June 2014. Subject line: "Grenfell Tower."	FORT00036670	RBK00001126

66.	Email chain between Laura Johnson, Rock Feilding-Mellen, Councillor Lindsay and Edward Daffarn dated between 24 June 2016 and 26 June 2016. Subject line: "Social cleansing."	FORT01108988	Uploaded via egress
67.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen, Councillor Lindsay and Edward Daffarn dated between 24 June 2016 and 26 June 2016. Subject line: "Social cleansing."	FORT01041829	Uploaded via egress
68.	Email chain between Laura Johnson to Cllr Borwick, copying in Rock Feilding-Mellen, Robert Black and Peter Maddison, dated 28 June 2013. Subject line "RE: Social cleansing."	FORT01160524	RBK00003635
69.	Minutes Grenfell Meeting July 13 to discuss concerns of Grenfell Action Group	FORT01126322	RBK00003561
70.	Minutes HPSC 16 July 2013	FORT00828468	Uploaded via egress
71.	Petition by Residents of Grenfell Tower at Lancaster West Estate, 16 July 2013	FORT00568914	RBK00002270
72.	Letter from Laura Johnson to Cllr Blakeman, dated 17 July 2013	FORT00568915	RBK00002271
73.	Email from Laura Johnson to Rock Feilding-Mellen, dated 17 July 2013, attaching petition and acknowledgment letter	FORT00568913	RBK00002269
74.	Email from Amanda Johnson to numerous councillors, dated 25 Jul 2013. Subject line: 'Grenfell Tower Petition.'	FORT01100703	RBK00003502
75.	Response to petition, dated 24 July 2013. Attached to email at RFM74.	FORT01100704	RBK00003503
76.	Email chain between Amanda Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen, dated between 25 July and 7 Aug 2013. Subject line: "RE: Grenfell Tower Petition."	FORT01205526	RBK00000032
77.	Email chain between Amanda Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen, Laura Johnson and Celia Caliskan, dated between 25 July and 27 Aug 2013. Subject line: "RE: Grenfell Tower Petition."	FORT01053097	RBK00003358
78.	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen, Amanda Johnson, Laura Johnson and Celia Caliskan, dated between 25 July and 27 Aug 2013. Subject line: "RE: Grenfell Tower Petition."	FORT00109336	RBK00000784
79.	Email chain between Cllr Marshall and Rock Feilding Mellen and Councillor Holt, dated 22 Aug 2013. Forwarding email from Edward Daffarn. Subject line: "FWD: Fwd: Scrutiny Committee and Grenfell Tower power surges."	FORT01198757	Uploaded via egress

80.	Email chain between Cllr Holt, Rock Feilding Mellen and Cllr Marshall, dated 23 Aug 2013. Forwarding email from Edward Daffarn. Subject line: "FWD: Fwd: Scrutiny Committee and Grenfell Tower power surges."	FORT01036515	Uploaded via egress
81.	Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee 4 Sept 2013 Minutes	FORT01234394	Not disclosed to Inq
82.	Response to petition by Laura Johnson addressed to Cllr Blakeman, dated 27 Aug 2013.	FORT02119683	RBK00013839
83.	Email from Roger Keane to Cllr Marshall, copying in Laura Johnson, Peter Maddison, Rock Feilding-Mellen, dated 6 Sep 2013. Subject line: "FW: Scrutiny Committee and Grenfell Tower Power surges"	FORT01049178	Uploaded via egress
84.	Briefing note prepared by Peter Maddison entitled "In Response to Mr Edward Daffarn's email dated 19 August 2013", 03 Sept 2013.	FORT01049179	Uploaded via egress
85.	Email from the GTLA to Peter Maddison, copying in many others, dated 7 March 2017. Subject line: " Seriously exposed newly installed gas pipe line throughout the entire staircase of Grenfell Tower poses extremely serious health and safety Risk."	FORT00262276	RBK00000146
86.	Email from GTLA to Millicent Williams at TMO, copying in many others, dated 15 March 2017. Subject line: "Re: Stakeholders Meeting with KCTMO & RBKC ref: Grenfell Tower."	FORT00290296	RBK00000147
87.	Email from GTLA to Millicent Williams at TMO, copying in many others, dated 16 March 2017. Subject line: "Re: Stakeholders Meeting with KCTMO & RBKC ref: Grenfell Tower."	FORT00176136	RBK00000150
88.	Email chain between Laura Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen, forwarding email from GTLA to Millicent Williams at TMO, copying in many others, dated 16 March 2017. Subject line: "Re: Stakeholders Meeting with KCTMO & RBKC ref: Grenfell Tower."	FORT01217141	Uploaded via egress
89.	Email from GTLA to Cllr Blakeman, dated 16 March 17. Subject line: "RE: Stakeholders Meeting with KCTMO & RBKC ref: Grenfell Tower"	FORT00991168	RBK00003118
90.	Email from Rock Feilding-Mellen to Laura Johnson, dated 20 Mar 2017. Subject line:	FORT00427257	RBK00001835

	"Fwd: Stakeholders Meeting with KCTMO & RBKC ref: Grenfell Tower"		
91.	Email from Laura Johnson to GTLA, copying in Rock Feilding-Mellen, Robert Black and Cllr Paget-Brown, dated 20 Mar 2017. Subject line: "RE: Stakeholders Meeting with KCTMO & RBKC ref: Grenfell Tower"	FORT00990074	RBK00003113
92.	Email from GTLA to Millicent Williams at TMO, copying in many others, dated 20 March 2017. Subject line: "Re: Stakeholders Meeting with KCTMO & RBKC ref: Grenfell Tower."	FORT00184125	RBK00000151
93.	Email from GTLA to Laura Johnson, copying in many others, dated 22 Mar 2017. Subject line: "Dodgy gas pipe work MUST be remove at Grenell Tower immediately and re-instated by replacing the old gas pipe through the service cupboards inside the flat."	FORT01039640	RBK00003306
94.	Email from Rock Feilding-Mellen to Laura Johnson, dated 22 Mar 2017 at 06:33. Subject line: "Fwd: Dodgy gas pipe work MUST be remove at Grenell Tower immediately and re-instated by replacing the old gas pipe through the service cupboards inside the flat."	FORT00398731	RBK00001760
95.	Email from Laura Johnson to GTLA, dated 22 Mar 2017, copying in Rock Feilding-Mellen and many others. Attaches her full response.	FORT01927028	RBK00029406
96.	Attachment to RFM95. Letter addressed to Mr Awoderu of the GTLA from Laura Johnson, dated 22 Mar 2017.	FORT01097912	RBK00000154
97.	Email from Laura Johnson to Rock Feilding-Mellen, dated 22 Mar 2017. Subject line:"RE: Dodgy gas pipe work MUST be remove at Grenell Tower immediately and re-instated by replacing the old gas pipe through the service cupboards inside the flat."	FORT01205488	RBK00003740
98.	Email from Cllr Blakeman to Laura Johnson, copying in Rock Feilding-Mellen, Robert Black, Cllr Atkinson and Cllr Lasharie, dated 22 Mar 2017. Subject line: "RE: Grenfell Leaseholders Association - March 2017."	FORT01167358	RBK00003658
99.	Email from Rock Feilding-Mellen to Laura Johnson, dated 22 Mar 2017 at 09:46. Subject line: "Re: Dodgy gas pipe work	FORT00247463	RBK00001248

	MUST be remove at Grenell Tower immediately and re-instated by replacing the old gas pipe through the service cupboards inside the flat."		
100	Email from Laura Johnson to Cllr Blakeman, copying in councillors, dated 22 Mar 2017. Subject line:" RE: Grenfell Leaseholders Association - March 2017."	FORT01157885	RBK00003630
101	Email from Robert Black at TMO to Rock Feilding-Mellen, Cllr Paget-Brown and Nicholas Holgate, copying in Gill Petford, dated 28 Mar 2017. Subject line:" RE: Stakeholders Meeting with KCTMO & RBKC ref: Grenfell Tower."	FORT01030168	RBK00003273
102	Attached to RFM101. Letter addressed to Mr Awoderu and Mr Chapman from the TMO, dated 28 Mar 2017.	FORT01030169	RBK00003274
103	Email from GTLA to Laura Johnson and Sacha Jevans, copying in many others, dated 20 Apr 2017. Subject line: "Mandate from the residents of Grenfell Tower to implement and remedy the following serious issues and concerns."	FORT01119040	RBK00003542
104	Email from GTLA to the TMO Complaints Team, and Anthony Cheney at TMO copying in many others, dated 13 May 2017. Subject line:"Re: Mandate from the residents of Grenfell Tower to implement and remedy the following serious issues and concerns-COM170410567 Stage 1 reply"	FORT00186034	RBK00001012
105	Email from Cllr Blakeman to Laura Johnson, and Rock Feilding-Mellen, copying in Robert Black, Janice Wray at TMO and Sacha Jevans, dated 18 May 2017. Subject line: "RE: National Grid Works at Grenfell Tower"	FORT01034244	RBK00003292
106	Email chain between Laura Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen, dated 22 May 2017. Subject line:"RE: National Grid Works at Grenfell Tower"	FORT01067908	Uploaded via egress
107	Email chain between Rock Feilding-Mellen, Cllr Paget-Brown and Nicholas Holgate, copying in Laura Johnson and Thea Baillie, dated between 22 May to 23 May 2017. Subject line:"Re: National Grid Works at Grenfell Tower."	FORT00179335	Uploaded via egress