

**GRENFELL TOWER  
PUBLIC INQUIRY**

---

**Witness Statement of  
Timothy Coleridge**

---

I, TIMOTHY RICHARD COLERIDGE WILL SAY:

1. I make this Witness Statement further to receipt of the Rule 9 letter from the Public Inquiry dated 12<sup>th</sup> 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 Council', 'RBKC'), and to which I have access and with which I am familiar and which I believe to be accurate.
3. I was first elected as a Conservative councillor for RBKC in May 1986. I served until 1994 and then stepped down due to work commitments.
4. I was reelected in May 1998 and served until 2018, during which time I was the ward councillor for Hans Town, then from 2014, Brompton and Hans Town ward. For a year (I believe between 1998 and 1999) and as part of my role as a councillor for RBKC, I was appointed to the board of Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation ('the TMO').
5. The Leader of the Council appointed councillors to the various positions in the Cabinet. In 2002 I was appointed as the Cabinet Member for Housing, a position I held until 2004. In 2010 I was appointed as the Cabinet Member for Housing and Property and I retained this post until May 2013.

6. In late 2013, when Cllr Paget-Brown became Leader, I became Cabinet Member for Planning Policy Transport and the Arts, a position which I held until July 2017 when I stood down from the Cabinet. I remained as a councillor for RBKC until May 2018.
7. In respect of Grenfell Tower prior to the fire, my involvement was in my capacity as Cabinet Member for Housing and Property during the above period. At the time of the fire, I had no direct involvement in Housing or Grenfell Tower.
8. I attach to this witness statement an index of the exhibits to which I refer in the following paragraphs of my statement.
9. I wish to express my great sadness and sincere condolences to all who suffered or experienced the tragic fire at Grenfell Tower on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

#### **Governance / Management**

10. In 1994 the government passed legislation which allowed tenants to take over the management of council housing stock. Around ten thousand properties belonged to RBKC; approximately seven and a half thousand were tenanted and two and a half thousand were leasehold; purchased under the Right to Buy scheme.
11. The TMO was set up in 1996 and was the first tenant-led management organisation to manage a borough-wide housing portfolio (as opposed to, for example, one or two estates at a time). It was responsible for the day-to-day management of the buildings, including repairs and maintenance of the gardens, greenery, lifts and car parks. It was not responsible for capital works.
12. In 2002, whilst I was Cabinet Member for Housing, a Decent Homes policy was implemented to bring all social housing up to a decent standard e.g. installing new kitchens and bathrooms. In order to obtain the funding to carry out the required work, the TMO had to become an Arm's-length Management Organisation ('ALMO') and I supported its doing so.

13. RBKC remained the freeholder/landlord of the housing stock but the TMO became responsible for its management and the capital works programme. RBKC had no power to replace the TMO unless the tenants voted themselves to change management or the Council made a special application to the Secretary of State. Tenant members of the TMO regularly voted to continue with the status quo.
14. The TMO was in place throughout my time as Cabinet Member for Housing and Property and at the time of the Grenfell Tower fire.
15. As the Cabinet Member, I was the elected spokesperson for all issues relating to housing and property within the borough. I sent reports to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee and I would attend those meetings and speak to those reports. I was also responsible for resident engagement in relation to Housing and Property.
16. In respect of Housing, I oversaw and worked with Laura Johnson, in relation to all of the Council's housing responsibilities. These included homelessness, housing allocation policy (i.e. waiting list priorities), temporary accommodation and supporting people (including those with special needs). In addition, the Council was always seeking to identify where new homes could be built.
17. I had weekly Housing digest meetings with the Director of Housing. These would last up to two hours and different members of the Housing team would attend to discuss issues such as housing and temporary accommodation. The possibility of refurbishment of Grenfell Tower was specifically discussed following the submission of a Paper from the Head of Housing dated 9<sup>th</sup> February 2012.
18. The Director of Housing and I would also meet quarterly with the Chief Executive of the TMO, Robert Black at TMO (HRA) Performance Meetings. Prior to each of these meetings I was required to read a performance report about the TMO, which assessed performance across the different departments and referred to performance indicators. The TMO would be questioned on their report. The meetings would cover finance, voids, rent collection and repairs. We would discuss strategic planning and the capital works programme, the Housing Revenue



Account and whether the rents being received were sufficient to pay for the programme of capital works over the following thirty years. We would also discuss upcoming targets for projects, such as building new housing.

19. In respect of Property, I had Cabinet responsibility over the Corporate Property team and oversight over the Council's property portfolio. This involved leading the management and development of the Council's property, which included Council offices, the Town Hall, schools, shops and the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre ('KALC').

### **Refurbishment of Grenfell Tower**

20. For years, the Council had been trying to do something useful with the basement space at Elm Park Gardens in Chelsea, which consisted of old storerooms for tenant and leaseholder properties. Eventually we persuaded the leaseholders to allow us to convert the space into housing. Most of it was used for affordable housing and some of the ground floor leaseholders purchased the basement underneath their property. There was a surplus of capital receipts initially to the value of around £6m, which was a windfall for the Council.
21. At the same time, Kensington Academy was being built as the borough needed a new secondary school and the Council had received a government grant towards funding it. The decision was taken to locate it on the Lancaster West Estate, which included Grenfell Tower. The Leisure Centre was a pre-existing building but this was to be demolished and rebuilt from scratch. Together, this was the KALC project.
22. It was recognised that the KALC project would be disruptive to residents of Grenfell Tower by way of dust and noise etc. I volunteered to chair the KALC Residents Forum and from 28<sup>th</sup> September 2011, there was a series of meetings arranged with councillors as part of an established resident consultation process. It was attended by the Director of Housing and I, and sometimes the architect and/or landscapers for KALC and/or the contractors. We met to discuss the project and hear any concerns about the same. The group included residents from Grenfell

Tower who were unhappy that a new KALC was being built whilst the neighbouring Grenfell Tower and Lancaster West Estate was in need of refurbishment.

23. In 2011, I was invited to the flat of a resident, Mr Daffarn. I could see that the windows were very poor and were single glazed. He stated that because the water pipes had to be on all the time, in the summer it was very hot and due to lack of good insulation, in the winter, it was cold. I felt that something should be done for the residents of Grenfell Tower. I also had longer-term hopes that the whole of Lancaster West Estate would be refurbished.
24. The idea to use the Elm Park Gardens receipts to refurbish Grenfell Tower I believe came from RBKC and to an extent, from me. Having spent many evenings holding the KALC Residents Forum in Grenfell Tower, I could see that the building was in need of refurbishment. I knew that the residents had undergone a lot of disruption as a result of the KALC project. The refurbishment of the Lancaster West Estate was raised as something needing to be done; it was a matter of co-incidence that an opportunity arose which involved KALC, its resident consultation process and Elm Park Gardens; all of which I was involved in.
25. I thought it would be good if, rather than giving the £6m back to the general fund (which was sometimes required in relation to capital receipts e.g. to pay debt back to the government), we put it into the HRA with the suggestion that it be used to refurbish Grenfell Tower (the TMO would have been entitled to recommend spending it on something else). I could not make this decision myself; it needed to be approved by the Council's Finance Director. I asked Laura Johnson to look into whether this could be done.
26. She agreed to ascertain whether the £6m could be used in this way. The suggestion also had to be put by the TMO (if they agreed) to its board and tenants. Then there had to be consultation with leaseholders. Ultimately, the decision on what to spend the money on rested with the TMO with RBKC needing to agree its contribution to the total cost. The TMO appeared supportive of using the money on Grenfell Tower. They had to be able to justify the capital works programme to

tenants borough-wide. They were requested to review investment needs throughout the borough and they did justify the estimated contribution of £6m from RBKC being spent on the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower (the final surplus from the sale of the Elm Park Gardens basements rose as final sales were agreed).

27. Once the TMO Board agreed, as Cabinet Member for Housing and Property, my approval was formally sought and then Cabinet approval was required.

28. A Housing Digest Report by Jean Daintith and Laura Johnson dated 9<sup>th</sup> February 2012 (TC/1) stated at paragraphs 8.1-8.2 (page 7):

*"Cabinet Member approval is sought to take a paper to Cabinet for authority to development [sic] of a programme of housing development and investment, to use the capital liberated from these basement spaces to increase the number of modern, accessible and good quality affordable Council homes in the borough and meet local need, with detailed development of the programme of works delegated to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Property.*

*The first identified priorities for the anticipated receipt of approximately £8m will be:*

- £200k for investment in the delivery of further market homes opportunities in the Elm Park Gardens basements, and delivery of a further unit of wheelchair accessible affordable housing.*
- £5.5m for investment in works to Grenfell Tower on the Lancaster West Estate, to deliver major improvements to the fabric of the building, and to provide new homes and improved accessible office space on the lower floors."*

29. Paragraph 11.1 (page 8) of the same report stated:

*"The proposed investment in Grenfell Tower is intended to substantially improve its carbon efficiency, and reduce fuel bills for both residents and the Council, providing positive sustainability outcomes. A detailed analysis of this benefit will be produced for the Cabinet report as evidence of this effect."*



30. The recommendations set out at paragraphs 14.1-14.3 were:

*"The Cabinet Member is requested to consider the options for investment of the Elm Park Gardens capital receipt, and recommend approval to Cabinet in due course.*

*The Cabinet Member is requested to receive a separate and more detailed proposal for the investment in Grenfell Tower as detailed surveys, designs and cost estimates are developed.*

*The proposal for expenditure of this capital receipt should go to Cabinet with a recommendation to delegate the authority for approval of any minor changes to the investment needs at Grenfell Tower to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Property."*

31. The Housing Digest Meeting Minutes for 9<sup>th</sup> February 2012 (TC/2) record at section 3 (pages 1-2) that the TMO supported the programme of opportunities for regeneration and that the TMO board would be signing it off in March. They also record that I approved the draft report in relation the Grenfell Tower proposals for submission to the Cabinet.

32. Paper A6 for the 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2012 Cabinet Meeting was a report by Laura Johnson (TC/3) which stated at paragraphs 6.3.3 - 6.3.6 (pages 9-10):

*"Based on the TMO's information on investment need, and the aspirations of the TMO Board and the Lancaster West Estate Management Board (EMB), the recommendation is therefore that funds from the Elm Park Gardens capital receipt be set aside for investment into renovation, regeneration and conversion works to Grenfell Tower on the Lancaster West Estate. The benefits anticipated to arise from this will be:*

- Replacement of single-glazed windows which are currently beyond economic repair and unsafe, with double-glazed fenestration throughout, improving thermal efficiency and fuel economy.*

- *Installing thermally insulating cladding and rain screen curtain walling system to the un-insulated external elevations of Grenfell Tower, significantly improving thermal efficiency, fuel economy, and providing for an external appearance that reflects and complements the adjoining KALC project.*
- *Replacement and rationalisation of existing office facilities with a fully accessible reception and office.*
- *Rationalisation and modernisation of estate community facilities.*
- *Delivery of between four and six new family sized affordable homes on the lower levels of Grenfell Tower.*
- *Replacement of an inefficient and life-expired communal heating system with controllable and highly efficient individual gas-fire combi-boilers to each unit, linked to funding from the existing HRA Capital Programme.*
- *Provision of improved pedestrian routes and Public Realm at the base of Grenfell Tower, which will assist in the access planning for the new Academy and Leisure Centre.*
- *Delivery of resident and community aspirations for their long term benefit.*
- *Support of wider RBKC policy objectives including carbon management and reduction targets.*
- *Reduced future investment demand on the HRA.*
- *Improvement of the overall appearance of Grenfell Tower to the benefit of its residents and of the wider regeneration of Golborne Ward.*

*In December 2011 the TMO was asked to provide indicative costings for these works. Their proposal, incorporating external insulated cladding, new windows, enclosure of the 'open' lower level corner of the block, provision of additional residential units on the lower levels, and rationalisation of the TMO and Estate Management Board office requirements had an estimated cost of £6m.*

*In March 2012 the TMO carried out a consultation at Grenfell Tower to establish whether the items identified for investment matched resident priorities. This produced overwhelming support for the proposals. Further detailed discussions with the EMB have started in advance of wider resident engagement and a Planning Application (currently anticipated in July 2012).*



*The TMO is seeking to work in close partnership with the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre project taking place on the site immediately adjacent to Grenfell Tower. The TMO has appointed the same design team as that for KALC to assist in the project management of detailed matters such as the co-ordination of design, consultation, public realm, site access, and works. The TMO also anticipates employing the same contractor and this is intended to ensure that the two projects are able to deliver cost savings where possible, and produce schemes that are complementary in their appearance and function. For this reason, and subject to the Cabinet's approval, there is a need to ensure that the Grenfell Tower project is permitted to proceed without delay."*

33. The Cabinet Meeting Minutes for 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2012 (TC/4) record at A6 (page 5):

*"RESOLVED - Cabinet agreed*

- (i) to approve options outlined in the report for the use of the capital receipts arising from the sale of Elm Park Gardens basement spaces;*
- (ii) To delegate the authority for approval of any minor changes to the investment proposals at Elm Park Gardens, Greaves Tower, Holmefield House and Grenfell Tower to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Property; and*
- (iii) To receive further and more detailed updates on the investments proposed as detailed surveys, designs and cost estimates are developed"*

34. By mid to end of 2012 there were discussions at Cabinet about the budget. The TMO had to decide whether to put a further £3.7m into refurbishing Grenfell Tower. By this stage I was aware that the intention was to install a new heating system, new windows and to insulate the building with cladding. The Budget Monitoring Report 2013-14 Quarter 1 by Laura Johnson (TC/5) recommended that Cabinet agree that the total budget provision for Grenfell Tower be increased to £9.7 million; the increase to be met from the HRA Working Balance.

35. The Cabinet approved the additional funding having received papers from Housing, Property and Finance. It was unusual to put general funds into the HRA

but I believe it was generally supported by the Council. I supported the project and supported the increase in spending.

36. On 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012, RBKC had issued a press statement (TC/6) to the effect that the £6m from Elm Park Gardens, together with a further £3.7m of the TMO's own money, would be used to fund the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower. The article stated:

*"Known as the Grenfell Tower Regeneration Project the works will be overseen by the TMO and carried out by the same team who are handling the academy and leisure centre programme. With architects, Studio E and contractor, Leadbitter, on the board the works can be carried out as cost-effectively and quickly as possible, minimising disruption to residents".*

37. I am quoted in the article as saying, amongst other things:

*"During such challenging economic times we are proud that the Council has invested almost £50m in the area and it's sure to leave a long-lasting legacy for future generations"*

38. At the time of the press release I do not believe that the architects had completed a detailed estimate of the cost of the project. I presume they must have provided a rough estimate as the press release did include some detail as to what the money would be used for but I had not seen any financial documents.

39. Councillors are generally policy makers and do not have direct involvement with or oversight of costing or plans. I did not have any technical expertise such that I could offer any advice about projects. Experts were always consulted in relation to areas which required technical or in-depth knowledge.

40. After the press-release, Leadbitter were not appointed as contractor. Things went quite quiet around the project and I had no further professional involvement in the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower. Personally, I was very interested in the project

and I continued to ask Ms Johnson about how it was going even after my role in Housing had ceased in May 2013.

## **Fire Safety**

41. One of the TMO's responsibilities was for Health and Safety in the buildings, including fire safety. RBKC monitored the TMO in this regard but it did not manage the TMO or have any technical role. The fire safety officers were employed by the TMO. The TMO sent reports to the Director of Housing, to me (as Cabinet Member for Housing and Property) and to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee ('HSPC') to keep the Council informed of the work they were doing. The Local Authority's Environmental Health Department would have enforcement powers over breaches of fire safety.
42. At the HPSC meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2011, Janice Wray (TMO Health and Safety Advisor) introduced a joint report by Robert Black and Laura Johnson on fire risk assessments in RBKC residential blocks (TC/7), which was an update to a previous report in March 2010. The HPSC Meeting Minutes for 20<sup>th</sup> January 2011 (TC/8) record at A12:

*"The TMO was still working closely with RBKC and the London Fire Brigade and making ongoing progress. In response to a question from Councillor Williams about flat entrance doors in enclosed blocks of flats, Ms Wray explained that all such doors must meet the same acceptable fire safety standard..."*

*At the suggestion of the Chairman, in view of the importance of this matter, it was requested that a follow up report be provided, probably to the Committee's meeting in November 2011. Action by: TMO Chief Executive/ Head of Housing*

*Councillor Mingay asked about Registered Providers in the Borough and the Head of Housing confirmed that they had been surveyed over a year ago. The Head of Housing undertook to update the information from Registered Providers and come back to the Committee in due course".*



43. I sent regular Cabinet Member reports on current issues for the HPSC. I regularly attended its meetings but was not a member of the committee. These reports were to inform its members of recent policy and practice developments and to provide progress updates on important current projects.
44. Paper A4 for the 13<sup>th</sup> July 2011 HPSC meeting (TC/9) included at section 8 (pages 3-6) an update on fire safety requirements in Registered Provider (RP) properties and responses to a fire safety survey undertaken in March 2011 to ensure that RPs continued to comply with fire safety standards and recommendations by the London Fire Brigade.
45. Paper A4 for the 10<sup>th</sup> November 2011 HPSC meeting (TC/10) contained at sections 4-6 (pages 3-4) a progress update on fire risk assessments in RBKC residential blocks which stated:

*"The Fire Risk Assessment programmes for the potentially high and medium risk blocks have now successfully completed and the third and final programme, to assess the remaining low risk blocks...is proceeding well and should be complete by March 2012...To date all completed assessments and re-assessments have been given a "normal / medium" rating which our Consultants have confirmed is the best rating that an occupied residential block could ever achieve.*

*...the Committee is asked to note –*

- A flat entrance door replacement programme to replace twelve hundred doors on tenanted dwellings is well underway and scheduled to complete in this financial year. These doors significantly improve fire safety within these blocks...*
- Within the terms of the lease the responsibility for the flat entrance doors is demised to the leaseholder. Counsel's opinion has recently been sought and would seem to support the position that any action taken by the London Fire Brigade because of inadequately fire-rated flat entrance doors on leasehold properties should be taken against the leaseholder and*

*not the TMO or RBKC'...we will write to leaseholders advising them of the requirements and our position.*

46. The HPSC Meeting Minutes for 10<sup>th</sup> November 2011 (TC/11) record at A4 (pages 2-3):

*"...The Committee noted that by the start of April 2012 all blocks of flats should have been checked".*

47. The HPSC Meeting Minutes for 1<sup>st</sup> February 2012 (TC/12) record at A4 (page 2):

*"Mr Black responded to concerns over liability for fire protection of TMO flat entrance doors, to say that all doors deemed high risk had been replaced, and letters had been sent to all leaseholders pointing out their legal responsibility...The Committee expressed its continued concern that every effort be made to ensure fire doors were installed by leaseholders."*

48. On 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2012 I asked Mr Black by e-mail if he was aware of and had a view on an external report I had been sent the previous day on improving fire safety by installing sprinklers in high-rise social housing. On 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2012, Mr Black forwarded to me a response from Janice Wray (TMO Health, Safety and Facilities Manager). She stated that she would provide a more detailed response on the subject following the launch of the project in April 2012 (TC/13) but I cannot recall what happened with it.

49. Paper A4 for the 15<sup>th</sup> March 2012 HPSC meeting (TC/14) provided at paragraphs 5.1-5.7 (pages 5-7) an update on fire doors:

*"TMO Officers reiterated that responsibility for the flat entrance door is demised to the lessee in the lease and further to that a recently produced opinion from Counsel had confirmed that the TMO and RBKC had no responsibility in regard to this..."*

*Whilst neither RBKC nor the TMO can take enforcement action against leaseholders' substandard flat entrance doors, the TMO advised that it intends to:*

- inform the leaseholders of the legislation and the required fire safety standards,*
- provide leaseholders with details of the contractor who is undertaking the replacement of substandard tenants doors so that any who wish can enter into a private arrangement with these contractors and*
- advise the leaseholders as necessary on the possibility of enforcement action etc..*
- advise LFB where a leaseholder flat entrance door is believed to be defective.*

*The LFB Officers agreed to undertake further discussions with RBKC Environmental Health Team whilst the TMO identifies a possible "test" leaseholder door in the Borough so that LFB may progress this. The LFB, TMO and RBKC agreed to continue holding regular meeting to monitor progress with enforcement in this area."*

50. The HPSC Meeting Minutes for 15<sup>th</sup> March 2012 (TC/15) record at A4 (page 2):

*"In response to questions on enforcing adequate installation of flat entrance doors to leasehold flats Ms Wray advised that the London Fire Brigade believed Environmental Health powers would be more effective in enforcing upgrades. Therefore, the London Fire Brigade intended to work with the Borough's Environmental Health Officers on the enforcement. She reported that counsel's opinion had not been sought on the freeholder's duty to ensure a safe means of escape as this was clearly a statutory requirement. The Chairman said a pro-active approach should continue to ensure the highest possible safety levels were achieved. The Committee would need an update at its next meeting".*

51. Paper A4 for the 16<sup>th</sup> May 2012 HPSC meeting (TC/16) provided at Section 2 (pages 2-3) an update in relation to fire doors and enforcement. The HPSC Meeting Minutes for the 16<sup>th</sup> May 2012 at A4 (TC/17) (page 2) record:



*"In regard to fire doors in TMO properties, the Committee noted that assuming the successful outcome of a test case (as yet to be identified with LFB/EHO), it was anticipated that the most dangerous fire doors could be replaced however there was no timescale on that at present. The Committee asked to be kept up to date on how this issue progressed".*

52. I did not report anything further in relation to fire doors between then and when I stepped down from being Cabinet Member for Housing and Property in May 2013. Although the papers I sent to the HPSC included updates in relation to fire doors, I would not be able to provide information on fire doors beyond what is recorded in those papers. They were sent to the HPSC as updates on an issue they were interested in.

#### **Communication with Residents**

53. As the Cabinet Member for Housing, I would often receive e-mails from residents in relation to Housing matters. Sometimes e-mails would be sent with around fifty people copied in. Normally the person who the email was actually addressed to would copy me into a reply to indicate they were dealing with it, otherwise I would ask if it was being dealt with.
54. If I saw an e-mail to the TMO regarding an individual resident's issue e.g. an outstanding repair, I would be aware of it and expect the TMO to deal with it. If it was something of greater importance, for example, a safety issue, I would have forwarded it on to the Director of Housing and expect to be copied into the action taken. I do not recall ever having to do the latter.
55. When I was copied into complaints, I would look at who it was addressed to and if they were the correct person to deal with it. If it had only been sent to me, I would either forward it on to the TMO or to Laura Johnson. If it had sent to the correct person, unless it was something I needed immediate assurance on, I would simply read it and pass it on to the appropriate person to be dealt with. This was against the background that from receiving Performance Review Reports and attending meetings with the TMO I was confident that the majority of complaints were

being dealt with promptly. For example, Paper A7 for the 12<sup>th</sup> July 2012 HPSC meeting (TC/18), at Appendix 1, paragraph 9.4 (page 11) provides a breakdown of complaints and how quickly they were dealt with. As well as regularly attending HPSC meetings where TMO performance was discussed, I also had separate meetings with the Director of Housing and the Chief Executive of the TMO to discuss and appraise the performances and see if the TMO were improving. These would normally take place at the time as the Housing digest meetings.

56. In terms of a complaints process, there were various stages to go through. There were three stages to the TMO's complaint's process. Once those were exhausted, the complaint could be escalated to the Ombudsman. In addition, a resident could at any time bring a complaint to the attention of a councillor as our e-mail addresses were publicly available and quite often, residents knew who their local councillor was. This was not part of the complaints procedure. When I was sent complaints I would forward them on to the TMO or the Director of Housing. I do not recall receiving many (if any) complaints in relation to Grenfell Tower as I was not the ward councillor for those residents.

57. Some leaseholders very much wanted to see Grenfell Tower improved. On 7<sup>th</sup> June 2012 I was copied into an e-mail from Tunde Awoderu on behalf of the Grenfell Tower Leaseholder Association (TC/19) which stated that they welcomed the investment and the improvement plan for Grenfell Tower.

58. I met informally with the Police in June 2017. I was not asked to give a formal statement.

**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: Timothy Richard Coleridge.

Position or office held: Former ABLE Cabinet member.

Signed: T. Coleridge.

Date: 30<sup>th</sup> October . 2018



**GRENFELL TOWER  
PUBLIC INQUIRY**

**List of Exhibits**

**Timothy Coleridge**

<b>Exb.</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>URN</b>	<b>FORT</b>
<b>TC/1</b>	Housing Digest Report	09.02.12	RBK00000521	FORT00039992
<b>TC/2</b>	Housing Digest Meeting Minutes	09.02.12	Uploaded via egress	FORT00064804
<b>TC/3</b>	Paper A6: Cabinet Meeting Report by Director of Housing	02.05.12	RBK00029027	FORT00109574
<b>TC/4</b>	Cabinet Meeting Minutes	02.05.12	Uploaded via egress	FORT02871295
<b>TC/5</b>	Budget Monitoring Report 2013-14 Quarter 1	18.07.13	RBK00013885	FORT00066929
<b>TC/6</b>	RBKC Press Statement	31.10.12	Uploaded via egress	FORT02871294
<b>TC/7</b>	A12 Fire Risk Assessments in RBKC Residential Blocks – Progress Report	20.01.11	RBK00029881	FORT02870602
<b>TC/8</b>	Minutes of a meeting of the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee	20.01.11	RBK00029882	FORT02870606
<b>TC/9</b>	Paper A4: Cabinet Member Report on Current Issues	13.07.11	Uploaded via egress	FORT01233212 (DRAFT)
<b>TC/10</b>	Paper A4: Cabinet Member Report on Current Issues	10.11.11	RBK00026084	FORT01276669
<b>TC/11</b>	Minutes of a meeting of the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee	10.11.11	Uploaded via egress	FORT01249466
<b>TC/12</b>	Minutes of a meeting of the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee	01.02.12	Uploaded via egress	FORT01241924
<b>TC/13</b>	Email fwd from Robert Black to Tim Coleridge; response from Janice Wray re launch of project in April 2012	23.12.12	RBK00013693	FORT01877648
<b>TC/14</b>	Paper A4: Cabinet Member Report on Current Issues	15.03.12	Uploaded via egress	FORT01276256
<b>TC/15</b>	Minutes of a meeting of the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee	15.03.12	RBK00029054	FORT01739793
<b>TC/16</b>	Paper A4: Cabinet Member Report on Current Issues	16.05.12	RBK00000447	FORT00024000

Index to Exhibits for Public Inquiry Witness Statement of Timothy Coleridge63219487-1

<b>TC/17</b>	Minutes of a meeting of the Housing & Property Scrutiny Committee	16.05.12	Uploaded via egress	FORT00828478
<b>TC/18</b>	Paper A7: Report on TMO Performance 2011/12 and TMO Performance Agreement 2012/13	12.07.12	RBK00000440	FORT00022614
<b>TC/19</b>	Email from Tunde Awoderu welcoming working relationship between TMO and GTLA	07.06.12	RBK00000523	FORT00040336