

**GRENFELL TOWER  
PUBLIC INQUIRY**

---

**Witness Statement of  
Laura Johnson**

---

**I, Laura Johnson 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 so that lessons can be learnt from the tragic events of 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017.
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 (“RBKC”, “the Borough,” “the Council”), and to which I have access and with which I am familiar and which I believe to be accurate.
3. I attach to my Witness Statement an Index of the Exhibits to which I refer in the following paragraphs of my statement.
4. I have made a statement to the Police. I consent to my police statement being disclosed to the Public Inquiry for use in evidence.
5. I wish to offer my sincere condolences to all the people who have suffered and lost friends and family as a result of the tragic events of the 14<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

Laura Johnson

1

## Background and Role

6. I have worked in housing for local authorities and housing associations for over 20 years, a significant proportion of which have been working in London in a variety of roles for the Royal Borough of Greenwich, London Borough of Islington and latterly RBKC. I chaired London Housing Directors for three years and was a committee member and chair of the London Homelessness awards. I sat on a number of officers' groups and attended pan-London meetings at London Councils, Greater London Authority (GLA), Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and Local Government Association (LGA) on housing issues.
7. I initially joined RBKC as a secondee from the London Borough of Islington in February 2009 and was made a permanent employee in 2010 as Director of Housing. In my role as Director of Housing, I was responsible for managing a team of around 120 people.
8. The Housing Department was made up of four teams with respective heads of service for each function. Homelessness and Housing Advice (Housing Needs), Housing Finance, Housing Commissioning and Strategic Regeneration and Development. The managers of these teams changed over time, however in June 2017, the Head of Housing Needs was Amanda Gill, the Head of Housing Finance was Steve Mellor, the Head of Strategic Regeneration and Development was Matin Miah and the Head of Housing Commissioning was Amanda Johnson. I reported directly to the Chief Executive of the Council, Nicholas Holgate.
9. The majority of staff within the Housing Department work in the Housing Needs service which provides a range of services, e.g. people seeking housing advice on their housing options, managing enquiries on the phone, on the front desk and via e-mail, prevention of homelessness, taking applications from customers wishing to make a homelessness application, management and maintenance of the Housing Register, allocation of both permanent and temporary accommodation and provision of services for rough sleepers. Local authorities provide a homeless and housing advice function as part of their statutory duties, set out in Part VI and VII of the Housing Act 1996, updated, revised and expanded in subsequent Housing Acts.

10. The Housing Finance team, led by Steve Mellor, was responsible for the management of General Fund (Housing) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) finances. The HRA must be used to benefit tenants, either in direct usage or as an investment providing a financial return. There is a robust methodology for calculating and allocating HRA costs, which is updated regularly to reflect changes in legislation, statutory guidance and codes of practice. The HRA must provide property and landlord services to tenants and must account for these within the confines of law and proper accounting practice. Expenditure within the HRA is attributable toward, e.g. day to day repairs, staff costs for the operation of the service, planned and major works programmes.
11. The Strategic Regeneration and Development Team managed proposals for the regeneration of estates and development of new affordable housing.
12. The Housing Commissioning team managed the agreement with the Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation (TMO); commissioning and contract management of supported housing services; procurement of temporary accommodation; complaints and the relationship with Housing Associations who owned and managed properties in RBKC. The Housing Commissioning Team were responsible for the day to day management of the relationship with the TMO which was set out in the Modular Management Agreement (MMA). The team was managed by Amanda Johnson, who had one officer working with her specifically on matters relating to the TMO (Celia Caliskan) and on an ad hoc basis time from other officers within the team depending on the issue e.g. complaints when matters arose that required a response or further investigation.
13. As Director of Housing it was my responsibility to manage the four department heads of service and an officer who was responsible for housing strategy within the housing department. This was undertaken through a variety of formal mechanisms: monthly one to one meetings; bi-weekly departmental management team meetings; annual staff conference; chairing or attending meetings on focused pieces of work; performance appraisals and the less formal part of management of discussions in the office over work that was taking place.
14. The relationship between Councillors and officers was managed directly through the role of Director of Housing. A key part of the role was managing the relationship with

Members, e.g. all correspondence from Councillors was sent through my office to arrange a response, whether that was a complaint or general enquiry.

15. RBKC operates a Cabinet and Scrutiny committee system. Whilst I was Director of Housing, I had five different Cabinet Members responsible for Housing, Property and Regeneration: Councillor Buxton/Councillor Moylan (shared the portfolio); Councillor Mills; Councillor Coleridge; and from June 2013 to June 2017, Councillor Feilding-Mellen.
16. The Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee meeting is held five times per year. The meetings are scheduled on an annual basis and the diary published online. The committee is made up of elected councillors. Both minority and majority councillors were members. The agenda is agreed by the Chair, and reports are drafted by officers for discussion by Members. The Scrutiny Committee gathers evidence on Housing and Property issues and scrutinises decisions and policies. It had no executive powers. Part of my role was to provide the Scrutiny Committee with information that enabled them to perform this function.
17. Part of the agenda for Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee was a regular update which was a report from the Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration or the Housing Director. The report updated members of the committee on a range of issues either nationally or locally in RBKC on Housing. For example, housing policy, changes in government guidance or issues that members may need to have a knowledge or understanding of. This would assist them in their role of scrutiny. Specific reports on specific topics were requested by the Chair or deeper dives were conducted by separate working groups. There were a number of reports which were tabled annually, e.g. budget/rent setting report in January. Councillor Marshall chaired the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee from 2010 to 2016 and Councillor Mackover chaired the Committee from 2016 to 2018. The Cabinet Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration and I attended these meetings at the request of the Committee.
18. A weekly meeting named 'Policy Board' was held with the Cabinet Member for Housing and the senior officers within their portfolio. The meetings had an agenda and were minuted. They were an opportunity for the Cabinet Member to provide officers with policy direction, agree recommendations on key projects, discuss budget provision, agree

reporting to Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet and to discuss complaints and performance of contracts.

19. In addition to my role as Director of Housing, I was the Chair of London Housing Directors for London Councils from 2014 to 2017. The group met approximately 6 times a year with a broad agenda covering a wide range of pan London housing issues, e.g. Welfare Reform, Homeless Reduction Act and estate regeneration.

### **Governance and Management**

20. The relationship between RBKC and the TMO was a contractual one, governed by the MMA. It is a statutory document which provides Local Authorities with a template for their relationship with Tenant Management Organisations. The TMO was a separate legal entity, established in 1996 when the tenants voted to enact the 'Right to Manage'.

21. The TMO had a constitution and a Board. The Board governed the work of the TMO. The Board according to the constitution had to have a majority of tenants and leaseholders and a tenant chair. There were three independents (not tenants and leaseholders) and four representatives nominated by the Council. TMO Board Meetings were held according to an annual cycle of meetings, this was agreed by the TMO Board and dates published on their website.

22. The TMO was a voluntary membership organisation, at the time of the Grenfell Tower fire over 5,500 tenants and leaseholders were members.

23. The funding for the operation of the TMO came from a management fee, as set out in the Housing Revenue Account. The management fee was agreed annually, it met the cost of running the organisation, e.g. staffing, office rental etc.

24. The TMO procured, contracted and performance managed contractors directly for the services they provided to tenants, for example day to day repairs, planned maintenance and major works programmes. RBKC retained oversight of the HRA monitoring and reporting on the budget on a quarterly basis.

25. When I started working at the Council, I took the view that the success of the TMO would be, in part, enabled by having a relationship with the Council which had clear boundaries of responsibility. The Council needed to have a responsive ‘clientside’ (Housing Commissioning) function that was able to support the TMO in its functions but have clarity about where responsibilities lay for key parts of the service and be able to communicate this to customers. This can be difficult where the Council owns the stock, the customers are Council tenants, Councillors receive enquiries but the function of management lies with a managing agent i.e with the TMO.

### *Monitoring of the TMO*

26. The Council relationship with the TMO was set out in the MMA. My understanding of the MMA is that it is a statutory contractual framework agreement between a local authority and a TMO. It is a template document that can be made bespoke and it contains standard terms relating to issues such as repairs and maintenance, rent and service charges, financial management, tenancy management and staffing. In practice it is an unwieldy document, that has little practical use when managing a contract day to day. It is more of a contractual point of reference. It was drafted some years ago by the then Department of the Environment, updated in 2013 in accordance with the statutory guidance regulation 18 of the Housing (Right to Manage) (England) Regulations 2012, but hasn’t been updated since. The practical mechanisms that were used instead to manage the contract between RBKC and TMO on a day to day basis were: Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), which were used to form the Performance Reviews; quarterly financial monitoring; monthly meetings between myself and the Chief Executive of the TMO, monthly meetings between Housing Commissioning and the TMO on key issues and access to their audit reports. Further details of these are given below.

27. The MMA between the TMO and RBKC was updated twice during my time as Director of Housing, with a variation made to the second MMA in April 2010, and then the third MMA coming into effect on 1 Dec 2015. The review was undertaken by the Housing Commissioning team, in collaboration with RBKC Legal and the TMO. The MMA by its very nature is a long, complex and detailed document, setting out the intricacies of what the responsibilities of the two organisations were in the management and maintenance of the Council’s housing stock. I understood what the MMA contained and how it set out the

relationship between the two organisations, however if there were detailed queries that required reference to the MMA I would refer these to my colleagues who had a better working knowledge of the detailed content.

28. A formal report entitled TMO Annual Performance Review went to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee annually. The yearly TMO Performance Review and Performance Agreement would consist of a report by the “Director of Housing and Town Clerk and Executive Director of Finance”. This included KPIs, which were key identified ‘actions’ for the TMO to take during the year, as well as the annual cycle of auditing of the TMO by the Council’s audit team. It also included key priorities for the year ahead. Celia Caliskan would write the report with information from the TMO and Housing Finance. The draft would be prepared, circulated for comments and agreed before being presented to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee. The TMO Performance Reviews are discussed in greater depth at paragraphs 85-90 below in relation to the Grenfell Tower refurbishment and at paragraphs 94-100 in relation to fire safety.
29. Joint Management Meetings between the TMO Management team and RBKC Housing Department were held quarterly to discuss areas of mutual interest. There was an agenda agreed and minutes taken.
30. The Housing Commissioning team held monthly meetings with the TMO to review performance and update on projects that were taking place.
31. The Director of Housing and Chief Executive of the TMO, Robert Black, met monthly. These meetings did not have an agenda and they were not minuted.
32. The TMO had an annual audit programme the results of which were reported to their Board, shared with the Director of Housing and Head of Housing Commissioning and a summary of results was detailed to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee as part of the Annual Review Report.
33. Since the introduction of self-financing in 2012 all stock owning authorities published a HRA Business Plan annually which set out the investment needs of the stock over the next 30 years, with a detailed analysis over the first five years. RBKC working with the TMO

drafted, published and updated annually the RBKC HRA Business Plan. The plan was reported to Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, Cabinet and the TMO Board.

34. RBKC Housing had strategic oversight of the TMO performance of maintenance and during building works but it was not part of the Council's remit to undertake spot checks of work.
35. The TMO had their own complaints policy agreed by their Board. When tenants or leaseholders complained, the TMO would respond to them directly. On occasion tenants or leaseholders complained to the Council about the performance of the TMO either to a Councillor or to the Housing Department. Depending on the complaint we would either refer them back to the TMO and advise them that they need to go through the TMO complaints procedure, or if the complaint came via a Councillor I would ask the TMO to draft a response that the Councillor could send to the complainant. I relied on the TMO to provide the Council with information that enabled us to respond to queries/complaints. I will talk more about the complaints procedure at paragraphs 135-138 in the Communications with Residents section below.
36. The TMO held an AGM annually, which was required in their constitution. They were also required to undertake a survey of TMO members every year in which they asked them if they wanted the TMO to continue to manage their homes. Results from the ballot were reported to attendees of the AGM, noted in the Annual Report to Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, and formed part of a report to the TMO Board. It was also publicised on the TMO website and in the quarterly TMO magazine to tenants and leaseholders.
37. Whilst the Council retained ownership of the housing stock, the TMO undertook all matters relating to the management and maintenance of the properties.

*Lancaster West Estate Management Board*

38. There was an estate management board (EMB) for the Lancaster West Estate which is the estate where Grenfell Tower stands. This was a tenant management organisation, separate to and which pre-dated the establishment of the TMO. Cost attributable to the management and maintenance of the estate that fell within the remit of the EMB was shown separately



in the accounts. The EMB contracted the TMO to undertake all repairs, maintenance and housing management on their behalf. It did not provide any services itself.

39. The EMB had not functioned particularly well for some years. It's role, function and purpose was unclear to me from when I started at RBKC in 2009. There was little interest from residents in attending Board meetings, setting a work programme or agreeing how it would work with the TMO. In the later stages of the existence of the EMB the Board was frequently not quorate. There were a number of attempts by the Council to facilitate improvements and generate more interest from tenants and leaseholders, however these failed. The Council served a notice on the EMB at the end of 2013 that set out that it was breaching the standards required of them under their MMA. A consultant was brought in to advise the EMB and help them to improve, however, they did not engage with the consultant or the improvement plan. A process was then undertaken to dissolve the EMB. This took a number of years, resulting in the dissolution in 2014-2015.

#### *Grenfell Refurbishment*

40. The Council had oversight of the work that the TMO undertook on the Grenfell Tower refurbishment as part of the commissioning and contract management function of the housing department. It was part of a wider capital programme of works that the TMO undertook on the repair and maintenance of the Council's housing stock. Oversight and liaison with the TMO regarding the Grenfell Tower refurbishment was initially undertaken by the Strategic Regeneration and Development team as the skill base of that team was ideally suited to projects of this level of scale and complexity. They dealt with the development of new housing in the borough, and responsibility was given to them due to the addition of new housing units as part of the refurbishment. Around June/ July 2014, the responsibility for oversight of TMO performance on the refurbishment moved to the Housing Commissioning team. As I managed both the Head of Strategic Regeneration and Development and the Head of Housing Commission, I was kept informed about how the project was progressing and the progress on the refurbishment of the tower would regularly come up at one to one meetings and the biweekly Housing Services Departmental Management Team meetings.

41. Peter Maddison, Head of Asset Management at the KCTMO would sometimes attend Policy Board, which was my weekly meeting with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Property and discuss updates in relation to Grenfell Tower.

### **Grenfell Tower's original design, construction and composition**

42. I had no knowledge or involvement in the original design, construction or composition of Grenfell Tower.

### **Subsequent modifications prior to the most recent**

43. I had little knowledge or involvement in modifications to Grenfell Tower, prior to the refurbishment project in 2012. I was involved in discussions around replacing leaseholder flat entrance doors across the housing stock due to non-compliance with fire regulations. This is discussed in full detail at paragraphs 105-107. There was also a programme due to be implemented regarding self-closers on doors across the housing stock from 2017. This is further discussed at paragraph 108 below.

### **Modification to the Tower 2012-2016**

#### ***Decision to refurbish Grenfell Tower***

44. As part of my duties as a senior officer at RBKC I was assigned the role of Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) by the then Chief Executive of RBKC, Derek Myers, for the development of the Kensington Aldridge Academy and Kensington Leisure Centre (KALC). The role was to provide oversight of the development of a new secondary school, leisure centre and new public park. The project commenced in 2010 and was finalised when the school and leisure centre were completed in 2014/15. The day-to-day management of KALC by the Council was overseen by project managers in the Property Services team. I oversaw their work and they reported to me directly on this project.

45. As part of the KALC development which sat adjacent to Grenfell Tower I attended regular resident consultation events to discuss the KALC project. Residents from Grenfell Tower attended the KALC consultation meetings. As well as discussing the proposed

development, they would on occasion raise with me the conditions in the Tower. I was made aware through these meetings that there were frequent problems with, for example, the lifts, heating, water pressure and poor sound and thermal insulation from windows.

46. Residents of the tower felt that there had been little investment in the block since the tower was built. It was difficult for them to see why the Council was prioritising investment of £56.4m in a new school and leisure centre whilst Lancaster West and Grenfell needed significant investment. The source of funding for the KALC project (non HRA) was different to that which would fund any investment in the tower. The Cabinet Member for Housing who also attended a number of these meetings was very sympathetic to the fact that the residents were in effect living on a building site with all the noise, mess and disruption, whilst the estate and tower had received limited funding for major works since it was built. I had been in Grenfell a number of times prior to the refurbishment. The entrance lobbies felt dated, there were spaces that were no longer used, the exterior at ground level was dimly lit and confusing to navigate and it had a general feeling of being run down and in need of investment.

47. The possibility of investment at Grenfell Tower/Lancaster West estate was mentioned at a RBKC Strategic Development Committee on 1 December 2010 (Exhibited at **LJ/1**).

48. In 2011, RBKC were in the process of refurbishing and sale of a number of redundant basements at Elm Park Gardens (EPG) in Chelsea. The projected receipts were anticipated to be around £6 million. (Details in 2 May 2012 report by Director of Housing, exhibited at **LJ/2**). It was a requirement for these funds to be re-invested back into regeneration projects, under guidelines issued by central government for regeneration and expenditure of receipts for the purpose of regeneration. The TMO were asked to provide options for how/where the money should be spent on the Council's housing stock.

49. On 2 November 2011, I received an email from RBKC's Housing Strategy and Regeneration Manager, Jane Trethewey, following a meeting she had had with the TMO (exhibited at **LJ/3**). She said that the TMO was keen to investigate the opportunity to undertake refurbishment of Grenfell Tower and they were seeking to cost this out with a view to investing EPG funds. This had the advantage of addressing the investment needs of a property that needed extensive work and would share in some of the regeneration

benefits of the brand new facilities being developed next door. There was an option to have a cladding design that linked to the design of the Academy, which would mean the visual appearance of the area would be significantly improved. The possibility of adding extra homes to the lower floors was also raised. This demonstrates the Council and the TMO's early desire to improve the condition and appearance of Grenfell Tower.

50. On 23 November 2011, I was sent an email from Tunde Awoderu via the Grenfell Leaseholders Association email address (exhibited at **LJ/4**) which said "We demand and expect the council and their managing agents to leave aside their corporate greed and vested interest, to find the money and resources to refurbish Grenfell Tower without having to charge the residents of Grenfell Tower through rent increments or service charges". There was not only a desire to refurbish Grenfell Tower from the Council and TMO, but also the residents.
51. The formal process of identifying where major investment was needed was set down in December 2011 when the TMO was asked to carry out an exercise to identify where major investment was needed to improve the stock. They used the Keystone Asset Management database that contained component data on the Council's housing assets. Grenfell Tower came out as a priority, as a building that had significant investment needs. The TMO were then asked to provide indicative costings for the works to be carried out to Grenfell Tower.
52. On 12 December 2011, I received an email from Mark Anderson, Director of Assets at the TMO, providing indicative costings for the over-cladding and thermal upgrade of the exterior facades and provision of flats to the roof area (exhibited at **LJ/5**). On the same day, Mark also copied me in to an email to Jane Trethewey with possible layouts for the lower levels of Grenfell Tower (**LJ/6**). This was prior to RBKC Cabinet's approval for investment for the refurbishment and the planning application being submitted.
53. In 2012, the "Self-Financing" regime was introduced nationally, which gave councils greater autonomy in the management of their HRA. It allowed Councils to keep the rent which they were collecting rather than it being centrally pooled and redistributed. It allowed local councils to actively manage their assets, planning for investment over a longer term and prioritising funding.

54. On 9 February 2012, a report was drafted entitled “Basements, Elm Park Gardens, SW10, Capital Receipt Expenditure” (LJ/7) where I sought Cabinet Member approval to take a paper to full Cabinet. I identified one of the priorities for spending from the capital receipts as “£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” (para 8.2).

55. A report went to Cabinet on 2 May 2012 asking for approval on the recommendations for the investment priorities from the funds generated by the sale of the units at Elm Park Gardens. The project generated a surplus of approximately £8 million (Minutes exhibited at LJ/8 and report by Director of Housing exhibited at LJ/9). The report 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 “An assessment of estate investment need places Grenfell Tower energy efficiency, external fabric, heating system and windows as the top priorities. The TMO Board also approved the submission of funding bid to the Council for the proposals at Grenfell Tower [sic]...In parallel, the proposed construction of the new Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre (KALC) will have a significant impact on the north of this estate, which has given rise to concern from Grenfell Tower residents who immediately overlook the site. Furthermore, the Grenfell Tower lower floors currently have an area of disused office space which has the potential for conversion into new homes. This demonstrates that an investment here has the potential to deliver a range of benefits.”

56. The report recommended from a list of options that the money should be used for “Renovation, regeneration and conversion works” to Grenfell Tower and set out why the investment was needed. The anticipated benefits were:

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

56.2. 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.

- 56.3. Replacement and rationalisation of existing office facilities with a fully accessible reception and office.
- 56.4. Rationalisation and modernisation of estate community facilities.
- 56.5. Delivery of between four and six new family sized affordable homes on the lower levels of Grenfell Tower.
- 56.6. 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.
- 56.7. Delivery of resident and community aspirations for their long term benefit. Support of wider RBKC policy objectives including carbon management and reduction targets.
- 56.8. Reduced future investment demand on the HRA.
- 56.9. Improvement of the overall appearance of Grenfell Tower to the benefit of its residents and of the wider regeneration of Golborne Ward.

57. The Cabinet approved the recommendation for the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project, with a budget of £6 million. This decision released the funding needed by the TMO to take the project forward. Thereafter, the TMO proceeded to manage the project including tendering, appointment/management of contractors, resident liaison, budget management and the project specification.

### ***Budget Increases for the Grenfell Refurbishment***

58. During the course of the Grenfell renovation, proposals were taken back to Cabinet on two occasions to increase the budget, from the original £6 million, to £9.7 million and then to £10.3 million. On each occasion this was accepted and the budget grew in line with the recommendation. On each occasion additional funding was sought, I or a member of my team discussed the request with Peter Maddison (Director of Asset Management) from the TMO. A report was then taken to Cabinet, written by my team, seeking approval for the

recommendations to increase the budget for refurbishment works to Grenfell Tower. When the initial budget was agreed in 2012, the estimate of cost for the works was based on a very general specification. As the project progressed and the contract was awarded, the TMO made requests of the Council to increase the budget as actual costs became apparent and the specification firmed up.

59. The Housing Department monitored the spend of the revenue and capital in the Housing Revenue Account, as such it requested information from the TMO on forecast and actual expenditure on Grenfell Tower.
60. In July 2013, the Cabinet approved a recommendation to increase the budget for the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project from £6.9m to £9.7m (LJ/9). 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.”
61. On 20 March 2014 at a Housing and Regeneration Policy Board meeting, the minutes (LJ/10) state “Ms. Johnson reported that a report was going to the TMO informing them of the successful contractor for Grenfell. She agreed to send a copy to Councillor Feilding-Mellen. Officers will need to do some value engineering as the bid has come in £500,000 higher than the budget. Councillor Blakeman was part of the interview panel. The report will going to Cabinet in June”. It is not unusual in large scale major works projects of this type to receive a bid based on the specification and then the contractor and client spend some time looking at options for how the costs can be brought in line with the budget. I would have expected the TMO to undertake this exercise with the contractor, Rydon. The TMO, carrying out functions of a public nature on behalf a public authority, were required to achieve value for money. Looking at the cost of contracts and considering it against this criteria forms part of any contract award to ensure the good use of public money.
62. In June 2014, a draft report, "Grenfell Tower Major Works and Hidden Homes Project" was presented to Councillor Feilding-Mellen’s Policy Board in advance of a Cabinet meeting on 19 June 2014 (LJ/11). In this draft report, version dated 3 June 2014, at para 6.2, it states, “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 gave a contingency of approximately £400,000 (para 8.3).

63. On 4 June 2014, Peter Maddison emailed me, Kitty Mortimer and Steve Mellor at RBKC, suggesting that due to potential areas of risk in costs in two areas, the cladding fixing method and energy funding, that the contingency should be increased and the budget thereby increased to £10.3 million (LJ/12).
64. The minutes of the meeting on 5 June 2014 (LJ/13) noted that the Policy Board discussed the contingency and recommended increasing the budget from £9.7m to £10.3m. It was decided to ask Cabinet to approve a larger contingency of £600,000. On this decision by Councillor Feilding-Mellen at the Policy Board, the report was redrafted and the amount asked for was increased.
65. The final report entitled “Grenfell Tower Major Works and Hidden Homes Project”, which went to the Cabinet meeting on 19 June 2014 (LJ/14), updated the Cabinet on the major works and additional 7 Hidden Homes at Grenfell Tower and asked for a budget increase from £9.7 million to £10.3 million. It stated, “While the agreed tender means that that the work can be done within the agreed budget of £9.7m, 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 the budget outlined in para 3.1 [including ‘planning conditions to be discharged in relation to detailed design and materials of a number of items, e.g. new windows, cladding material and fixing method’], 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.” (para 3.2).
66. The Cabinet agreed to the increase in the budget to £10.3 million. This was the last budget increase. The number of Hidden Homes was increased from 7 to 9, as signed off by Councillor Feilding-Mellen in an Executive Decision Report, in August 2014 (LJ/15).

### ***Tender Process***

67. Leadbitter were the original contractor for KALC. During the early stages of the project they were taken over by Bouygues, but they were referred to as Leadbitter throughout. It was the initial intention that Leadbitter would also contract with the TMO to do the



refurbishment works at Grenfell so KALC and Grenfell could be done concurrently, to minimise disruption to tenants and utilise work compounds.

68. However there were issues with Leadbitter's budget against the specification for the KALC project. In January 2013, I emailed Leadbitter to say that due to the fact they could not agree a financial close figure in line with Stage D of the cost plan for KALC, RBKC would no longer be recommending the TMO to proceed with Leadbitter and would advise the TMO to tender the work to a list of contractors not including Leadbitter (**LJ/16**). We managed to agree the costs and get into contract for KALC and they continued to be considered for the refurbishment at Grenfell Tower.
69. I prepared a report on 16 July 2013 (**LJ/17**), which was an update on "The Grenfell Tower Improvement Works and the Recent Power Surges," for the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee. I stated, "Since January, the design team has been working with Leadbitter (the proposed contractor) to bring the scheme within budget and to ensure that the project will deliver value for money. Progress has been slow and Leadbitter currently estimate the cost of works to be £11.278m (inclusive of fees), which is £1.6m above the current, proposed budget... A range of options have been considered to bring the scheme within budget. It is now proposed to market test the works through an open OJEU tender to ensure that the best contractor is selected and value for money achieved. Subject to planning and procurement risks, this process will result in a start on site in Quarter 4 of 2013-14. By comparison, the IESI procurement process with Leadbitter would have resulted in a start on site at the end of Quarter 3; however, that route also had a significant risk of delay if a negotiated agreement could not be achieved with the contractor".
70. It also became apparent there wasn't spatially enough room on the ground to do both KALC and Grenfell at the same time, (Notes of Meeting Regarding Grenfell Tower Project 14 Nov 2013, exhibited at **LJ/18**) and so it was decided to tender the Grenfell scheme to start as the KALC project neared completion. The tender commenced at the end of November 2013. I cannot be sure, as I had no further involvement in the procurement, but I believe Leadbitter did not tender. I do not know why.
71. Rydon were appointed as the preferred contractor by the TMO in March 2014. I had no involvement in the selection or appointment of Rydon.

72. A report, entitled “Grenfell Tower Major Works and Hidden Homes Project” that was presented at a Cabinet meeting on 19 June 2014 (exhibited at **LJ/14**), stated, “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.”

73. Paragraph 2.10 of the 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.”

#### *Consultation with Residents Prior to Refurbishment*

74. Consultation with residents was conducted by the TMO, who then passed the information to me. Grenfell Tower residents were consulted in early 2012, with a questionnaire sent out (exhibited at **LJ/19**) and the opportunity to speak with the TMO at “KCTMO Roadshows.” I was aware that residents were generally in favour of refurbishment. 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.” (As stated in the 2 May 2012 Report by the Director of Housing- **LJ/2**).

75. The report to the Scrutiny Committee dated 16 July 2013 (**LJ/17**), stated, “Resident engagement in the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower has been reviewed and actions agreed to ensure that all residents have clear information about the current status of the scheme and are clear about how they can influence the proposals”. It detailed recent engagement, a newsletter and a public meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2013. It said that, “Next Steps involve a further newsletter which will be sent to Grenfell Tower residents giving feedback and responding to the issues raised at the public meeting. A series of further meetings is planned... Further engagement is planned over the summer period to ensure that all residents have an opportunity to engage in finalising the scope of works; be consulted on the designs submitted to planning and be involved in the selection of the contractor for the

works. Particular focus will be given to face to face contact with residents to ensure the widest possible engagement” (paras 6.1-6.4).

76. In the report to Cabinet dated 19 June 2014 (LJ/14), it stated, “Resident consultation was undertaken regarding the revised proposals which carried on throughout the process as timescales have changed and specifications have become more certain against budget...” “Consultation for this scheme has been extensive involving open meetings, newsletters, drop in sessions and door knocking. Residents have been consulted extensively during the planning applications and subsequent procurement processes and were given a number of opportunities to comment on the proposed work and materials. In addition, residents were given the opportunity to be involved with the contractor procurement process. Two residents were involved with the Prequalification Questionnaire review, and Fay Edwards, Chair of the TMO Board agreed to sit in on the interviews of the short-listed contractors. Regular newsletters are now being produced and Rydon intend to set up a series of drop in sessions and coffee mornings once they are on site. Housing Management have been asked to identify any potentially vulnerable households who may require additional support and KCTMO will make the necessary arrangements”.

77. I thought that the amount of consultation with residents, both by the TMO and RBKC, was in keeping with a project of this nature.

### *Cladding*

78. I was not involved in any of the technical detail or specification of material used in the regeneration of Grenfell Tower. My involvement in the refurbishment was to have an oversight in terms of the time scale, complaints and how they were responded to, satisfaction level of the residents, and general oversight in relation to how it was performing against the budget set for the redevelopment. I was not involved in the procurement of materials or with any of the decisions made by the contractor or RBKC Building Control.

79. My understanding of the cladding that was placed onto the exterior of Grenfell Tower was that it was added for the purposes of thermal efficiency and aesthetics. The Council wanted to help improve the living conditions for the residents, enable them to be proud of where

they lived, as well as address fuel poverty and adhere to the Council's Climate Change Action Plan.

80. In terms of the technical specifications of the cladding or its compliance with relevant regulations and standards, I am unable to add anything to this statement as it wasn't mine or my department's remit to check whether the design or the specifications were compliant, or that the components were suitable.

81. As far as I can recall, in relation to the cladding, there were discussion in the early stages of the proposed refurbishment about the colour choices, residents were able to express a preference on the colour at one of the consultation meetings. I knew that the residents had strong feelings about the colour of the cladding, because they had been presented with images that were bright green in the early stages of the proposed refurb. The colour and design had been presented to the Council's Architect panel as part of the planning process. Residents had fed back to the TMO that they did not like it and wanted something more muted. The extent of my involvement with discussion about cladding would have been to ensure the residents' colour choice was considered.

82. I did not ask about the combustibility of either zinc or aluminium cladding option. It wouldn't have occurred to me to ask about the flammability of the material or health and safety considerations. I would have assumed that quality checks had been done by qualified professionals the TMO employed or regulated through British Safety Standards/central government regulation, this is not my area of expertise. The conversation I was present at between Councillor Feilding-Mellen and Peter Maddison focused on achieving a cladding solution within the budget, that met the residents' desires for a muted colour scheme and met the requirements of improving thermal insulation.

83. As far as I can recall, cladding was only raised as a specific concern following the fire at Shepherd's Court and subsequent letter the LFB sent to local authorities. I don't know if it was raised as a specific item at the LFB / Housing Directors meetings, as I did not attend them.

### *Scrutiny of the TMO during the Refurbishment by RBKC*

84. Although the decision to refurbish Grenfell Tower was made in 2012, the actual work did not commence until 2014. During the time between the proposal for Grenfell Tower and the project starting, I had broad discussions at Policy Board with the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor Coleridge then Councillor Feilding-Mellen, and the TMO, on average every four to six weeks, about progress on the procurement and appointment of a contractor to undertake the works, timetable for mobilisation of the contract and resident consultation. Neither myself nor the Cabinet Member(s) had any expertise about the technical aspects of a refurbishment project of this type. The questions to the TMO would predominantly be about whether the project could come in on time, on budget and feedback from residents. I do not recall there ever being any conversations with the Cabinet Member where it was stated or insinuated that there would not be additional resources/money for the refurbishment if it was required. I was of the view that if more funds were required, we would have made a recommendation to Cabinet for more funds, and they would have been made available.
85. Regular updates on the progress of the works at Grenfell Tower were provided to Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, by means of the annual TMO Performance Review and the mid-year Review on the Performance Agreement, which both went to the Scrutiny Committee. I shall set out below the findings of the TMO Performance Reviews in relation to the Grenfell Tower refurbishment, from the years 2013 until the last Performance Review prior to the fire, in 2016.
86. The TMO Performance Review 2013/2014 and the TMO's Performance Agreement 2014/2015 report, dated 10 July 2014 (**LJ/20**), stated that the “regeneration options are being processed” and that Rydon had been appointed as contractor. Work would start on site soon.
87. The Mid-Year TMO Performance Review, dated 6 November 2014 (**LJ/21**), stated “The contractor, Rydon, is on site. The work is continuing to schedule. New flats, a nursery and boxing club facilities have been started on the lower ground floors. In the new year, the communal heating pipes will be connected to the flats and new double-glazed windows will be installed. Surveys in advance of the new cladding at Grenfell Tower will be on site soon and delivering over the next 18 months. Regeneration options are being progressed.

The contract is currently out to OJEU, planning issues are being discussed and further resident consultation is taking place.”

88. The TMO Performance Review 2014/2015 and TMO's Performance Agreement 2015/2016, dated 9 July 2015 (**LJ/22**), gave an update that work was 7 weeks behind schedule.
89. The Mid-Year TMO Performance Review dated 5 November 2015, (**LJ/23**) stated “The regeneration of Grenfell Tower is approaching its final stages. New double glazed windows have been installed to all homes and the new communal boiler has now been commissioned. The TMO is working with residents to agree the connection of individual flats onto the new system. The external cladding is now being fitted and the construction of the new communal entrance and community room is well underway.” It noted a delay owing to two of Rydon’s subcontractors going into liquidation.
90. The TMO Performance Review 2015/2016 and TMO's Performance Agreement 2016/2017 dated 13 July 2016 (**LJ/24**), stated that the Grenfell regeneration has almost finished, “delivering £10.3 million of investment improving thermal efficiency with new heating and double glazing, providing nine new homes and a refurbished nursery and boxing club. The full capital programme allocation was spent.”
91. The Housing Commissioning team met monthly with members of the TMO Asset Management team who were responsible for the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower. Amanda Johnson or a member of her team would report back on progress either through one-to-one meetings, Housing Services Departmental Management Team meetings and general catch ups in the office as part of business as usual.

### **Fire and Safety Measures within the Building at the time of the Fire**

92. The TMO were responsible for fire safety measures in the housing stock. Janice Wray was the Health and Safety Manager for the TMO, and therefore fire safety management at Grenfell Tower would have come under her remit, as would the advice given to the residents on what to do in the event of a fire. The TMO and the LFB would communicate

often at bi-monthly meetings, which RBKC did not attend. The TMO also had responsibility for maintaining and inspecting fire safety equipment and systems.

93. The TMO were responsible for the maintenance of lifts at Grenfell Tower, which I was aware often broke down. Complaints came to me or I was copied in, if they were sent directly to me I would ask the complaints manager to forward them to the TMO, and track them so I knew that the TMO were actioning the complaint. For example, on 10 October 2016, I emailed Councillor Blakeman with a response I had sought from the TMO relating to a complaint by the GTLA about, amongst other matters, lifts not working during the refurbishment and requesting a fire drill at Grenfell (LJ/25 and LJ/26). I stated “Although only cc’d into this communication from the GTLA, I took it upon myself to ask the TMO to put together a response”. The TMO recognised higher than usual lift usage during the refurbishment, but stated that since the works had completed, there were far fewer callouts, and that a fire drill are not be necessary in blocks with a “stay put strategy.” The TMO reassured residents that the LFB had arranged a LFB familiarisation exercise in June 2013 and there had been bi-monthly meetings between them for several years.

### *General Fire Safety Measures across Housing Stock*

94. The TMO Performance Review report, as presented to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, had a section on health and safety, and particularly fire safety. The TMO would be annually assessed on KPIs relating to fire safety across the whole housing stock.

95. I will set out below details from the TMO Performance Reviews relating to fire safety from the years 2013 to 2016. The generally positive results indicated that the TMO were meeting their KPIs on fire safety across the housing stock in general.

### *TMO Performance Review 2013/2014 and TMO's Performance Agreement 2014/2015*

96. The TMO Performance Review 2013/2014 and the TMO's Performance Agreement 2014/2015 report, dated 10 July 2014, at paragraph 2.2, stated that this was “another good year for the TMO”, with “continued work around fire safety.” (LJ/20) 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".

97. The report stated that "the programme to replace non fire-rated tenants' flat entrance doors has been successfully concluded" and that TMO had worked with the Council's legal services to address the issues associated with non-compliant leaseholder flat entrance doors (for further discussion of these topics see below at paragraphs 105-107). It stated that the TMO met 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. At paragraph 3.6 on page 24 of the report it stated that "intensive work in the area of fire safety [would] continue" and that this would include the ongoing programme of fire risk assessments and reviews. It also said that TMO would continue to liaise closely with the LFB, and to work with leaseholders with remaining non-compliant flat entrance doors.

*TMO Performance Review 2014/2015 and TMO's Performance Agreement 2015/2016*

98. The next year's report, dated 9 July 2015, stated at paragraph 3.7.1, that a Health and Safety Action Plan had been introduced to facilitate monitoring of compliance with legislation and good practice by the TMO H and S Committee, the programme of FRAs and review required by the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety Order) was ongoing, and noted that the recommendations of the best practice guidance had been adopted with regard to frequency (LJ/22). 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."

99. On 5 November 2015, the HPSC committee received a Mid-year review of the TMO Performance Agreement 2015/16 (LJ/23). It stated that since April 2015, progress had been made with the Fire Risk Assessment Programme through the continuation of "bi-monthly meetings with LFB Officers" and "LFB familiarisation visits", with the TMO having a close working relationship with LFB.



100. The following year, the report, dated 13 July 2016 (LJ/24), 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.” 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. The report noted that “two Enforcement Notices were served on TMO/RBKC by the LFB” after the Adair Tower fire. The TMO and RBKC were determined to ensure all doors at both Adair Tower and Hazlewood Tower were sufficiently fire-rated and had self-closers. The report stated 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. The report at para 3.6 stated that in the next year, 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.

#### *Fire Risk Assessments*

101. As mentioned in the TMO Performance Reviews above, the TMO had to implement a Fire Risk Assessment program according to new requirements introduced by the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005, which came into force in 2006. The TMO then began commissioning fire risk assessments (FRAs) of all the properties. Once the first assessments were completed, FRAs became planned as part of a rolling program of updates.

102. C S Stokes was the contractor for the TMO who performed all FRAs at Grenfell, as well as other properties across the housing stock, from 2009 onwards. I was not involved in the contracting of C S Stokes, nor monitoring his performance.
103. On 30 September 2010, Robert copied me in on an email which confirmed all high risk fire risk assessments had been completed, including high rise blocks (LJ/27). He confirmed the "Stay Put strategy" was adopted because, "These blocks consist of purpose-built, self-contained dwellings and the compartmentation is good, if a fire were to break out elsewhere in the block the residents would be safe to stay put." He was responding to an email from Jean Daintith, Executive Director, Housing, Health and Adult Social Care at RBKC who had forwarded an article written by an RBKC staff member, Claire Wise, about disabled residents living in high-rise housing (LJ/28). I then emailed Claire Wise to praise her article and I said "This is a good example of where as a result of improved fire safety measures required the TMO are taking positive steps to take action for disabled people that could save lives".
104. The TMO had a rolling programme of Fire Risk Assessments, and I was aware from the annual and half-yearly Performance Reviews that the programme was ongoing and working well, but I did not know the timetable for those assessments.

#### *Leaseholder Doors*

105. One example of an issue I was involved in and supported the TMO on, that was directly related to fire safety issues, related to the question of replacing entrance doors to leaseholder properties. There was a borough-wide tenanted flat entrance door replacement programme starting in 2011. After FRAs identified that there were a number of non-compliant doors across the housing stock, the TMO launched a replacement programme to ensure compliance. RBKC were not involved in the implementation of the programme.
106. A leaseholder, under their lease (although there is not one standard lease for all RBKC leaseholders), is as a rule the owner of the entrance door and so has responsibility to replace their door on notification of non-compliance. A small number of leaseholders did not engage and refused to replace their door. There was a question over how enforcement action should be taken against them. The Council was keen to ascertain whether the LFB was the

enforcement authority and the leaseholder was the "responsible person" for the flat entrance doors. It was critical for RBKC to understand who any notice would be served upon, the leaseholder or RBKC as landlord. The leaseholder controlled the door and RBKC did not have the power, as landlord, to force them to change it. It was an issue that we deemed serious, as non-compliant doors could have an effect on all residents. We therefore put considerable effort into ensuring mechanisms were available to ensure doors would be replaced. Letters were sent both by the TMO and RBKC Legal to leaseholders across the housing stock whose doors were deemed to be non-compliant. Council staff from the Housing Department and the Environmental Health team, as well as the Legal department discussed available enforcement powers. Legal advice was sought by the Council in 2012, and there were extensive discussions between the LFB and the Council about who would serve enforcement notices. The LFB refused to do so. The DCLG were asked by the Council to become involved but they declined.

107. After a prolonged period of discussion, spanning 2012 to 2014, often at TMO (HRA) Performance Meetings and at Scrutiny Committee meetings, it was decided, for the safety of residents, that the remaining non-compliant doors (which were very few in number by this point, and not belonging to leaseholders at Grenfell Tower) would be replaced and paid for out of the HRA, as far as I can recall. It was decided that in the future the TMO would pursue leaseholders whose doors were not compliant. RBKC Legal were exploring what enforcement action was reasonable against leaseholders who refused to replace their doors. As far as I was aware, the issue was resolved but kept under constant review for the whole housing stock, as residents could change or modify their doors, doors could fall into disrepair or there could be changes to guidance.

### *Self-Closers*

108. After the fire at Adair Tower, Enforcement Notices in 2015 and a Deficiency Notice in 2016 were served by the LFB stating that all flat entrance doors should have self-closers installed. All newly installed flat-entrance doors across the Housing Stock would have had self-closers, however I understood that residents could disconnect them at any time. We discussed the implementation of a replacement and inspection programme in 2016. The feasibility of an inspection programme for something that could so easily be removed and required entrance into residents' flats was an issue. Between November 2016 and the time

of the fire, we made a concerted effort to address the issue of self-closers. The HRA Business Plan for 2017/2018 (LJ/29) stated the LFB expected there to be inspections on the self-closing devices on the doors to ensure they remained in place and active. This was echoed in the Report entitled Installation of Self-Closing Devices on Flat Entrance Doors - For Discussion by RBKC Housing in February 2017 (LJ/30). It was agreed in March 2017 at a Joint Management Meeting that there would be a 5-year programme to retrofit self-closers in all tenanted properties. It was estimated to cost £619,000 for the retrofitting, and a maintenance and inspection programme would cost £288,000.

### *Previous Fires in RBKC or Surrounding Boroughs*

#### Grenfell Tower Fire 2010

109. On 4 May 2010, Janice Wray emailed Jean Tretheway and me "to advise you of a fire that occurred at Grenfell Tower at approximately 6pm on Friday evening [30 April 2010]" (LJ/31). She said as far as she was aware, no one was injured, the fire alarm had been triggered and residents were evacuated. She said, "We have been advised that the mechanical vents which act to extract smoke in the event of a fire did not operate (these are on a regular ppm maintenance contract). I am currently investigating and will advise you of more detail once I have this." Later the same day, Robert provided some further information (LJ/32). I do not recall this incident but from reading the email, I see that the TMO was managing the follow-up of the fire. It did not give me any reason for concern with regards to fire safety at Grenfell Tower.

#### Lakanal House Fire

110. On 17 April 2013, Cynthia Vachino confirmed to me the completion of the Lakanal House inquest. She provided a summary of the Coroner's recommendations and actions arising from the inquest and attached various letters and the narrative verdicts (LJ/33).

111. On 17 July 2014, I emailed Councillor Feilding-Mellen and Councillor Marshall, stating that the Council and the TMO were aware of the advice coming from LFB following the Lakanal House fire and that we were reassured that the TMO were on top of it. I forwarded documents that the Fire Brigade had produced along with the accompanying email. I said "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." (LJ/34)

#### Adair Tower Fire

112. I am aware of a fire at Adair Tower on 31 October 2015. The fire was successfully put out, and a number of residents had to be rehoused on a temporary basis due to smoke and water damage to their flat.

113. Following the fire the Council and the TMO met with the LFB to discuss why they hadn't followed the "Stay Put" policy but had brought people out of the tower during the incident thus allowing smoke to travel around the building as they broke down a considerable number of the flat entrance doors. There were discussions with the TMO following the fire (but not documented) that whenever the TMO completed a refurbishment project they needed to ensure that compartmentalisation was intact – we had these discussions because we were so very aware that these were pertinent issues.

#### *Enforcement Notices relating to Adair Fire*

114. The LEFPA issued Enforcement Notices in respect of Adair and Hazlewood Towers (Hazlewood was a tower near Adair built to the same specification) in December 2015 and January 2016. LFB confirmed substantial compliance on 17 and 18 January 2017.

115. With regards to Enforcement Notices, Janice Wray at TMO would have been responsible for collating the information in the response. The TMO management team would have then taken responsibility for ensuring the response went to the LFB and reported to their Board. I would agree the draft response to the LFB before it was sent. I would also discuss the Notice with the Council Chief Executive. Janice Wray, Robert Black or Barbara would keep me updated on the LFB's position. In my time as Director of Housing at RBKC, only a few Enforcement Notices were served across the housing stock. I took them very seriously.

116. I have detailed some key correspondence about the Enforcement Notices below.

117. On 5 February 2016, I emailed Robert Davies at LFB in relation to the enforcement notice for Hazelwood Tower (**LJ/35**). I requested a meeting with Robert Black from TMO as well as LFB to discuss the two enforcement notices following the fire at Adair Tower. I requested that the Enforcement Notice for Hazelwood Tower was not saved on the public register until we had met with LFB to discuss the ventilation system. I explained that we believed that the ventilation system in the building did work and did not require changing and I said that instead of challenging this formally through the Court system, it would be sensible to meet and discuss this with LFB. I also said, “I would also like to discuss with you the protocol around Staying Put in the case of a fire in a tower block, [and] the reality of what actually took place in the case of the fire in Adair Tower both in terms of the actions of the residents and LFB.”
118. On 22 June 2016, I was forwarded an email from Barbara Matthews at the TMO confirming that the time limits for the enforcement notices for Adair Tower and Hazelwood Tower had been extended (**LJ/36**). I was aware of the Enforcement Notices, appreciated the seriousness of them, and was kept informed but equally I was conscious that the TMO was dealing with them and was confident in their ability to do so.
119. I was sent a letter by Janice Wray at TMO, dated 6 July 2016, from the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority to Janice Wray (**LJ/37**). As a result of the letter, which was a Statutory Information Request, Janice Wray prepared a briefing note which she also sent to me (**LJ/38**) which referred to a phone call between Janice and the LFB about the enforcement action by the LFB. The LFB confirmed investigations were still ongoing. The briefing note said that “[Janice] emphasised that the LFB’s post fire audit did not raise any concerns about breaches in compartmentation or the fire resisting standard of the flat doors, but only the absence of self-closing devices.” The letter also noted that the TMO's own investigations and those undertaken by their Fire Risk Assessor demonstrated that the compartmentation worked and the “Stay Put” strategy was and remains appropriate for Adair Tower. The briefing also stated that it was the Operational Fire Crews decision to evacuate the entire block and the majority of residents were allowed to return home on the same day, which indicated that the LFB had no concern about fire separation within the flats.

120. On 28 July 2016, I was copied into an email from Amanda Johnson to Councillor Feilding-Mellen giving him an update on the LFB Investigation following the Adair Tower fire (LJ/39). Amanda Johnson confirmed that "in respect of the works required in the Enforcement Notices, the TMO is well on track and still plan to complete all the work required well before the extended dates". It said that the LFB were in dialogue with the TMO's specialist consultants. From this, I was satisfied that the TMO was dealing with the matter of the Enforcement Notices and liaising frequently with the LFB in doing so.

121. In a report to the Scrutiny Committee from 16 November 2016, (LJ/40), the first item relates to the Hazelwood and Adair Enforcement Notices. I explained that an extension of time was given and that all works required at Adair tower had been completed satisfactorily and LFB had audited the block and indicated they were happy with the works. In relation to the works at Hazelwood Tower, I explained all necessary works had been completed and RBKC and the TMO were awaiting confirmation from LFB with a date for an audit. This audit went ahead at a later date, and I was satisfied that the matter was dealt with.

#### Shepherd's Court Fire

122. I was aware of a previous fire at Shepherd's Court. On 16 September 2016, I was emailed by Nicholas Holgate saying that at his London Chief Executives meeting that morning it had been mentioned that there had been a fire in Shepherds Bush as a result of a tumble dryer. Nicholas Holgate was asking me to ensure somebody was taking responsibility for this issue. I replied on the same date to say that this had been discussed at Scrutiny Committee that week and the TMO had run an article in its magazine for tenants. I said I did not know what else could be done and said that there had been another fire that week as a result of a faulty battery in a mobility scooter. I explained to Nicholas Holgate that this had been followed up with the TMO as well to ensure safe charging. I said I would drop Hammersmith and Fulham an email to ask what they planned to do and see if we wanted to work with them. I then forwarded the email chain to Celia Caliskan saying "Another item for our meeting with the TMO next week," (LJ/41). I cannot recall whether it was the Chief Executive or I that received a letter from the LFB about the fire. The letter was then forwarded to the TMO, and I believe Janice Wray responded to me with the actions they had taken after the fire.

123. I was sent a letter on 06 April 2017 from the LFB, raising the issue of combustible cladding and external fire spread (LJ/42), asking to strongly consider this issue as part of the risk assessment process for RBKC housing stock. I then asked the TMO to confirm if any of its stock used the type of cladding involved. The response from Janice Wray which I received on 27 April 2017 stated, “I can confirm that it is our understanding that we do not have any blocks with cladding of the nature described in the LFB’s letter (which was present at the Shepherds Bush tower block). Grenfell Tower did have external cladding panels fitted as part of the recent refurbishment work, however, our assessor [C S Stokes] investigated thoroughly the details of the installation with the contractor (Rydons) when the works were on site and he is able to confirm that this complies with the requirements of the current Building Regulations.” (Email chain at LJ/43).

#### Trellick Tower Fire

124. There was a fire in Trellick Tower on 19 April 2017. From recollection, I believe the fire was contained within one individual flat and therefore compartmentalisation in the building worked on this occasion. A report to the Scrutiny Committee on 4 May 2017 (LJ/44), stated “Whilst it is always a concern to have had a fire, what is clear in the review of the incident to date is that all the work undertaken by the TMO to ensure 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. Work to support the displaced resident is ongoing and further liaison with the LFB is also ongoing.”

#### *Grenfell Related Fire Safety Measures*

125. I had no specific knowledge of fire safety measures within Grenfell Tower at the time of the fire. My knowledge of fire safety measures was general across the whole housing stock. I understood there were bi-monthly meetings between the TMO and LFB both before and during the refurbishment. This regular communication and opportunity for problems to be raised and addressed gave me the impression that the TMO were appropriately dealing with fire safety measures at Grenfell.



126. I have been shown a copy of the “Corporate Health and Safety 6 monthly Update Report” dated November 2016, and presented to the RBKC Management Board at a meeting on 9 November 2016 where I was present (LJ/45). The report on page 5 of 8, at item 12.6, states that in relation to the Grenfell Tower refurbishment, there was close liaison with LFB and a fire risk assessor throughout the duration of the project and that after the work had been completed, some of the operational firefighters attended an onsite briefing where the contractor demonstrated the fire safety features of the building. At item 12.8 in relation to ongoing publicity to residents, it states that residents should follow the “Stay Put” fire strategy in the event of the fire and leaseholders should be informed about the fire safety standards required of their flat entrance doors.

*Deficiency Notice relating to Grenfell Tower*

127. A Deficiency Notice was issued by the LFB in November 2016 with compliance due by 18 May 2017. The LFB undertook an inspection of Grenfell Tower in November 2016, at which point a Deficiency Notice was served based on their observations at the time (LJ/46). These were:

- 127.1. Several communal fire doors did not fully self-close
- 127.2. Two flat entrances were identified as not self-closing
- 127.3. Some stored items within the common parts including a mobility scooter which was being charged through the letterbox at the time
- 127.4. One panel protecting the services duct on the 8th floor was found to have a damaged top corner
- 127.5. Fire Action Notices were not displayed within the common parts.

128. The LFB undertook regular fire safety assessments of Council housing buildings, particularly the high-rise blocks and if they thought that any part of the area did not meet the requirements of the Housing Act, or Health and Safety legislation, they could serve a Deficiency Notice. This could relate to anything that they felt could endanger life, or wasn't good management of the building, increasing fire risk.

129. If a deficiency notice was served by the LFB, as far as I was aware, it would usually be served on the TMO. The TMO would manage the process, liaising directly with the LFB

to ensure all the items were addressed in the notice, they would then inform the Council how they had responded. As far as I am aware, deficiency notices are not discharged, in that there is no formal process from the LFB to bring them to an end or for them to be signed off as resolved. I understand usually the LFB completed a report detailing the inspection date, issues noted, what they required the organisation to rectify and by when. Once that had been done a notice would be sent to the LFB informing them that it had been complied with.

130. The Council effectively placed its trust in the TMO that the deficiency notice would be dealt with appropriately and followed up with the LFB. If the TMO required additional finance in order to be able to comply with a deficiency notice, depending on the scope and cost of the work, usually it would be managed within the existing budget provision. If not, it would be referred to Cabinet for extra funding. Councillors would have no involvement in managing the response to a deficiency notice. I would have let the Cabinet Member know about a deficiency notice and any action taken in respect of it as a matter of course.

131. The TMO notified me of the Deficiency Notice by email. The TMO sought to rectify these issues, and measures were in the process of being undertaken that had been highlighted to them. My understanding is that they had informed the LFB.

## **Inspections**

132. I have no direct knowledge of any formal inspections of Grenfell Tower during its refurbishment as these would have been conducted by RBKC's Building Control department. I didn't receive any of these reports as far as I am aware and can recall.

133. I visited the building during its refurbishment to see how it was progressing. I wanted to see not only improvements to the block but the new affordable housing, boxing club and nursery that would make real difference to the local community. I can't recall specific dates or occasions but believe I visited the refurbishment at least 2, maybe 3 times. Once by myself and once, maybe twice with Peter Maddison of the TMO.

## **Communications with residents**

### ***Complaints handling in general***

134. The Council had a formal complaints procedure. Complaints that arose out of issues within the remit of the Housing Department only were dealt with by Jon Morcom, the Housing Complaints Officer at RBKC, who reported to Amanda Johnson. The majority of these complaints related to Housing Needs and Temporary Accommodation. The Council would formally advertise the fact it had a complaints procedure and would for example advertise phone number and email contact details.
135. If a problem related to something within the TMO's remit, it would ordinarily be dealt with by the TMO's Complaints team. I have referred to the TMO complaints procedure briefly above at paragraph 35. It was a three-stage procedure. Most of the issues relating to the day-to-day management of the housing stock was dealt with by the TMO.
136. Residents didn't always follow the TMO or the Council's formal complaints procedure, and residents would either approach councillors or me with any issues they had. They would write to me by email or call me. If I could I would respond directly instead of telling them to go through the formal complaints procedure, for example if I knew the answer. Then I would often 'close out' a complaint and forward the correspondence to Jon Morcom for filing.
137. If a complaint had been addressed specifically to the Leader of the Council, the TMO would draft the response to the complainant, and they would then send it to me. The Head of Housing Complaints or I would check the response and it would then go to the Leader's office in order to be sent out in the Leader's name. If it had gone to myself and Robert Black, he would draft the response which would go out jointly in both our names, or it would be sent in his name and I would be sent a copy.
138. Generally, I did not have a direct relationship with resident groups, forums or authors of blogs. It was not part of my day to day remit to check blogs that people had written. The TMO had a resident engagement team who would work with existing residents associations and help set new ones up.

139. As well as the formal and informal resident's complaints process, there were other mechanisms through which the council communicated with residents. There is a Tenant's Consultative Committee (TCC) which has representatives from tenant and resident groups from across the borough. This was an opportunity for representatives from Residents Associations (RA) to hear about changes to rents and investment plans for the year ahead and ask questions of Councillors and Officers in attendance. The Housing Commissioning team would put the agenda together, invites were sent out to chairs and vice chairs of RAs. It was held in the Town Hall and minutes were taken. It met approximately twice a year until about 2012 and then once a year after that until 2016. It was wound down because central government decided to reduce rents by 1% per annum for the next 4 years, so there was no longer any decision to be made by the Council regarding rents (LJ/47) and therefore no need for formal consultation with the TCC. It was restarted in 2017, after the fire.
140. Whilst the TMO Performance Review 2013/2014 (LJ/20) showed complaints handling not meeting its target (stating "A short term action plan was put in place to address performance issues, and outturns are now improving"), the TMO Performance Review for 2014-15 (LJ/22) found that they had met their targets. There was no Complaints KPI for the 2015-2016 Performance Review (LJ/24). However, the TMO still undertook performance monitoring of complaints.
141. The TMO also had complaints KPIs. They reported on them to the TMO Board and Scrutiny Committee annually. Complaints were discussed at HSDMT, where an annual report was presented every year. Jon Morcom would attend, and performance and response times of the teams drafting responses to complaints was discussed.
142. In September 2013, Test of Opinion poll was carried out of residents across the TMO stock, which was reported to the Scrutiny Committee in March 2014. This showed that resident satisfaction with the TMO provision of services stood at 75%, and 86% of residents would like the TMO to continue to manage the properties. These figures would have been benchmarked against other Housing Associations of a similar size for resident satisfaction. I cannot recall these figures causing me any concern.

### *Complaints Relating to Grenfell Tower*

143. Prior to the refurbishment, the complaints from residents were largely about the lifts breaking down, a general feeling that the building was rundown and problems with water pressure and heating. It was always going to be very complex to move the tower from a communal boiler system to individual heating and billing. Complaints specifically relating to fire safety are detailed below at paragraphs 167-182 below.

144. Most general complaints, for example, about lifts not working, or other day-to-day maintenance issues, would have been the TMO's remit. I would have forwarded any complaints I received directly to the appropriate person in the TMO or via Jon Morcom (complaints officer). I would often ask for a follow-up email to ensure the matter was dealt with.

145. I did on occasion receive complaints that the TMO were not responding to complaints by residents (LJ/48). I followed this up either via Jon Morcom, raised it with Robert Black at our regular one-to-one meetings, or directly e-mailed a head of service if a response was required immediately.

146. The TMO responded to complaints directly from residents about the renovations. Complaints also went to Rydon who would have managed them through their resident liaison officer. A number of residents did ask for compensation for disturbance as they had to live in the tower whilst the refurbishment project took place, but this was refused. The project cost £10.3 million which was the equivalent of spending £100k per flat to improve the quality of the building for tenants and leaseholders.

147. The level of communication and complaints about Grenfell Tower was not reflective of the rest of the borough. It seemed to generate more complaints than any other TMO managed block of flats. The majority of complaints came from a few people - Edward Daffarn (resident) and Francis O'Connor (lived locally but not in the tower) from the Grenfell Action Group, Tunde Awoderu, Chairman of the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders' Association (GTLA), Lee Chapman and David Collins from the Residents Association/ Compact, and from Councillor Blakeman. Many of the complaints regarding Grenfell Tower would be emailed to me or councillors directly, often copying in a large number of

other recipients. I was the main respondent to the complaints from residents at Grenfell that came via Councillor Blakeman. Only one complaint that went through the formal complaints procedure was upheld, which reassured me that complaints were being responded to appropriately.

148. I would often work closely with the TMO to investigate issues raised in complaints and agree responses to them. The responses would usually come from me or Peter Maddison at the TMO.

149. I detail below some of the key areas I was involved in with regard to communications with residents and complaints relating to Grenfell Tower. Most do not relate to fire safety issues. I have expanded on the two key areas of complaints relating to fire safety at the end of this section - the 2013 power surges, and the 2017 National Grid gas pipe concerns.

#### *KALC Consultation*

150. Between 2011 and 2013, whilst the KALC scheme was in consultation and then the construction was taking place, there were emails from Edward Daffarn, Francis O'Connor and Tunde Awoderu. These emails expressed concerns that Grenfell residents were not being consulted about the KALC project. As SRO, I met with residents, including Mr Daffarn, Mr O'Connor and Mr Awoderu on a number of occasions, and ran monthly resident liaison groups to discuss the works from September 2011. This monthly group meeting was set up after a meeting with residents on 18 July 2011 (LJ/49), where we agreed that resident engagement was important. Councillor Campbell stated "We are committed to a successful forum that listens to residents." I always responded or forwarded emails to the appropriate person to deal with them when I received specific complaints or queries.

#### *Delays to Refurbishment*

151. The planning process behind the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower was a long process and there were delays to the work commencing, for a variety of reasons. Perhaps understandably, the residents were keen to see the refurbishment, that the vast majority wanted to happen, start. I received or was aware of complaints about the delays to the

project starting. I felt that the TMO did keep the residents informed about the status of the project.

152. On 28 February 2013, I was copied into an email to the TMO, copied to a number of other recipients, from Tunde Awoderu on behalf of the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association (**LJ/50**) expressing concerns about the progress of the Grenfell Tower regeneration. On 10 March 2013, I was copied into an email to Councillor Coleridge, copied to a number of other recipients, from Tunde Awoderu on behalf of the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association (**LJ/51**) expressing further concern about the delays to the refurbishment starting.

153. After a number of emails in the first half of 2013 on behalf of the Grenfell Action Group, GTLA and Lancaster West Residents Association, I met with Edward Daffarn on 19 July 2013, with Councillors Feilding-Mellen and Blakeman, and Peter Maddison (minutes of meeting at **LJ/52**). The reasons for delays were explained to Mr Daffarn, namely that at that stage there were hold ups with RBKC Planning signing off on the design and being unable to decide on a budget with Leadbitter. There was also a petition presented by Councillor Blakeman to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2013, signed by 94 residents regarding the “Power Surges and Delays to the Regeneration Project” (**LJ/53**, for further discussion please see paragraph 178 below).

154. There is a further email on 8 June 2014 from the GTLA, addressed to Councillor Feilding-Mellen, copying me in, complaining of delays (**LJ/54**). Tunde Awoderu stated that the works were supposed to begin early 2014. Councillor Feilding-Mellen responded with information that he had been given by Roger Keane at RBKC, accepting that there had been delays but confirming there had been much activity behind the scenes and that delays were always a possibility in large scale projects. A newsletter was sent to the residents around this time to keep them informed of the refurbishment progress.

### *Refurbishment Complaints*

155. During the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower, between 2014 and 2016, there were a number of complaints and concerns about the management of the project by TMO, the contractor Rydon, their interaction with residents and the work being done. Specifically,

there were complaints about the placement of the Heat Interface Units (HIUs) in the apartments. These complaints came to me in a variety of ways, as with other complaints.

156. On 03 December 2015, I was sent a petition signed by 60 residents submitted by Councillor Blakeman to the HPSC asking them to undertake a review of the TMO and Rydon's management of the refurbishment project (LJ/55). The concerns related to intolerable living conditions rather than safety concerns. On 07 December 2015, I sent the petition to Councillors Feilding-Mellen and Marshall (LJ/56). In my email, I said that if the Councillors would like to discuss the petition with Robert Black or Peter Maddison with regards to communication with residents, they would be happy to do so. I also stated that "I think it's fair to say Peter is exhausted from the amount of time/responses that he and Councillor Blakeman have taken on this project, the TMO will of course be happy to assist in whatever way they can but I don't think either myself or Robert have the resources to undertake a full-scale review with interviews of residents to meet the demands of the petitioners. I would like your guidance on how you wish to respond to the petition".

157. The Council acknowledged the disruption and inconvenience caused by the major refurbishment to Grenfell Tower but said that this was the inevitable price that must be paid by residents in order to have their flats brought up to modern standards (LJ/57). I discussed the matter with Councillors Feilding-Mellen and Marshall as to how best to respond. On 09 December 2015, I sent a letter to Councillor Blakeman saying that in response to her petition, it would be included as an agenda item at the Scrutiny Committee on 6 January 2016 (LJ/58). I explained that this would give Councillors the opportunity to debate and consider the concerns that have been raised. I told her that officers from both the Council and the TMO will be available to respond to any specific queries raised. Councillor Blakeman responded (LJ/59) that she thought it would be helpful to hear also from a representative of the Grenfell Tower Compact. The Councillors and I decided this would be a good idea.

158. A briefing note entitled "Grenfell Tower Refurbishment," dated 24 December 2015 (LJ/60), was prepared by Peter Maddison as a response to the petition and sent to Councillors Mackover, Marshall, Paget-Brown, Feilding-Mellen, Amanda Johnson, and myself, Robert Black and Sacha Jevans at the TMO as well as Victoria Borwick MP and John Sweeney from Parliament. 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. It said there were two main issues raised by the Resident Compact. These were allegations 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.

159. The TMO had undertaken a door-knocking exercise “to take stock of any current issues facing residents in relation to the refurbishment works.” 90% of the 77 households (out of a total of 120 at Grenfell) confirmed that the improvements to the heating and hot water system were working effectively, 85% confirmed that they understood how to operate the new heating system, 83% were happy with the new windows and 97% confirmed that they understood how to operate the windows. None of the 77 households raised any problems relating to “bullying” or “harassment.”

160. On 04 January 2016, I was forwarded an email from Robert Black (**LJ/61**). The email he forwarded was from Councillor Blakeman to a number of recipients. Robert Black said "Councillor Blakeman is sending this information to my Board Members, and copying in other Councillors outside the Board". In the email chain, there is an email from David Collins on 03 January 2016 to Victoria Borwick. In his email Mr Collins said that residents are seeking an independent investigation into the TMO and how it carried out the refurbishment project. He states "the number one priority for our Compact is to see such an independent investigation take place.”

161. On 05 January 2016, I emailed Councillor Mackover, copying in Councillor Marshall (**LJ/62**). In my email I explained that the TMO Board had met on Monday night and had agreed that TMO would carry out a review to see what had worked and what had not and to ascertain lessons learned. I said, "Usually this would be officers doing it but Board Members wanted to be involved which adds the challenge and independence. Paula Fance

(independent Board Member appointed by RBKC) wants to be involved and adds value to her regeneration work [sic], she was very supportive, KUSH will get involved and a few others as could Judith – they can listen to the issues". I stated that the TMO Board felt that this was a TMO matter and wanted to deal with it itself. Its outcomes would be shared with the Scrutiny Committee later in the year.

162. On 6 January 2016, at the Scrutiny Committee meeting attended by Edward Daffarn as a representative of the Grenfell Resident Compact, the minutes (**LJ/63**) note, "Ms Johnson said that the TMO had worked closely with Rydon and the residents of Grenfell Tower and had representatives available onsite 5 days per week...Ms Johnson confirmed that the works had been intrusive and would have undoubtedly been difficult for residents who would have faced considerable disturbance during the works, especially when access to individual homes was required." Mr Daffarn addressed the committee about his concerns, namely: the lack of consultation and resident engagement; the placement of the 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. It was decided the TMO Board would conduct its own review into these complaints by setting up a Working Group.

163. The TMO Board Working Group reported its findings on 31 March 2016, entitled Grenfell Tower Board Review (**LJ/64**). The report was authored by Paula Fance. 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 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." It noted that it found that the example of poor workmanship, which was referred to before the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, was work in progress and therefore this was misleading. In May 2016, the TMO shared this report with the Scrutiny Committee and it was made available to the residents.

164. On 11 May 2016, a report was presented to the Scrutiny Committee (**LJ/65**) giving an update on the findings of the TMO Board. It noted the mitigating action that had taken place to try to lessen the disruption on the residents: limiting noisy work hours from 9am to 3pm; one lift for passengers and one lift for carrying materials; two flats were made available for respite facilities for residents to use and Rydon's RLO was to be based on site to deal with all specific issues on a day-to-day basis. It noted that a "full project review and resident satisfaction survey would be undertaken six months after the project is completed. The results of this review will be presented to a future Board meeting."

165. On 10 July 2016, I was copied into an email from Councillor Feilding-Mellen replying to David Collins, also copying in Councillor Blakeman and others (**LJ/66**). They had been discussing over a number of emails David's concerns relating to resident engagement and the attitude of the TMO during the refurbishment. David Collins replied on 11 July 2016 and I was copied into this email. He said the biggest issue with the TMO Board Report was that the TMO had been asked to complete it and therefore felt the independence was questionable. Mr Collins agreed to a meeting which was held in July 2016. On 06 September 2016 Councillor Feilding-Mellen had received an email from David Collins in relation to a meeting we had had with him previously in July 2016. He was asking whether anything had changed following the meeting, specifically in relation to the Council's approach to regeneration or the operation of the TMO (**LJ/67**). Councillor Feilding-Mellen forwarded this email on to me asking whether I had any thoughts on the matter and I replied on 04 October 2016, saying that I was struggling to think of something because I thought the TMO had managed the refurbishment project well in difficult circumstances. I proposed a response saying that there would be greater council officer and member involvement and more focussed working on assessing the needs of individual tenants in future estate regeneration works.

166. On 3 January 2017, I was copied into an email from Councillor Feilding-Mellen to Peter Maddison at the TMO (**LJ/68**). The email related to work at Trellick Tower and Councillor Feilding-Mellen was asking the TMO for information in order to ensure that all lessons had been learnt from the Grenfell Tower refurbishment with regards to resident's consultation and engagement. This demonstrates that the Council did learn from resident feedback and was not simply sweeping matters under the carpet as it had been accused of doing.

### *Fire Safety Related Complaints*

167. The majority of complaints relating to fire safety concerned the power surges and National Grid gas pipe. Other complaints included concerns about leaseholder doors (the Council's actions in relation to which have been addressed above), or a small number of complaints raising issues with lack of a fire drill or lifts breaking down (for example the email referred to in paragraph 93 above). The Council did not routinely undertake fire drills of Council accommodation but we would have followed any advice on such issues given by the LFB had they have advised us drills were necessary. Due to the "Stay-Put" policy, I was aware that evacuation exercises were deemed unnecessary, and even counter-productive, as it went against the policy to remain in flats and could lead to confusion amongst residents. Regarding lifts, I forwarded any complaints I received to the TMO as repair and maintenance was their responsibility (LJ/25).

168. Other than complaints relating to lifts breaking down, I received few other emails directly related to fire safety concerns specifically at Grenfell Tower. One correspondence is detailed here, relating to concerns about fire safety equipment. On 02 January 2015, I was copied into an email from the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association to Councillors Dent-Coad and Blakeman, along with a large number of others (LJ/69). In his email, Tunde Awoderu was asking for a statement of work for the regeneration project at Grenfell Tower. He made reference to a letter from the TMO dated 30 January 2013 which said that "we can confirm that improvements will be made to the existing smoke extraction and ventilation system which links to the fire alarm under the Grenfell Regeneration Project". Mr Awoderu was concerned that the contractor, Rydon, had been on site since June 2014 and there was little evidence to suggest that the smoke ventilation and extraction system would be replaced.

169. On 05 January 2015, I was copied into an email from Peter Maddison to Amanda Johnson (LJ/70). Mr Maddison was emailing in relation to Mr Awoderu's email to Councillor Dent-Coad. Mr Maddison said that he did not think that the TMO's complaints procedure was the right place to deal with this email because it had been addressed to Councillor Dent-Coad and Councillor Blakeman. He said that as Councillor Blakeman had forwarded it to him to ask for help in responding, he suggests it is treated as a Members

enquiry and he would draft a brief response to Councillor Blakeman explaining that the agreed scope of work to Grenfell Tower included, amongst other things, "smoke/fire safety and ventilation works".

170. On 29 September 2016, I was copied in to an email from the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association to Councillor Blakeman. This email had a number of recipients (**LJ/71**). The GTLA were raising a number of issues with Councillor Blakeman including a fire drill at Grenfell Tower and the regular breakdown of the lifts at Grenfell Tower. In relation to the lifts, the residents were complaining that as a result of the overuse during the refurbishment works, the lifts were malfunctioning more than lifts of their age should. In relation to the fire drill at Grenfell Tower, residents were alleging that there was an inconsistency between an LFB report following a fire in 2010 and the risk assessment for the building undertaken on 20 November 2012. The email says that one fire drill has been organised since 2010 and a further one is due. The residents refer to the power surges in previous years saying that they were fortunate on that occasion and scared of fire risk. Councillor Feilding-Mellen forwarded the email to me asking me to draft a reply and I acknowledged this email saying that I would do so. I then emailed Councillor Blakeman saying that I would discuss the issues raised in the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association's email with the TMO and respond in due course (**LJ/72**).

171. On 04 October 2016, I was copied in to Councillor Blakeman's response to the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders Association (**LJ/73**). On 10 October 2016, I emailed Councillor Blakeman saying that I had asked the TMO to pull together a response which I attached to the email. (**LJ/25** and **LJ/26**). In the TMO's response, in relation to the lifts, it was explained that the vast majority of the lift call outs were minor in nature and that only 1 of the 2 lifts had been left out of service for more than a day over the previous 12 months. In relation to the concerns about the fire drill at Grenfell Tower, the TMO provided a comprehensive response. It stated that there was no evidence of any negligence on behalf of the TMO in relation to the fire in 2010. The TMO was not aware of any inconsistencies between the fire risk assessor and the LFB in relation to the 2010 fire. The TMO explained that they had liaised closely with the LFB and had undertaken a joint site visit to the tower following the fire and no specific recommendation of deficiencies were raised by the LFB. The TMO explained that for several years, the TMO and the LFB had had regular bimonthly liaison meetings to discuss fire safety in the housing stock. The response

explained that there was the stay put policy in place for Grenfell Tower and that residents are required to stay put in the event of a fire. It explained that on arrival, LFB would make an assessment and determine whether partial or total evacuation was required. The letter explained that fire drills were not required in blocks with a stay put fire strategy because the purpose of the fire drill is to test the procedure to be followed in the event of a fire. The letter explains that the TMO had arranged a familiarisation visit with LFB at Grenfell Tower in June 2013 and that during the refurbishment works at Grenfell Tower the TMO, LFB and Rydon liaised closely to ensure that the LFB fire crews carried out regular familiarisation of the block so that they were clear on all changes made and any impact that would have on firefighting. Finally, the letter also noted that at the conclusion of the works, local LFB staff had met on site with Rydon and were briefed on the fire safety features of the block and its new layout. I was satisfied and assured by this detailed response by the TMO.

### *Power Surges*

172. In 2013 there were a number of power surges and a number of flats had electrical equipment damaged as a result. This fault was not as a result of poor maintenance or the TMO - it was a National Grid issue. The National Grid came and replaced the equipment which had caused the problem. Following the power surge, a number of tenants requested compensation. No compensation was given due to the fact that insurers concluded we were not liable. However, a goodwill payment of £200 was offered to the affected residents. The message from the TMO to residents was they should claim under their own insurance.

173. I have set out below key correspondence related to the power surges.

174. I first became aware of the power surge issue in May 2013. I believe the complaint was raised by Shah Ahmed on behalf of the GTLA, dated 13 May 2013. I emailed Councillor Feilding-Mellen on 24 May 2013 (LJ/74) forwarding an email chain about the matter. I confirmed that the TMO was investigating and would be contacting residents.

175. In early June, a briefing note was prepared by the TMO 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. On 3 June 2013, I emailed Councillor Feilding-Mellen saying the TMO believed the cause of the power surges was a loose connection, that they had implemented a temporary fix but the team was still working on resolving the issue. The matter of residents' compensation was being looked in to (**LJ/75** and **LJ/76**).

176. Throughout June, I was liaising with the TMO who were investigating the cause of the surges. I was aware that this was a fire safety issue, and that residents were being affected. I asked the TMO to prepare responses to the complaints we were receiving, from the GTLA, Edward Daffarn and Councillor Blakeman, who were asking for updates on the surges, for the problems to be rectified and explanations given. Peter Maddison responded on 21 June 2013 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 **LJ/77**).

177. After further correspondence between Councillors, myself, the TMO and residents, a meeting took place to discuss concerns, with Edward Daffarn, Councillor Feilding-Mellen, Councillor Paget-Brown and myself on 19 July 2013 (**LJ/52**).

178. A petition had been presented by Councillor Blakeman to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2013, signed by 94 residents regarding the “Power Surges and Delays to the Regeneration Project” (**LJ/53**). 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.

179. On 28 August 2013, a formal response to the petition was sent to Councillor Blakeman, signed by me, stating “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.” I addressed compensation, stating that a goodwill payment of £200 per affected household was offered. I set out the chain of responsibility between the TMO, the EMB and RBKC and gave a full explanation of delays to the refurbishment project (LJ/78).

### *National Grid*

180. After the refurbishment finished at Grenfell, the National Grid carried out some works which included placing new pipe work in the lobby areas and different parts of the tower to facilitate the delivery of gas to the flats. Some residents wrote to the TMO and to RBKC, expressing their concerns about the noise, the mess, the lack of consultation by National Grid and their concerns that some of the pipe work had been left exposed. The residents either wrote to me or I was copied in to complaints that they had sent to the Chief Executive, the Leader of the Council, or the Cabinet Member for Housing and Property.

181. The complaints were responded to, and we took them seriously. Janice Wray at the TMO liaised with National Grid. She employed CS Stokes to conduct a Fire Risk Assessment of the works that the National Grid had undertaken, and the report was sent to the National Grid and the London Fire Brigade. The TMO were in conversations with National Grid about those works. By the end of March, Robert Black from the TMO had replied to the various complaints in some detail explaining that the TMO had met with National Grid, and that the TMO would also be raising the issue of the safety of the gas pipe at their next meeting with the LFB. I felt that National Grid had not been helpful in trying to resolve this problem, as the TMO had had to chase them for meetings. Eventually, Councillors Paget-Brown and Feilding-Mellen asked me to raise the issue of National Grid’s attitude with MP Victoria Borwick. I can’t recall whether I did this or not.

182. After a review by the National Grid, in May 2017, they considered the location of the gas pipes within the staircase to be acceptable but had committed to encasing the pipework that they had installed in fire retardant boxing. The LFB considered the location of the gas pipes within the staircase to be acceptable. Peter Maddison also committed to reviewing



the work by National Grid once it was completed. To my knowledge that work had not been undertaken at the time of the fire.

**Fire advice to Residents 2012 to 14 June 2017**

183. I don't have any direct knowledge of this as it would have been the remit of the TMO, though I am aware that there was a "stay put" policy in place, as there was at all high-rise blocks in the borough. I am not aware of what fire safety advice was given prior to the night of the fire, or whether that advice changed after the completion of the regeneration project.

**Statement of Truth**

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

I am willing for this statement to form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website.

Full name:

Laura Rachel Johnson

Position or office held:

DIRECTOR OF HOUSING

Signed:



Date:

8<sup>th</sup> November 2018

**GRENFELL TOWER  
PUBLIC INQUIRY**

---

**Index to  
Witness Statement of  
LAURA JOHNSON**

---

<b>Exhibit Number LJ/</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>FORT</b>	<b>URN</b>
1	RBKC Strategic Development Committee Notes	01/12/2010	FORT00050621	RBK00000576
2	Report by the Director of Housing to Cabinet, "Use of Capital Receipts arising from the sale of Basement Spaces at Elm Park Gardens."	02/05/2012	FORT00009521	RBK00000380
3	Email from Jane Tretheway at RBKC to Laura Johnson and Peter Wright, CC Shelley Gittens. Subject: Grenfell Tower	02/11/2011	FORT00461543	RBK00000005

4	Email from the GTLA to Edward Darffarn, Sdelola Dairo, Laura Johnson, CC Robert Black, Derek Myers, Councillors, Jane Tretheway, TMO Complaints, Sacha Jevans, and others. Subject: Agenda from GTLA stakeholders meeting on 29th November 2011 6:30pm	23/11/2011	FORT00586041	RBK00002315
5	Email from Mark Anderson to Laura Johnson, CC Jane Tretheway. Subject: Grenfell Tower	12/12/2011	FORT00592501	RBK00002335
6	Email from Mark Anderson to Jane Tretheway, CC Laura Johnson and Peter Wright. Subject: Grenfell Tower lower level proposals	12/12/2011	FORT00254945	RBK00001273
7	Report by the Director of Housing to Cabinet, "Basement Spaces, Elm Park Gardens, SW10, Capital Receipt Expenditure."	09/02/2012	FORT00144488	RBK00000862
8	Minutes of Cabinet meeting 2 May 2012	02/05/2012	FORT01116041	RBK00015869
9	Report by the Director of Housing to Cabinet, Budget Monitoring 2013/14 Quarter 1	18/07/2013	FORT00418638	RBK00013783
10	Minutes of Housing and Regeneration Policy Board meeting	20/03/2014	FORT01118025	RBK00003538
11	Draft report by Director of Housing to Cabinet, "Grenfell Tower Major Works & Hidden Homes Project"	03/06/2014	FORT00064158	RBK00000644

12	Email from Peter Maddison to Kitty Mortimer, Laura Johnson, Steve Mellor, CC David Gibson at TMO, Claire Williams. Subject: Grenfell Cabinet Report	04/06/2014	FORT00007405	RBK00000369
13	Minutes of Housing and Economic Development Policy Board meeting	05/06/2014	FORT01184745	RBK00003688
14	Final report by Director of Housing entitled "Grenfell Tower Major Works & Hidden Homes Project", presented to Cabinet on 19 June 2014	19/06/2014	FORT00015762	RBK00000409
15	Executive Decision Report- Permission to enter into a Unilateral Undertaking for two additional Hidden Homes	Aug-14	FORT01040732	RBK00003309
16	Email from Laura Johnson to Cliff Thomas at Leadbitter, CC Peter Wright, Steven Bell, Colin Chiles (Leadbitter), Appleyards, Chris Carey, Mark Anderson. Subject: FW: KALC: Draft email from LJ to CT	03/01/2013	FORT00204712	RBK00001093
17	Report by the Director of Housing to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, "An Update on Grenfell Tower Improvement Works and the Recent Power Surges."	16/07/2013	FORT02120202	RBK00013843

18	Notes of Meeting Regarding Grenfell Tower Project 14 Nov 2013.	14/11/2013	FORT00077883	RBK00000694
19	Grenfell Tower Resident Consultation Questionnaire	Jan-12	FORT00013150	RBK00000006
20	TMO Performance Review 2013/2014 and the TMO's Performance Agreement 2014/2015 report	10/07/2014	FORT00828489	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18
21	Mid-Year TMO Performance Review dated 6 November 2014	06/11/2014	FORT00011868	RBK00000393
22	TMO Performance Review 2014/2015 and TMO's Performance Agreement 2015/2016	09/07/2015	FORT01164530	RBK00003649
23	Mid-Year TMO Performance Review dated 5 November 2015	05/11/2015	FORT00073870	RBK00000670
24	TMO Performance Review 2015/2016 and TMO's Performance Agreement 2016/2017	13/07/2016	FORT00052268	RBK00000589
25	Email from Laura Johnson to Cllr Blakeman, CC Cllrs Paget-Brown and Feilding-Mellen, Robert Black and Peter Maddison dated 10 Oct 2016, forwarding email from the GTLA to Cllr Blakeman dated 29 Sept 2016, CC many others. Subject: FW: Grenfell Tower refurbishment-mission accomplished by the KCTMO and their appointed Contract Rydon	10/10/2016	FORT00739392	RBK00002727

26	Attachment to LJ/25. Titled "Aduweru Oct 16." Response to email from GTLA.	10/10/2016	FORT00739393	RBK00002728
27	Email chain between Laura Johnson, Claire Wise, Robert Black, Jean Daintith, Brian Deans at LFB, Janice Wray, from 28 Sept 2010 to 30 Sept 2010. Subject: FW: Fire safety research article	30/09/2010	FORT02718535	RBK00026862
28	"Inclusive Needs"- Fire safety research article by Claire Wise	16/09/2010	FORT00072759	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18
29	Housing Revenue Account Business Plan 2017/18-2021/22	27/02/2017	FORT01483513	RBK00004664
30	Installation of Self-Closing Devices on Flat Entrance Doors - For Discussion	28/02/2017	FORT00181108	RBK00000988
31	Email from Janice Wray to Jean Tretheway and Laura Johnson. CC Robert Black and Sacha Jevans. Subject: Fire at Grenfell Tower	04/05/2010	FORT00776236,	RBK00002823
32	Email from Robert Black to Laura Johnson and Jean Daintith. Subject: FW: Fire Grenfell Tower	04/05/2010	FORT00215626	RBK00001144
33	Lakanal House inquest summary of findings, List of recommendations and actions arising from the Inquest, narrative verdict and letters from the Assistant Deputy Coroner, Her Honour Frances Kirkham CBE	Mar-13	FORT00332436	RBK00001553

34	Email from Laura Johnson to Cllr Feilding-Mellen and Cllr Marshall. Subject: FW: Two new guides for councillors about fire safety and knowtheplan	17/07/2014	FORT01041700	RBK00003314
35	Email from Laura Johnson to Robert Davies, LRB, CC Nicholas Holgate, Robert Black. Subject: Publication of Enforcement Notice- Hazlewood Tower	05/02/2016	FORT00162281	RBK00000903
36	Email from Barbara Matthews to Laura Johnson, CC Janice Wray. Subject: FW Adair and Hazlewood Enforcement Notices	22/06/2016	FORT00755830	RBK00002768
37	Letter from LFEPA to Janice Wray, Statutory Information Request, re. Adair Tower	06/07/2016	FORT00433341	RBK00001864
38	Adair Tower Enforcement- Update on LFB position as at July 2016, by Janice Wray	07/07/2016	FORT00433342	RBK00001865
39	Email from Amanda Johnson to Cllr Feilding-Mellen, CC Laura Johnson and Celia Caliskan. Subject: Update on Fire Brigade Investigation	28/07/2016	FORT00611373	RBK00002380
40	Report by the Director of Housing to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, "Live Issues Report by the Director of Housing."	16/11/2016	FORT00796237	Uploaded via Egress

41	Email chain between Laura Johnson, Amanda Johnson, Nicholas Holgate, Celia Caliskan. Subject: Fires arising from tumble driers	16/09/2016	FORT00185826	RBK00001011
42	Letter from LFB to Laura Johnson. Re: Tall Buildings- External Fire Spread	06/04/2017	FORT00791957	RBK00002860
43	Email chain between Robert Black, Laura Johnson, Barbara Matthews and Janice Wray, Hannah Lougher at LFB, between 6 April 2017 and 27 April 2017. Subject: Fwd: Letter from LFB-External Fire Spread	27/04/2017	FORT00614914	RBK00002385
44	Report by the Director of Housing to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, "Update on Fire at Trelick Tower on 19 April 2017."	04/05/2017	FORT00828455	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18
45	PDF of multiple documents- RBKC Management Board Agenda, RBKC Health and Safety Policy, Corporate Health and Safety 6 monthly Update Report, Management Board 2016-17 Mid-Year Vital Signs, RBKC Notice of Meeting	04/11/2016	FORT00489296	RBK00002038
46	LFB Deficiency Notice- Grenfell Tower	17/11/2016	FORT00832135	Disclosed to PI on 25.09.2017 but no URN
47	Minutes of Housing Policy Board	10/03/2016	FORT01169231	Uploaded via Egress



48	Email chain between Laura Johnson, Robert Black, Keith Mott, Sacha Jevans and the GTLA, between 27 June 2011 and 14 Nov 2011. Subject: RE: Lift Maintenance Agreement.	14/11/2011	FORT00422936	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18
49	Minutes of Meeting with Residents regarding KALC	18/07/2011	FORT00194585	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18
50	Email from GTLA to P Dunkerton at TMO, with many copied in. Subject: Explanation why improvement work to Grenfell Tower on the LWE hasn't started yet. [sic]	28/02/2013	FORT01262947	RBK00003901
51	Email from GTLA to Cllr Coleridge with many copied in. Subject: The Grenfell Tower Regeneration Project must start NOW in tandem with Kensington Academy Leisure Centre as promised.	10/03/2013	FORT01311438	RBK00003928
52	Minutes of meeting with Edward Daffarn, Cllrs Feilding-Mellen and Blakeman and Peter Maddison	19/07/2013	FORT01126322	RBK00003561
53	Petition from Residents of Grenfell Tower at Lancaster West Estate W11	16/07/2013	FORT00568914	RBK00002270
54	Email from GTLA to Cllr Feilding-Mellen, copied to many others. Subject: Grenfell Tower regeneration project MUST START NOW.	08/06/2014	FORT01034633	RBK00014597

55	Petition from Residents of Grenfell Tower at Lancaster West Estate W11	03/12/2015	FORT00178582	RBK00000975
56	Email from Laura Johnson to Cllrs Feilding-Mellen and Marshall, CC Amanda Johnson. Subject: FW: Petition presented at Council last night	07/12/2015	FORT01156185	RBK00000109
57	Email chain between Laura Johnson, Cllrs Feilding-Mellen, Marshall, Amanda Johnson, Peter Maddison, Robert Black, between 7 Dec 2015 and 9 Dec 2015. Subject: Petition presented at Council last night.	09/12/2015	FORT00502405	RBK00002078
58	Letter from Laura Johnson to Cllr Blakeman in response to petition	09/12/2015	FORT00502406	RBK00002079
59	Email chain between Cllr Blakeman to Cllr Marshall, CC Anne Wright and Jerome Treherne, BCC Laura Johnson between 18-19 Dec 2015. Subject: RE: Grenfell Tower Petition.	19/12/2015	FORT01235789	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18
60	Briefing note entitled "Grenfell Tower Refurbishment" by Peter Maddison	24/12/2015	FORT01094271	RBK00003490
61	Email chain between Laura Johnson, Amanda Johnson, Robert Black, Cllr Blakeman, Victoria Borwick, David Collins and others, between 15 Dec 2015 and 4 Jan 2016.	04/01/2016	FORT00023833	RBK00000116

	Subject: FW: Grenfell Tower Issues			
62	Email from Laura Johnson to Cllr Mackover, CC Cllr Marshall. Subject: FW: TMO Board and Scrutiny Committee	05/01/2016	FORT01229985	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18
63	Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee Minutes	06/01/2016	FORT00001940	RBK00000338
64	Grenfell Tower Board Review	16/03/2016	FORT01107184	RBK00003513
65	Report by the Director of Housing to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee, "Grenfell Tower Report by the Director of Housing."	11/05/2016	FORT00828473	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18
66	Email chain between Cllr Feilding-Mellen, David Collins, Blakeman, Laura Johnson, Edward Daffarn and others, between 14 May 2016 and 4 Oct 2016. Subject: Re. Following on from our meeting	04/10/2016	FORT01118604	RBK00003541
67	Email chain between Cllr Feilding-Mellen and Laura Johnson, forwarding David Collins email, between 6 September 2016 and 4 Oct 2016. Subject: Following on from our meeting	04/10/2016	FORT00294617	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18

68	Email chain between Peter Maddison and Laura Johnson, Cllr Feilding-Mellen, Sacha Jevans, between 22 Dec 2016 and 3 Jan 2017. Subject: FW: Trellick Tower- Further information requested.	03/01/2017	FORT00417475	RBK00001807
69	Email from GTLA to Cllrs Dent-Coad and Blakeman, CC many. Subject: Improvement work on existing smoke extraction and ventilation, system which links to the fire alarm, under the Grenfell Regeneration Project [sic]	02/01/2015	FORT01176874	RBK00003672
70	Email from Peter Maddison to Amanda Johnson, CC Laura Johnson, Celia Caliskan, Jon Morcom, Roger Keane, Robert Black, Sacha Jevans, Catherine Dack. Subject: RE: Improvement work on existing smoke extraction and ventilation, system which links to the fire alarm, under the Grenfell Regeneration Project [sic]	05/01/2015	FORT00025573	RBK00000096
71	Email chain between Laura Johnson and Cllr Feilding-Mellen, forwarding email from the GTLA on 29 Sept 2016. Subject: RE: Grenfell Tower refurbishment-mission accomplished by the KCTMO and	30/09/2016	FORT00318752	RBK00001494

	their appointed Contractor Rydon			
72	Email from Laura Johnson to Cllr Blakeman, CC Cllrs Coleridge, Paget-Brown, Feilding-Mellen, and Amanda Johnson. Subject: RE: Grenfell Tower refurbishment-mission accomplished by the KCTMO and their appointed Contract Rydon	30/09/2016	FORT00566561	RBK00002258
73	Email from Cllr Blakeman to the GTLa, copied to many others. Subject: RE: Grenfell Tower refurbishment-mission accomplished by the KCTMO and their appointed Contractor Rydon	04/10/2016	FORT01028461	RBK00003266
74	Email from Laura Johnson to Cllr Feilding-Mellen forwarding an email chain. Subject line: "FW: Loss of water at GT and Power Surge."	13/05/2013	FORT01183302	RBK00003684
75	Email chain between Laura Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen. Subject line: "Grenfell Tower update." Forwards email from Thea McNaught Reynolds at the TMO.	03/06/2013	FORT01129932	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18
76	Attachment to LJ/75, email from Laura Johnson to Cllr Feilding-Mellen. "Grenfell tower power surge RBKC Briefing-31 May."	31/05/2013	FORT01129933	Disclosed to PI on 31.10.18

77	Email chain between Cllr Blakeman, Robert Black, Peter Maddison, Laura Johnson and Rock Feilding-Mellen, dated between 16 June 2013 to 21 June 2013. Subject line: "Grenfell Tower."	21/06/2013	FORT00036670	RBK00001126
78	Response to petition by Laura Johnson addressed to Cllr Blakeman.	28/08/2013	FORT02119683	RBK00013839