

THE GRENFELL TOWER INQUIRY

WITNESS STATEMENT OF

CLAIRE WISE

I, CLAIRE WISE c/o Kensington Town Hall, Hornton St, Kensington, London W8 7NX, WILL SAY:

1. I make this Witness Statement further to receipt of the Rule 9 letter from the Public Inquiry dated 21 July 2020 and to provide assistance to the Public Inquiry. I am able to assist the Inquiry with questions 4 to 6 of the letter. I have set out my general understanding in respect of those issues below, followed by a section where I have tried to answer the specific questions asked.
2. The matters contained in this statement are either known to me or, are ones which I believe to be true (in which case I have specifically said so) or are derived from records including computer records maintained by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea ("the Borough," "the Council", "RBKC") with which I have been provided to assist the preparation of this statement and with which I am familiar and which I believe to be accurate.
3. I attach to this witness statement an index of exhibits to which I refer within this statement.

Background

4. I joined RBKC in 2007. When I started with the Council, I was employed as an Occupational Therapist (OT). In this role, I was responsible for undertaking access surveys of RBKC's stock so as to enable the introduction of the Greater London Authorities' Accessible Housing Register ("**AHR**"), which had been adopted by RBKC. From 2009 to 2011, I was technically employed by RBKC but seconded to a project funded by the DCLG / Greater London Authority ("**GLA**") working on a project that was trying to get other London boroughs to adopt the AHR. The project was hosted by RBKC.

5. Between 2011 and when [REDACTED] in April 2013, I worked on older people's housing, access surveys of sheltered housing and led on the accessible housing pilot at RBKC. During the period from 2007 to 2013 my line manager was initially Jo Whitehouse between 2007-2009, then Pam Sedgwick in 2009 and then Amanda Johnson. Upon my return [REDACTED] in April 2014, I moved to sit in the Housing Regeneration team and my line manager was Ruth Angel and subsequently Martin Miah. My role was focussed on older people's housing, regeneration and projects.
6. Prior to my resignation from RBKC in July 2020, I worked supporting the Council's Grenfell recovery effort for nine months and then worked to support the implementation of new homelessness duties within RBKC Housing Needs under Amanda Gill. I was Head of Homelessness at the time of my resignation from RBKC.

Academic Research

7. I did a Masters course in 2010 in which I undertook academic research into accessibility and inclusive design. The research paper was intended to consider aspects of accessible and inclusive housing design, asking "*how safe are disabled people living in flats in tall buildings?*". My research was based on interviews with fire safety professionals and questionnaire responses from organisations representing disabled people. It exposed some real discrepancies in terms of what people were advised to do in the case of a fire and what people actually did. A summary of the research was published in an article called "Inclusive needs" which I exhibit as CW1. The academic study highlighted the need for further research. I attempted to progress this by speaking with members from the London region Access Association in respect of the accessibility and fire safety in high rise buildings. However, I did not complete this particular project owing to the lack of funding for further research.

Accessible Housing Register

8. The AHR was initially adopted by two London Councils, RBKC and Tower Hamlets, further to guidance issued by the GLA. The AHR was designed to provide sufficient information to both Councils and residents as to the

accessibility of the Council's housing stock. Between 2007-2009, a survey was carried out by RBKC to assess social housing properties and categorise them, from an accessibility perspective, from between A (fully wheelchair accessible) to F ("general needs" - meaning it did not meet accessible housing design standards). This survey included the TMO stock, as well as all of the other social housing in RBKC which was managed by other Registered Social Providers. These categorisations were then included on each property advert on Choice Based Lettings, which is the programme social housing applications in RBKC use to choose a property. Before we undertook this work, applicants could not see whether a property was appropriately accessible for their needs on Choice Based Lettings.

9. After I had completed the categorisation of social housing in RBKC, from July 2009 to July 2011, I was seconded to a project funded by the DCLG/GLA, encouraging other London Councils to adopt the AHR scheme because of the benefits it could provide to the local authorities and their tenants. Only very few other Councils adopted the scheme.
10. It is important to note that RBKC had very few Category A or Category B properties within its Housing Stock, I recall there only being two at that time so offering step free properties (Category C-E+) were the best properties RBKC could offer. A document explaining Categories C-E+ is exhibited at CW2. Category C properties are what is known as "Lifetime Homes", these would meet the space standards of Lifetime Homes developed by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the main features include a step-free entrance and wider doorways and corridors. Category D properties would be "easy access properties", these are compatible with design standards in Mobility Standard Housing (1974) and Part M of the Building Regulations 2000, the key features are a step-free entrance with wider doorways and corridors than general needs housing.
11. Category E properties do not meet any published design standard and would be general needs housing with no steps to enter the property, there would be elements that made them unsuitable for wheelchair users such as a small turning circle or a narrow internal corridor. Category E+ properties were an

RBKC designation. These properties were not step-free and may have up to six steps to access the property; or internal steps; or a change in floor level within the property. These kinds of issues that would make a property either Category E or E+ are prevalent in older properties of which there is a significant amount in RBKC's stock.

12. The AHR was ultimately about enabling choice – it was designed to provide tenants with the information they needed to decide whether or not a property was suitable for them from an access perspective. The AHR was not designed to consider egress from a building in the event of a fire. We did not consider egress from a building when assigning a property with an AHR category.
13. The results from the AHR surveys were uploaded onto the Council's website and property adverts. However, we found that this additional information was not affecting how properties were being bid for. Those who needed accessible homes most were not, for whatever reason, bidding for them.
14. To attempt to help solve this problem, RBKC initiated a pilot scheme with a view to ensuring that accessible properties were allocated to those residents who most needed them, by providing additional support. A document titled "Accessible Housing Lettings & Adaptions – Pilot Programme", prepared by me and dated 19 June 2012 is exhibited to this statement at CW3. I also produced a document called "*Demand for Accessible Housing & Lettings Activity*" which sat behind the report. I exhibit this as CW4. The 19 June 2012 document is a draft version of the report detailing why the pilot scheme was initiated and what it set out to achieve. The pilot scheme was intended to enable direct offers of accessible properties to those who needed them and were at the top of the rehousing register due to their needs, as determined under the RBKC Housing Allocation Scheme. The 19 June 2012 report essentially kick-started the pilot programme and set out the issues the pilot intended to address. At the time this document was produced, we were aware of the number and nature of the accessible properties and we were also aware of residents who needed them. I believe that the 19 June 2012 was a draft report and, following input from others, was finalised on 20 July 2012. The finalised version is exhibited as CW5.

15. I recall discussing with operational staff some of the issues with the delivery of the pilot in a summary review meeting on 21 August 2012. The minutes are exhibited to this statement at CW6. As with any new scheme, there were always going to be issues which we tried to resolve as the pilot programme progressed.
16. We provided an update to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee ("HPSC") in September 2012. The update, which is exhibited to this statement at CW7, detailed the nature of the pilot and what it intended to achieve. Preparing this update report for HPSC was not mandatory but it was a good opportunity to showcase the positive work from our department and how we were improving the service to our residents.
17. We carried out a mid-point review of the pilot programme in November 2012, the review document is exhibited at CW8. The mid-point review gave us an opportunity to take stock of what the pilot had achieved as at that date. In particular, we noticed that despite the direct offer scheme, a significant number of accessible housing properties were still being refused by residents for whom they were most suitable. We decided that if the residents at the top of the list rejected two direct offers of accessible properties then they would not be made a further direct offer for 12 months. This would enable us to make direct offers to people further down the list who had fewer points under the RBKC Allocation Scheme. However, being removed from the pilot for 12 months did not preclude those at the top of the list from bidding on the properties via the Choice Based Lettings scheme. I should add that being included in the pilot scheme also did not prevent housing applications from bidding on Choice Based Lettings, that option always remained available to them.
18. CW9 is a document dated January 2013 called "*Accessible Housing Lettings Pilot amended procedure note*". As is usual with new projects, following the November 2012 review, we decided to make some changes to the procedure adopted in the pilot programme. These notes reflect that amended procedure.
19. I do not recall if there was ever an end of scheme review of the pilot programme as I would have been on [REDACTED] by this stage. There often would be on projects like this, but I do not know if any such analysis was done. I understand that officers who still work at the Council have looked for an end of

scheme assessment and have not been able to find one. I do know that the outcome of the pilot programme was that RBKC's Rehousing Plan and then Allocation Scheme were changed to incorporate direct offers of accommodation to those with accessibility needs.

20. Because the pilot programme was only introduced in the summer of 2012, it would only have been applicable to residents who moved into Grenfell Tower after this date and then, only if they had accessibility requirements. I understand that Robert Shaw is providing a statement to the Inquiry which covers whether any of the residents at Grenfell Tower were placed there under the pilot programme.
21. I have been shown RBK00050821, which is a handover note I prepared [REDACTED] in April 2013. The handover note was intended to bring my colleagues up to speed with the pilot programme. The "enhanced support services" referred to in my handover note meant receiving a direct offer of an accessible property as part of the pilot scheme, as well as accompanied viewings of a property with a Housing Occupational Therapist and, in some cases, financial assistance with moving properties.

Choice Based Lettings

22. Choice Based Lettings was the online programme that RBKC used to enable those on the housing register to bid for properties.
23. From what I can recall, the Council tended not to intervene if a resident bid on a property on Choice Based Lettings which we did not feel to be entirely suitable for their needs. Rather, Occupational Therapists would make recommendations to support decisions. However, in extreme cases we would do so, for instance if there was a wheelchair user who had bid on a property with internal steps.
24. I am not aware if the Housing department ever had a fixed policy as to the maximum floor level on which a wheelchair user, or person with other accessibility needs, might be allowed to bid for a property on Choice Based Lettings. I do recall a discussion as to whether properties above the fourth floor were suitable for wheelchair users, but we were not able to find guidance or research relating to a maximum floor level. I do not know whether the Council

settled on a position relating to the placement of wheelchair users or persons with other accessibility needs above a certain floor level.

Access audits

25. Access audits are quite distinct from the AHR surveys and they were always carried out by the TMO or other Registered Social Providers during my time with RBKC. They are made in compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 ("**DDA**") (which was repealed in full by the Equality Act 2010) and are undertaken on residential and commercial buildings to ascertain accessibility.
26. My understanding is that under the DDA, it was unlawful for a provider of services to discriminate against a disabled person (including in respect of access to and use of any place which members of the public are permitted to enter) and that the duty lay with the provider of services. My understanding is that in respect of RBKC's housing stock, this duty was with the TMO as managing agents. My understanding is that under the Equality Act 2010, the duty remained on the TMO. The predominant difference between access audits and the AHR surveys is that access audits are about the building as a whole whereas the AHR survey was about determining a specific accessibility category for each property within a building.
27. The AHR considered physical features of properties and communal areas with the specific purpose to inform disabled people when considering bidding for homes on Choice Based Lettings. By contrast, access audits are designed to assess the overall accessibility of buildings. The latter will often include physical features such as steps, ramps and door widths, as well as sensory features such as lighting, acoustics and tonal contrast. Access audits are designed to inform building managers on whether improvements are needed to resolve features that may be barriers for disabled people.
28. As far as I can recall, access audits were carried out by the TMO on the Council's housing stock, including Grenfell Tower. I am not sure if this obligation was set out in the Modular Management Agreement but I am aware that the TMO commissioned consultants (Pellings) to undertake access audits of the TMO stock and to make recommendations in respect of works that could assist

disabled people in accessing buildings and recommendations for reasonable adjustments that could be made, pursuant to the DDA. The report was commissioned before I joined the Council but I was sent it as part of my work in respect of the AHR. I exhibit the report as CW10 and will refer to it as the "Pellings Report". I note that in the Background section on page 1, the Pellings Report sets out the requirements of the DDA, namely that *"there has been a duty that requires a service provider to make reasonable adjustments to the physical features of premises to overcome physical barriers to access"*. I also note that the survey benchmarks that were used were BS 8300 and Approved Document M (page 6).

29. Ultimately, the Pellings Report recommended that the TMO carry out over £30million of work. However, it also identified that 75% of all of the actions recommended were not required by the DDA because they related to housing/residential blocks and elements of the TMO stock where access was controlled and therefore, public access was not available. The DDA only applies to public access to buildings. The report stated that "essential" work amounted to £2 million.
30. I recall receiving the report in 2009 and reviewing the works that were recommended. I was aware that the TMO had a limited budget for DDA works. From an email chain that includes an email I sent on 23 March 2009 (which I exhibit as CW11, I have been reminded that the TMO's budget was £900,000 which was considerably lower than the cost of the works Pellings were recommending. I reviewed the report and offered a recommendation as to which works the TMO may want to carry out first. I do not recall what happened after I sent that email and cannot assist with what works the TMO carried out.
31. In terms of a specific audit of Grenfell Tower, I can see that Grenfell Tower is listed on page 23 of the report and therefore assume that it was within scope of the access audits carried out by Pellings on behalf of the TMO. At page 94 of the report, I can see that there were costings provided for works at Grenfell Tower. The report does not appear to include the Grenfell Tower access audit itself. I do not know whether the TMO or Pellings would be able to provide this

to the Inquiry. I do not know whether any of the recommended works for Grenfell Tower were carried out.

32. The handover note that I refer to at paragraph 21 above, included a document called "Access audit checklist Residential Communal Areas" which I exhibit to this statement as exhibit CW/12. This was a document which was produced by RBKC in 2012 to assist housing and other service providers in the borough to identify areas for improvement of communal areas. This was created as the AHR project identified that the accessibility of a number of homes could be improved by cost-effective adaptations to communal areas. It was not designed to serve as a full access audit form for social housing landlords.
33. I have also been shown a copy of a RIBA document called the "Access Audit Handbook" [RBK00045171]. This is not a document I recall seeing before.

Grenfell Tower

34. As part of my role as a Housing OT, I would undertake Access Appraisals where new social housing was being created. I undertook an Access Appraisal of the new residential units proposed as part of the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower which I discuss below.
35. Access Appraisals are distinct from access audits under the DDA / Equality Act. Access Appraisals would be advice from our team to the Planning department, or contractors, on how accessible properties could be included in a project. This role was previously undertaken by a specific access officer who would have sat in the planning service of each local authority, however, following the cuts to local government funding most local authorities were unable to retain this role and instead, at RBKC, the work relating to social housing appraisals passed to the OT Team. As an OT team, we did not carry out Access Appraisals on existing buildings – it would be for proposed new build social housing only. These dealt with designs under Part M of the Building Regulations and applied principles from Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing Design Guide publications. Fire safety was dealt with separately.
36. I have considered a 2018 edition of the Wheelchair Housing Design Guide. I note that even post-Grenfell, I could only find a single reference in respect of

egress from the building which discusses the idea that wheelchair users may not feel safe on the ground floor and may prefer to live on upper levels. In these circumstances, consideration should be given to emergency egress. However, there was no other guidance of which I was aware which covered means of escape being covered as part of an Access Appraisal.

37. I recall doing an Access Appraisal for Grenfell Tower in respect of the new properties only. The background to this was that I received an email from Paul Dunkerton at the TMO on 11 September 2012 attaching the existing floor plans for Grenfell Tower which I exhibit as CW/13. I followed this up with a request for the proposed floor plans which Paul Dunkerton sent them to me that day. I exhibit this email chain as CW/14. The floor plan itself is exhibited as CW/15. On 8 November, I emailed Paul Dunkerton asking about the different floor levels at Grenfell Tower, which he clarified. I then sent him the Accessibility Appraisal. I exhibit these emails as CW/16. In this instance, I communicated directly with the TMO, as we were in the process of trying to maximise the number of accessible properties given the Council's shortage of accessible housing. I therefore provided advice directly to the TMO on this occasion. However, on other access appraisals the request may have come from the RBKC Planning department. As can be seen from the correspondence, I was considering whether the designs of the properties were fully wheelchair accessible or were of a lower standard than that.
38. Jane Tretheway also emailed Paul Dunkerton and me on 8 November 2012. In response, I provided some more information about how the TMO could achieve wheelchair accessibility on two of the units. I exhibit these emails as CW/17. I also sent this email chain to Bruce Sounes at Studio E on 9 November 2012 and exhibit my email as CW/18. I cannot recall why I sent this directly to Bruce Sounes. For completeness, I was also copied into an email from Stanley Logan as he raised some potential issues ahead of the planning application which I exhibit as CW/19 but I do not recall responding to this.
39. Bruce Sounes replied to my email on 20 November 2012 attaching a feasibility study of a wheelchair accessible unit at Grenfell Tower. I exhibit his email as CW/20 and the attachment as CW/21. I responded on 22 November 2012

thanking Bruce for revising the plans to create a wheelchair accessible unit at Grenfell Tower. I confirmed that RBKC would welcome a three-bedroom unit on the Walkway+1 Level (which became the Third Floor) and a two-bedroom unit on the Mezzanine level (which became the First Floor). I exhibit the email as CW/22.

40. I then received an email from Paul Dunkerton on 26 November 2012 which attached revised floor plans showing a one-bedroom flat on the Mezzanine level and a three-bedroom flat on the Walkway+1 level. I exhibit the email and attachments as CW/23. I reviewed the drawings and contacted Jane Tretheway at RBKC to check that she was happy with the reduction in bedroom numbers, which she confirmed she was. I exhibit that email as CW/24. I then responded to Paul Dunkerton confirming that the wheelchair units looked fine and I made some further suggestions about the flats' layout. I exhibit my email as CW/25. Paul Dunkerton replied on 3 December 2012 thanking me for my email and passing my comments to the design team. I exhibit his email as CW26. After Paul Dunkerton's email of 30 November 2012, I do not recall receiving any further feedback on my comments. As stated earlier, I went on [REDACTED] in 2013 and do not recall commenting on the Grenfell Tower scheme again. When additional new flats were planned in 2014, I do not recall making any further comments although that is not to say I definitely did not. I understand that the lawyers representing RBKC have undertaken a search on Relativity of my mailbox and cannot find any correspondence to suggest I commented on the project again after November 2012.
41. Prior to the refurbishment, the TMO managed flats at Grenfell Tower were Category E, Step-Free, as the document at CW27 demonstrates. Being involved in the early design of the new flats at Grenfell Tower meant that RBKC was able to ensure accessibility was considered as part of the planning process and that plans were made for two wheelchair accessible properties.

Questions from the Inquiry's Letter of 21 July 2020

42. By way of question 4, the Inquiry has asked:

"RBKC has disclosed to the Inquiry an Access Audit Handbook [RBK00045171/FORT003369700]. In relation to Access Audits:

- a. Please set out RBKC's policy in relation to Access Audits between 2012 to 14 June 2017 referring to relevant documents where necessary;*
- b. Were any access audits carried out by RBKC of its high rise housing stock between 2012 and 14 June 2017? If so please disclose relevant documents from such audits;*
- c. Were any Access Audits carried out by RBKC of Grenfell Tower between 2012 and 14 June 2017? If so please disclose relevant documents from such audits;*
- d. Please detail the steps RBKC took to ensure that the TMO carried out Access Audits where appropriate of its high rise housing stock between 2012 and 14 June 2017.*

43. My understanding as set out in paragraph 25 is that it was the TMO who had responsibility for carrying out Access Audits in respect of RBKC's Housing stock. As a result, my understanding is that RBKC did not undertake Access Audits of its stock and it follows that it did not undertake an Access Audit of Grenfell Tower in the period from 2012 to 14 June 2017.

44. I am aware that the TMO commissioned Pellings to undertake Access Audits of its stock in 2007 and I have exhibited the report that Pellings prepared to this statement.

45. I have discussed above the Access Appraisal I undertook in respect of Grenfell Tower in 2012. This was different from an Access Audit. An Access Audit would only consider the accessibility to the public of publicly accessible areas of a building. By contrast, the Access Appraisal that I undertook specifically considered access to and within the new flats that were proposed as part of the Grenfell scheme.

46. I cannot recall seeing RBK00045171, which is a RIBA document, before being shown it for the purposes of drafting this statement.

47. By way of question 5, the Inquiry has asked:

Page 30 of the Access Audit Handbook states:

The means and route of escape from a site or building in an emergency is equally important as the route of entry and should be fully considered in any audit. Issues to consider include the suitability and operation of alarm systems, the identification and accessibility of exit routes and evacuation procedures. There is likely also to be a link with building management and staff training issues.

a. Please detail the steps RBKC took to ensure that the means of escape from Grenfell Tower were fully considered in any audit carried out between 2012 to 14 June 2017.

48. As stated above, I do not recall that RBKC commissioned any Access Audit of Grenfell Tower between 2012 and 14 June 2017. I am unable to assist with whether Pellings were asked to consider the means of escape from Grenfell Tower, or other buildings, for the purposes of their 2007 Report which was commissioned by the TMO and not RBKC.

49. By way of question 6, the Inquiry has asked:

Access Audit checklists are referred to on page 4 of the Accessible Housing Handover notes dated 2 April 2013 [RBK00050821].

a. The notes refer to a pilot programme to provide enhanced support services to disabled people on the Common Housing Register with a high priority for housing on health and disability grounds and / or needing high cost adaptations. Please detail the “enhanced support services” envisaged by the programme and whether any such services were provided to Grenfell Tower residents or residents of any other high rise buildings within RBKC housing stock;

b. Please disclose relevant documentation in relation to the pilot programme including the end of project evaluations of the scheme or refer to relevant FORT numbers where such documents have already been disclosed to the Inquiry;

c. Please disclose the Access Audit checklist referred to at page 4 of the notes.

50. The “enhanced support services” envisaged were a direct offer of an accessible property, accompanied viewing with a Housing Occupational Therapist and, in some cases, financial assistance with moving. I understand that Robert Shaw is addressing the question of whether any Grenfell Tower residents were assisted through the pilot programme in his statement.
51. I exhibit a number of documents relating to the pilot programme to this statement and understand that the lawyers representing RBKC are reviewing my personal drives for any further relevant documents and will disclose the same. The Handover Notes referred to in the question were drafted by me when I handed the project over in April 2013 prior to going on [REDACTED] it follows that I did not have a role in the end of scheme assessment. I understand that officers who still work for RBKC have not been able to locate an end of scheme assessment document. I understand that RBKC’s Rehousing Scheme and Allocation Policy were ultimately changed to allow for direct offers of accessible housing to be made to households that required them.
52. The Access Audit checklist is exhibited as CW/12.

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

I believe that the facts stated in this Witness Statement are true.

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

Signed  Dated.....02/10/2020.....

Index of documents to the witness statement of Claire Wise

Number	Document	FORT/URN
CW1	Claire "Inclusive Needs" paper	RBK00030073
CW2	Document explaining Categories C–E+	FORT04953288
CW3	Draft Accessible Housing Letting & Adaptions – Pilot Programme dated 19 June 2020	FORT00073834
CW4	Demand for Accessible Housing & Lettings Activity report dated 19 June 2012	FORT00110216
CW5	Finalised Accessible Housing Lettings & Adaptions – Pilot Programme updated report dated 20 July 2012	FORT00141793
CW6	Minutes of pilot summary review meeting dated 21 August 2012	
CW7	Update to the Housing and Property Scrutiny Committee dated September 2012	FORT00096940
CW8	Pilot programme mid-point review dated November 2012	FORT00123127
CW9	Accessible Housing Lettings Pilot amended procedure note dated January 2013	FORT00072626
CW10	Pellings Report	FORT04953399
CW11	Email chain from March 2009 regarding budget for DDA works	FORT04531364
CW12	Access audit checklist Residential Communal Areas	FORT00080033
CW13	Existing floor plans for Grenfell Tower	RBK00026101 RBK00026102

		RBK00026103
CW14	Email chain between Claire Wise and Paul Dunkerton regarding proposed floor plans	RBK00026104
CW15	Proposed floor plans for Grenfell Tower.	RBK00026105
CW16	Email from Claire Wise to Paul Dunkerton attaching the Accessibility Appraisal	FORT02605504
CW17	Emails between Jane Tretheway, Claire Wise and Paul Dunkerton re wheelchair accessibility on two of the new units at Grenfell Tower	FORT00074708 FORT02721379
CW18	Email from Claire Wise to Bruce Soules at Studio E	FORT02711881
CW19	Email from Stanley Logan regarding the planning application	RBK00000330
CW20	Email from Bruce Soules attaching a feasibility study of a wheelchair accessible unit at Grenfell Tower	RBK00026110
CW21	Feasibility study of a wheelchair accessible unit at Grenfell Tower	RBK00026111
CW22	Email from Claire Wise to Bruce Soules dated 22 November 2012	FORT02740907
CW23	Email from Paul Dunkerton dated 26 November 2012 attaching revised floor plans + attachments	RBK00026112 RBK00050811 RBK00050812
CW24	Email from Jane Tretheway confirming her acceptance to the reduction in bedroom numbers	RBK00045717
CW25	Email from Claire Wise to Paul Dunkerton with further suggestions as to the layout of the flats	RBK00026115

CW26	Paul Dunkerton email dated 3 December 2012	RBK00045723
CW27	Spreadsheet showing the results of the AHR surveys for TMO properties.	FORT04952761