

## STATEMENT OF WITNESS

*(Criminal Procedure Rules, r.27.2;*

*Criminal Justice Act 1967, s.9, Magistrates' Courts Act 1980, s.5B)*

**Statement of: Nicola Donnelly**

**Age of witness: over 18**

**Occupation: Resident Liaison Officer Manager**

This statement, consisting of 2 pages signed by me, is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

1. I am making this statement in response to a request for written evidence in relation to Phase 2 of the Grenfell Tower Inquiry.
2. I am a Resident Liaison Officer ("RLO") Manager for Rydon Group Limited ("Rydon"). I joined Rydon in 2003 as a management trainee based in Islington. Once my training finished I then became a Resident Liaison Officer. After a period of time my then manager went on maternity leave and I stepped into her role; when my manager did not return from maternity leave I remained the RLO manager.
3. At the time of the Grenfell Tower Refurbishment Project ("the Project") I had twelve RLOs reporting to me including Kim Davies as Assistant RLO Manager, and Linda Padden as Lead RLO. In addition to the Project I was also involved on four or five other refurbishment and construction projects.
4. In my role I would manage the RLOs on the sites and ensure they were providing customer service to the communities they were working in, that they were communicating effectively and, in respect of the Project that they were liaising with Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation ("the Client") over what they wanted us to do. The contacts at the Client were Claire Williams and Siobhan Rumble.
5. There was a monthly project team meeting whereby the RLOs, Site Manager, Project Manager and the Client would attend. During these meetings discussions were had about various things such as the project's progress, any open complaints, resident colour choices, and dates for resident drop-in meetings that would be required in the coming weeks. I attended these meetings if the RLOs were away from the site and depending on where the Project was up to – the meetings were not as important towards the end of the Project as most decisions had been taken by the Client by then.
6. My role dealt mainly with the internal works; in respect of the external works my role would be to pass information received from others on to residents regarding timescales, any site plant or machinery that would be arriving on site, whether there would be any access changes to and from the site office. This information would be provided to me and would be communicated to the residents in letters or the newsletter. My role ended on the Project when Rydon finished on site, this was around June 2016.
7. For each property on the Project the RLO team visited it in order to carry out a condition survey to identify the condition of the areas that were to be worked in before those works commenced. The survey covered the residents and Rydon regarding any damage caused by the works but it also allowed us to introduce ourselves to the residents and to provide hints and tips to them regarding coping whilst the works were taking place in their home.

Signed



Dated

10-1-2020

8. I cannot recall whether the RLO team prepared a resident profiling form. If there was one it would have included details such as contact details for the resident, details of the residents' first language, any translation needs and/or specific requirements, secondary contact details for a family member or carer.
9. A newsletter was prepared for residents which provided contact details for the RLO, this was to give comfort to the residents that they had someone to ring if they had an issue or a query, a first point of contact during the refurbishment works. Any literature that was to be sent out to residents was approved by the Client before issuing.
10. The RLO was the first point of contact for the residents regarding the Project works; however any queries that came up which were outside of the Project were passed to the Client. Often because Rydon had an on-site presence residents would contact us about other matters such as rent or housing matter issues. We would also pass these queries on to the Client.
11. The RLO team also had in place a complaints log and a daily communications log which showed whether a complaint had been dealt with and if so, by who. I would say the majority of complaints were recorded. Under Key Performance Indicators, Rydon had a certain amount of days to respond to a complaint so details of complaints would be provided to Claire Williams at the Client immediately by email or phone. The complaints log was also shared with the Client during meetings with Claire.
12. I do not recall any complaints about the cladding or AOV and I do not believe that Rydon was responsible for the fire doors or any sprinklers. Residents were concerned about the location of the HIU and that it may be installed near the front door or in the kitchen and so there were lots of discussions about that and the RLOs spoke to the residents about this. There were also concerns regarding noise from the works.
13. There was not a specific system for fire safety related concerns, however, if residents had concerns about the refurbishment works that Rydon were carrying out then there was a Freephone number the residents could contact the RLO on. There was also a contact email address and a site office the residents could visit; Rydon operated an open door policy.
14. The Clerks of Work were involved in the Project at the end once the works had been completed; I am not aware of any specific issues raised with them. The RLOs arranged appointments with the residents for the Clerk of Works to attend to review the works inside the flats; the RLOs acted as a buffer between the residents and the Clerk of Works so that the residents felt comfortable with their attendance.

Signed

Dated



10-1-2020