

## **IN A MATTER CONCERNING THE GRENFELL TOWER INQUIRY**

---

### **WITNESS STATEMENT OF CLAIRE WILLIAMS**

---

#### **Claire Williams states:**

- 1 I make this statement in response to a Rule 9 request letter dated 24 October 2018.
- 2 I was employed by Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) as Project Manager within the Asset and Regeneration Department. I commenced employment with TMO on 9 September 2013. I briefly transferred to RBKC under TUPE when the work of TMO was wound up but I left that employment after a short period with my last working day being 17 May 2018. I have never been a member of the TMO Board nor of its Executive Team. I received counselling after the fire and left my job before the first anniversary because of the further stress that would cause.
- 3 I was TMO's Project Manager for the Grenfell Tower refurbishment from September 2013 to Practical Completion in July 2016 and I had continuing involvement with the Tower after that date mostly dealing with queries from residents on how to operate the new equipment that had been installed.
- 4 My role as Project Manager was virtually a full-time job for 3½ years and it necessarily involved a significant amount of interaction with many individuals and organisations throughout each day. It also involved a significant amount of documentation and all relevant detail will be a matter of record that will be more reliable than my memory and ability to recall names, dates, times etc. I no longer have access to all relevant papers but before I left I did retain a selection of documents I thought might assist my recollections and I understand these have all been disclosed to the Inquiry.
- 5 Although my memory is good, I may not be able to remember every last detail during this period of my employment with TMO which will significantly be a matter of record.

I have therefore prepared this statement from analysis of documentation made available to me supplemented by my memory prompted by sight of that documentation. This I believe is the most helpful and reliable way of assisting the Public Inquiry without having to guess and speculate.

- 6 I personally knew many of the residents of Grenfell Tower who lost their lives in the tragic events of 14 June 2017 and I grieve along with their families and friends. Their tragic loss has affected me deeply.
- 7 In the days following the fire, I received a number of written and verbal threats in the form of emails and voicemails. I referred these to my managers and to the police but ultimately I chose not to take matters further.
- 8 In this statement, I have endeavoured to cover all issues identified by the Inquiry as helpfully as I can but where I have not dealt with some issues it is because those issues are not within my sphere of responsibility or knowledge.

### **Career Background**

- 9 My career started in 1978 within small private architectural practices and from 1983 to 1992, I worked within the housing departments of the London Borough of Haringey and London Borough of Camden. I worked for Circle Housing Trust Ltd from 1992 to 2002; Community Housing Association Ltd from 2002 to August 2007; Charles Church North London (Persimmon) from December 2007 to July 2008; and finally Circle Housing Group again from September 2008 prior to joining TMO.
- 10 I have a diploma in Maintenance Management and have worked all my career in housing for either local authorities or housing associations, concerned with maintenance, repairs and regeneration projects. I also worked on some new build and refurbishment works.
- 11 The job on offer at TMO was specific to the Grenfell refurbishment which had not commenced at that time but had been planned for several years prior to my joining. It was specifically identified to be a role that would benefit by my experience of liaison with residents during the refurbishment because of the challenges of carrying out the works with residents in situ. This was something I had a lot of experience of during my work elsewhere.

- 12 During my time as Project Manager with TMO, I believe I built up a good relationship with a majority of residents many of whom would ring, text or email me with their queries or concerns. I would regularly be stopped by someone calling my name when I was on site or in the area and I knew many residents by name and would talk to them over specific issues like works on their floor or within the property. I made myself available to residents and I would take the opportunity to talk to residents to check if there was a general complaint so that I could understand the individual or wider concerns over the issue, e.g. noisy works. I personally knew many of the residents who lost their lives in the tragic events of 14 June 2017.
- 13 I learned at the time of my appointment that there had previously been a problem in relation to electric power surges within Grenfell Tower and this had created a feeling of animosity towards TMO. Other than that, I knew little about Grenfell Tower at the time of my appointment but I knew that my appointment was predominantly to liaise with the residents at Grenfell Tower during the refurbishment and I was selected because of my experience in this regard.
- 14 Following my appointment, I took on other minor projects but Grenfell remained 70%-80% of my work.
- 15 In my role, I reported to David Gibson, the Head of Capital Investment until he retired in September 2016. David in turn reported to Peter Maddison, the Director of Assets and Regeneration. None of us was part of the Executive team. Peter reported to the Director of Operations, Sacha Jevans, who reported directly to the Chief Executive, Robert Black.

**1 and 2. Grenfell Tower's original design, construction and composition and subsequent modification prior to most recent**

- 16 My understanding is that Grenfell Tower was constructed in the 1970s and TMO came into existence 20 years later. As stated, I had no knowledge of Grenfell Tower prior to my joining TMO in 2013. I fully expected the construction to comply with all relevant legislation, regulations and guidance and I had no reason to believe that it did not. I am not aware of any later modifications prior to my joining TMO but again my expectation was that any modifications were compliant with relevant legislation, regulations and guidance and I had no reason to believe that they were not.

### **3 and 4. Modifications to the interior and exterior of the building between 2012 and 2016**

- 17 To assist the Inquiry I set out here in overview the issues identified by the Inquiry followed by a chronology of events relevant to those issues.
- 18 My role was to monitor the programme and budget for the TMO. It was largely a reporting function and my role was not to manage the contract. Professional consultants were employed for this. I fronted the scheme for residents as their TMO point of contact, liaising with residents and the Principal Contractor, Rydon, and others throughout the works.
- 19 My role was to keep residents informed and to liaise with them and to report to others within TMO and RBKC. My role was very specifically in relation to monitoring, liaison and facilitation.
- 20 The programme of works was set by the contractor and I had little personal control over it apart from ensuring that activities affecting residents had enough lead-in time for consultation and putting strategies into place. For example, when the steelwork sub-contractor went into liquidation, I could do nothing about the programme but report back on the proposal to ameliorate any delay. Also when the lift was taken out of service, it was my role to manage that situation with the residents by early notification and ensuring elderly and vulnerable residents were given access to 'estates services' for helping with shopping and so on. Also by way of example, I arranged for the residents to have free access to the leisure centre to use the washing facilities there for the short period of their connection onto the new boiler system.
- 21 Within the CDM Regulations 2007, TMO was the "Client". The Principal Contractor was Rydon and the CDM Co-ordinator was Mr Keith Bushell from Artelia, known as Appleyards in the earlier stages. Artelia were also the Contract Administrators and the Quantity Surveyor Costs Consultants as well as the CDM Co-ordinator.
- 22 This was a Design and Build contract, with all responsibilities for design and construction work being the responsibility of the Principal Contractor with warranties supplied to cover liabilities. As part of this arrangement Rydon were contractually responsible for

ensuring compliance with all legislation, regulation, standards and guidance and for receiving all necessary building regulations approvals.

23 TMO's role was to monitor and manage progress of the refurbishment work against budget to ensure delivery of the programme on behalf of RBKC, residents and leaseholders. Its role, together with contractors, was to liaise with residents in situ during the works.

24 The overall project for the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower included:

- Window replacement to replace single glazed steel windows with double glazed aluminium powder coated windows;
- Thermal external cladding involving a metal rain screen cladding over thermal insulation;
- A new entrance lobby;
- Communal decorations to internal lobbies and all newly created areas on the lower 3 floors;
- New communal heating system;
- Seven new flats (later nine) in the lower part of the Tower, referred to as "hidden homes";
- Temporary relocating out of the building the boxing club, nursery and housing office and the return of the boxing club and nursery to different newly created areas within Grenfell;
- Fire safety and ventilation works; and
- Environmental enhancements.

25 The combination of insulated cladding, new double-glazed windows, installation of new boilers and a new hot water system with individual Heat Interface Units (HIU) were all aimed at improving energy efficiency in the building at a time when the communal boilers were old. The existing communal heating system had experienced leaks and was getting to the end of its natural life having been installed in 1974 but with regular component renewals and overhauls since. The new system put in was to give individual residents control over their heating systems/energy and therefore their heating bills. This

individual control ability subsequently became a statutory obligation during the course of the works. Previously, residents had a non-adjustable standard delivery of heating and they paid a portion of the overall cost based on the size of their property rather than the usage. This led to such things as residents having windows open in winter as some of the flats could not turn off the system and there was no incentive to be economic with its use. This was not efficient use of thermal energy and was expensive for residents.

- 26 The professional consultants involved with preparations for the project were all appointed by RBKC prior to my involvement and as a consequence of their work on Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre (KALC) and were re-appointed by TMO for Grenfell Tower refurbishment having satisfied RBKC's procurement processes. Studio E were the lead consultant who worked with the other consultants to ensure a comprehensive specification was produced. Those professional consultants were Artelia as Contract Administrator, Costs Consultants (QS) and CDM Co-ordinator; Studio E as Architects; Max Fordham as Mechanical and Engineering Consultants; Curtins as Structural Engineers and IBI Taylor Young as Planning Consultants.
- 27 I am aware that before my involvement, the scheme costs were initially negotiated with contractor Leadbitter who were building the adjacent KALC and I understand it was considered that better value might be achieved by putting the scheme out to tender through the transparent and auditable mechanism of the Office of the Journal of European Union (OJEU) used for public procurement.
- 28 I am aware that the initial design work for the refurbishment had been carried out by Studio E Architects. I am also aware that the design was worked up over approximately two years before I joined TMO and it was substantially complete by the time of my appointment.
- 29 Artelia, Max Fordham, Curtins and Studio E had been appointed by RBKC for the KALC project and TMO continued with their services for the purpose of the Grenfell tender. Curtins and Studio E's contracts were subsequently engaged by Rydon upon their appointment.
- 30 Exova Warrington Fire were the fire engineer consultants, who were on board before my involvement. I am aware that they produced fire engineering reports to Studio E and I



understand they were engaged by Studio E to advise them with the tender specifications and specifically in relation to fire safety strategies but I do not know the detail of that.

- 31 Studio E were the CDM Principal Designer. Later, and following completion of the project, there was a change in the CDM Regulations in October 2015 that identified TMO as the Principal Designer. This was a month after the original practical completion date of 4 September 2015. TMO took on the role as there was no design element left within the contract and it was purely to fulfil the CDM requirement.
- 32 The Design and Build contract that was administered by Artelia on behalf of TMO meant that the cladding design and fitting was the responsibility of the Principal Contractor and their specialist designers and sub-contractors. Rydon were selected because of their experience and expertise in this regard having carried out many similar projects previously and under the terms of the Design and Build contract, they were tasked with ensuring that appropriate materials were being used and fitted. The TMO also had the comfort of knowing that this work would need to satisfy standards and regulations that the specialists would be conversant with.
- 33 The construction detail was interrogated by RBKC planners and Building Control who liaised with the Principal Contractor, their advisers and London Fire Brigade (LFB) to ensure all Building and Fire Safety requirements would be met.
- 34 TMO also engaged John Rowan and Partners as Clerk of Works to inspect the various works on site. This included inspection of workmanship and quality to ensure works were carried out as designed and to challenge Rydon when necessary if there were shortcomings. They also had a role to report on health and safety issues. This was an additional tier of inspection to ensure works were completed to a good standard to ensure the landlord's future maintenance risk was limited.
- 35 I personally had previous experience of project managing refurbishment works from a client/landlord perspective but I had no previous experience of works involving cladding.

### **Procurement**

- 36 Procurement was dealt with independently by Jenny Jackson, an external consultant, to oversee compliance with OJEU regulations with all assessments and recommendations

being made by Artelia the Contract Administrator and Costs Consultants. Jenny Jackson led the procurement process. She collated the paperwork and information and assessments provided by Artelia and presented them to the TMO Board with recommendations for a decision to be made. During the tendering process of September 2013 there were initially 17 responses to the OJEU Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) expressing initial interest in the tender.

- 37 I am aware that Artelia sent out invitations to 5 tenderers on 29 November 2013. I had marked some elements of the tenders but I had no involvement with the decision-making in relation to procurement.
- 38 Ultimately there were five tenderers for the project, namely Durkan, Rydon, Wates, Mullaley and Keepmoat. Jenny Jackson gave a PowerPoint presentation to the tenderers to identify what was required in the tender. In conjunction with Artelia, I conducted tours to show the five tenderers around Grenfell Tower so they could see for themselves the site constraints and the interior of the building to assist their proposals.
- 39 The tender criteria set fell into many categories and different people were involved in assessing appropriate sections. Residents were invited to take part in the tender review process. Nobody responded to the general requests for assistance and participation and so I personally contacted a number of people to invite them to participate and ultimately I persuaded two leaseholders, namely Pily Burton (Flat 165) (now sadly deceased) and Mr Barakat (Flat 92) to provide a view on behalf of residents and they assisted us when no-one else came forward. They were involved with and looked at the part of the tender concerned with the residents' consultation process and the participation with residents.
- 40 I believe RBKC were kept formally advised throughout the procurement process and advised of all issues.
- 41 I was aware that the Artelia tender report had recommended that Rydon be appointed to carry out the refurbishment work.
- 42 The Project team comprised the professional consultants to run the contract on behalf of TMO and provide the requisite technical information as well as the appointed contractor.



- 43 Rydon was the Principal Contractor responsible for all aspects of the Design and Build contract and experienced in carrying out the refurbishment works required including the fitting of cladding to high rise buildings.
- 44 Studio E were the architects for the scheme providing design advice and specifications and they liaised with the Borough Planning. They drew up the architectural specifications for the Tower refurbishment and were recommended by RBKC following their work on KALC.
- 45 Studio E had been involved with the scheme from early on, attending resident consultation sessions as the scheme was put together. They were tasked with providing information for the scheme to achieve planning approval. My understanding was that the basis for the building contract was planning permission was required to be in place to allow the scheme to be 'firmed up' in terms of work content and to ensure the scheme could be costed. The contractor's role under the Design and Build contract would then be to take on the responsibility for achieving Building Control approval particularly as so much of the works were specialist and needed detailed designs e.g. M&E and cladding.
- 46 Studio E were novated to Rydon when the project went on site to ensure design continuity.
- 47 IBI Taylor Young are planning consultants who were initially appointed by RBKC in relation to KALC. They facilitated discussions with the Borough Planners to understand the requirements of planning permission and to liaise with all concerned, particularly Studio E, to facilitate those requirements.
- 48 Artelia were initially engaged by RBKC to manage the KALC project and it was considered sensible and expeditious for them to continue with the Grenfell Tower refurbishment on behalf of TMO. They had a good track record of robust contract management on the adjacent KALC scheme and were aware of site constraints and involved parties. Their role was that of Contract Administrator, Costs Consultant (QS) and CDM Co-ordinator and as such they were required to manage the contract on behalf of TMO, advise on the specifications in terms of CDM and understand the costs involved and provide regular reporting on programme and costs.

- 49 As the CDM Co-ordinator, they were required to check the information and comment on any concerns before going to tender.
- 50 As the Contract Administrator, their role was to manage the contract, alert the TMO, as client, of any cost or programme issues that would impact positively or negatively on the project.
- 51 Artelia as Costs Consultants provided a monthly cost report with commentary to fulfil this requirement. These reports provided financial information i.e. anticipated and actual costs as well as a graph showing actual progress against the contractor's programme.
- 52 Curtins were the structural engineering consultants again originally engaged by RBKC on KALC but their contract was ultimately novated to Rydon and their role as structural engineers was principally to check the suitability of the structure for accommodating cladding and its fixings and formulating the structural specification. They would have been involved with Rydon in presenting information to Building Control in terms of the structure itself. They also worked with Rydon in relation to steel works and penetrations to the building structure.
- 53 Max Fordham are service engineers who dealt with mechanical and engineering aspects. Like others, they were originally engaged by RBKC to work on the KALC project and they continued on Grenfell and were subsequently contracted by TMO to write the performance specifications relevant to mechanical engineering and to approve contractors' proposals for completion of those works which principally related to the heating specifications, e.g. boiler, water flow, water temperature but also to deal with ventilation, via the smoke dispersal system. They also dealt with the specifications on the new areas/flats to deal with such matters as sockets, radiators, lighting levels etc.
- 54 Exova Warrington Fire are fire engineers. Their appointment and role in relation to the project is not clear. As far as I knew Exova were Fire Strategy advisers to Studio E but may also have provided advice to Rydon.
- 55 TMO engaged John Rowan and Partners as Clerk of Works to inspect the works on site. This included inspection of workmanship and quality to ensure works were carried out

as designed and to challenge Rydon when necessary if there were shortcomings. They also had a role to report on health and safety issues.

- 56 Their inspectors were Jon White and Tony Batty. Jon White dealt with general building and cladding whilst Tony was a sub-contractor of John Rowan and Partners and he dealt with the M&E side of inspections. They attended site routinely and typically once a week but often 2 or 3 times a week depending on site activities. Their role included the provision of reports to inform TMO and the project team of progress against the program of works and any issues arising which they did via regular (usually weekly) Site Inspection Reports.
- 57 Details of some of Rydon's sub-contractors would have been recorded via the Monthly Progress meeting minutes. I was aware that Harley were the cladding and window sub-contractor, and JS Wright were the M&E sub-contractor. I had no contact with the former until after the works were completed when I wanted to get a quote for cladding to tidy up the adjacent garages, and to obtain additional window ironmongery where a resident had accidentally damaged a window (i.e. outside the contract). I dealt with JS Wright more regularly as their work involved entering residents' homes and I had to facilitate access. I have limited knowledge of any other sub-contractors. TMO were not invited to Rydon's subcontractor meetings.
- 58 TMO is a "paperless" organisation. Most of the agendas and minutes for these meetings were generated electronically and distributed by email. However many were also arranged "back to back" and for which agenda and minutes were provided in hard copy only. These agenda, minutes and supporting documents should have been provided electronically and/or scanned to the system but may not always have been.
- 59 The Design Review Meetings, which were held prior to tender, had been operating for some time prior to my joining TMO and I attended these meetings on 08/10/13, 22/10/13 and 5/11/13 shortly after joining TMO.
- 60 This forum was chaired by Artelia who produced the minutes, and was attended by TMO, Max Fordham, Studio E, Curtins and Artelia as necessary.

- 61 This forum did not always consider the detailed design specifications but it did consider the overall concept of what was planned for the refurbishment in order to ready for tender. This forum was useful for me to get to know what was likely to be involved in the scheme. The last of these meeting was on 5 November 2013 and this forum ceased when the contract was put out to tender when design issues were to be taken forward by the successful tenderer.
- 62 When Rydon were appointed Principal Contractor, Monthly Progress Meetings were organised, chaired and minuted by Artelia and attended by Artelia, Rydon, TMO, Consultants, Clerk of Works and others as necessary e.g. RBKC or housing management representatives. These meetings held monthly were for Rydon and Artelia to formally advise/ update on the scheme status and any issues arising. Rydon prepared and circulated their Progress Reports prior to this meeting.
- 63 TMO/Rydon Liaison Meetings were held regularly during the period June to late 2014 and as necessary subsequently. They were an opportunity for TMO and Rydon to formally discuss issues impacting upon residents and such matters as identifying hoarders and the needs of vulnerable tenants during the refurbishment works. Rydon's Resident Liaison Officers (RLOs) and site managers would attend these meetings with TMO's neighbourhood management and myself.
- 64 Grenfell Project Team meetings were attended by representatives of TMO and this was a cross-department forum attended by representatives of the Capital Investment Team, Housing Management, Community Engagement to discuss the priorities, identify obstructions/blockages, risks and to offer/suggest ideas and solutions to improve the service.
- 65 The Capital Investment Team Meeting, which was also known as the Capital Programme Team Meeting, was a TMO only forum not specific to Grenfell attended by various members of David Gibson's team in order to exchange notes and to ensure that all capital investment projects and other matters were being co-ordinated across the Team without duplication.
- 66 In its capacity as Client, TMO was not involved in executing the refurbishment works but it received regular reports relevant to progress and costs.

- 67 Artelia produced monthly financial statements and commentary in relation to their contract management role showing valuations and payments. Rydon produced Progress Reports to report the progress of their works ahead of the monthly progress meetings and John Rowan and Partners produced Works Progress Reports and Site Inspection Reports in their capacity as Clerk of Works. These latter reports were specifically to report upon their regular site inspections in order to report on progress and the quality of Rydon's works. These reports were usually weekly and were signed off by Jon White of that firm and presented by both Jon White and/or Tony Batty. Their reports helpfully included photographs identifying the progress and other matters referred to within to inform TMO
- 68 Formal planning applications relevant to cladding were prepared and presented to the RBKC Planning Department by IBI Taylor Young on behalf of TMO and they arranged pre-application meetings with the Planning Department of RBKC at which representatives of Studio E and IBI Taylor Young met with RBKC's Planning Department to consider in particular matters relevant to the cladding.
- 69 I am aware that planning submissions were presented prior to my engagement and ultimately planning permission was granted by RBKC on 10 January 2014. This permission was in relatively standard form and referred to numerous drawings which had been prepared by Studio E.
- 70 The permission was conditional upon matters such as detailed drawings or samples of materials being submitted for approval by the local planning authority before the relevant part of the work was begun. It was specified that the material to be used on the external faces of the buildings was to accord with the development plan by ensuring that the character and appearance of the area was preserved and living conditions of those living near the development suitably protected. Similar conditions were specified in relation to the windows and doors to ensure the appearance of the development was satisfactory and to safeguard the amenity of the area. This planning permission was sent to me by IBI Taylor Young on 13 January 2014.

**Thermal external cladding involving a metal rain screen cladding over thermal insulation;**

- 71 Specifically in relation to cladding, I have never, throughout my career, had any involvement or technical understanding of cladding work. This is specialist work and I

have limited knowledge of the materials involved and limited knowledge of how they were intended to be installed. I had no involvement with any details of how Rydon conducted the work. This was a Design and Build contract for Rydon to comply with design specifications set by Studio E and to comply with all legislation, building regulations, guidance and industry practice and to obtain Building Control approval. TMO engaged Clerk of Works to inspect and check quality of work and progress, and to bring issues to the attention of TMO and Rydon.

- 72 TMO was itself not in a position to judge compliance with legislation, building regulations, guidance and industry practice and so it engaged professionals to advise on these issues.
- 73 During meetings I heard the cladding material being referred to as being “Class O” (letter O). I did not know what that meant but from my understanding of “Class O” applying to paint finishes in communal areas, I had understood this to mean that it was flame retardant. I did not involve myself in this detail because the technical specification was contained in the Architect’s section of this Design and Build contract with a specification that all relevant building and fire regulations would be met.
- 74 In very general terms, my understanding was that the cladding was to be fitted on or within a framework bolted to the exterior of the building. The new windows were fitted into the new framework and initially were installed additional to the existing single glazed windows which were then removed following installation of the double glazed replacements.
- 75 I played no part in relation to technical decisions concerning cladding, insulation or cavity barriers. I have no technical expertise in this regard and TMO relied on the consultants and the specialist contractors appointed to undertake the project under this Design and Build contract. My understanding was that all materials were compliant with all appropriate building regulations and were in fact non-combustible.
- 76 Cladding, insulation and cavity barriers were designed and installed by the specialist contractors under the control of Rydon as part of the Design and Build contract and quality was inspected by John Rowan and Partners as part of their duties as Clerk of



Works, and inspected and approved by RBKC's Building Control from a construction perspective.

- 77 I had no involvement with any design issues relative to cladding other than facilitating meetings and visits by relevant planning professionals. I then reported back to TMO and residents what had been reported to me.
- 78 My understanding is that the cladding on the Grenfell project was sourced by Rydon and installed by them and based on specifications drawn up by Studio E Architects and as approved by RBKC Building and Planning Departments with supporting information provided to them by Rydon, Artelia, IBI Taylor Young and by RBKC Planners and Building Inspectors carrying out their own researches and inspections.
- 79 I do not have specific knowledge of the materials involved and whilst I may have been informed of trade names and perhaps general information, they would not have meant anything to me as this is a specialist issue.
- 80 The cladding specification and installation together with associated insulations and cavity barriers was approved by RBKC Building Control based on their own inspections and upon information provided directly by Rydon. I believe the RBKC Building Control inspectors attended site on numerous occasions throughout the refurbishment. The workmanship and quality were checked by John Rowan and Partners.
- 81 I was not involved in any decisions to changes to the cladding design or materials at any time. That was not something over which I had any control. Matters relevant to materials or specifications were not within my knowledge or field of expertise. I was aware that the cladding was changed from zinc to aluminium at an early stage but I had no involvement with that decision and no concept of what that meant except that it increased the colour choices and was changed from an undesirable battleship grey to a "champagne colour" and/or to "metallic silver" at the request of RBKC Planners. My understanding was that there was no difference between the types of cladding in terms of specification, etc. and the only difference was in relation to appearance to suit the RBKC preferences. I had no input to these decisions.

- 82 All matters relative to Building Control were dealt with directly between Rydon and RBKC Building Control Inspectors who made regular visits to site and held other meetings with Rydon and LFB. Rydon had the responsibility under the Design and Build Contract to comply with all building regulations and to obtain Building Control approval.

### **Fire safety and ventilation works**

- 83 In relation to interior modification, new smoke dispersal and ventilation works were included within the performance specification provided by Max Fordham as part of the tender. These operated in conjunction with sensors detecting the presence of smoke in the communal areas and for which Rydon obtained approval under the building regulations.
- 84 My understanding is that the ventilation works also provided automatic environmental temperature control to the internal lobbies.
- 85 The old smoke dispersal system required updating and a new system designed by Max Fordham was installed by Rydon's contractors at the time of refurbishment. This system remained under warranty with Rydon at the time of the fire but arrangements were in place for maintenance of the system to be taken over by Allied Protection following expiry of the warranty period. Upon its completion and commissioning, the system was regularly checked by the Estate Services team.
- 86 There were no known reports of failure of the environmental ventilation system which was checked weekly by the Estate Services team but on an occasion on 28 May 2017 when I was walking through the Tower with Dave Hughes, Rydon's site manager, checking works on a hot day, I thought the ambient temperature was too high. Dave Hughes said that he would arrange for it to be checked.

### **New communal heating system**

- 87 The new heating arrangements involved the siting of new boilers in the basement area with flow and return pipes to each of the individual flats. I think it may have been 2 new boilers with one back up but I am not sure. The boiler water temperature was maintained at a regular level and that temperature was topped up in individual flats by use of electrically operated HIUs, not dissimilar to an immersion heater. Hot water would

therefore be delivered to each individual flat and topped up to a standard temperature by use of individual HIUs within the flats. The new heating system was designed to Max Fordham's performance specification which Rydon's specialist sub-contractor, JS Wright was required to meet.

## **Windows**

- 88 New powder-coated aluminium windows were installed by Rydon to the cladding structure to the exterior of the building prior to removing the existing aluminium framed windows within.
- 89 The original proposal was that the windows would be designed larger than the structural opening. I do not know why. I understood this to mean that the contractor would have been required to carry out internal works within the flats to cut larger structural openings to make the windows fit and this would have caused difficulties and disruption to residents. Rydon suggested retaining the structural openings and fitting the windows to them to avoid these issues. Max Fordham checked the lighting levels and Rydon were required to confirm that these revisions and the new proposed windows met the existing building regulations for refurbishment standards.
- 90 At the Progress Meeting No. 5 dated 18 November 2014 (CW/1:TMO10007909), the matter of window sizes to fit was raised and Rydon reported that if the windows were sized to fit in existing opening they could over clad on the existing trim around the internal windows and give a clean finish internally avoiding resident disruption and making good. A sample window was to be fixed to the pilot flat for December so that residents could see what the new window looked like as a finished product. Simon Lawrence of Rydon was instructed to prepare drawings for the non-material amendment planning application and to put the application into the Planning Officer as soon as possible with efforts made to getting it processed faster. Consideration was to be given to whether to order windows ahead of planning approval because of the impact of delay. This was confirmed in writing by Philip Booth of Artelia by email dated 26 November 2014 (CW/2:TMO10007968).
- 91 I updated the Capital Programme Team Meeting on 27 November 2014 (CW/3:TMO10008749) and reported that a mock-up of the window design would be

ready for December. I gave residents an update on progress in the December Newsletter. I arranged for 2 resident consultation drop-ins to the show flat (an empty flat held for meetings and to demonstrate HIU and heating systems etc.) for residents to see the new windows proposed and understand the window opening mechanisms. I also wrote to all residents and non-resident leaseholders as part of the non-material amendment to inform them of the application required by the planning authorities.

- 92 There were numerous email exchanges in early December seeking tentative approval from the planners and discussion on the costs of ordering the windows ahead of approval.
- 93 In the event, on 2 January 2015 the Planning Authority gave approval to a non-material amendment to “change window sizes to be as existing” (CW/4:TMO10008388).
- 94 The fire doors at Grenfell Tower were not replaced or modified during the refurbishment. My understanding is that the majority were replaced as part of a fire door replacement program in about 2012.
- 95 My understanding is that new fire doors were installed in the newly constructed areas at lower level and that those doors complied with current fire standards as required.
- 96 The two lifts in Grenfell Tower were substantially unaltered during the refurbishment works except the lift shaft was adapted to accommodate the lower floors to the new flats with an additional floor stage being installed. These works were carried out by Apex lifts as subcontractors to Rydon. Apex were the original installers. New controls were fitted at ground level and the lift was commissioned for use by Apex and subsequently serviced and maintained by PDERS.

#### **The fire and safety measures within Grenfell Tower at 14 June 2017**

- 97 I was not ultimately responsible for fire and safety measures within the Tower but I am aware that on 17 October 2014 Carl Stokes conducted a Fire Risk Assessment for Grenfell Tower (CW/5:TMO10042446). I had met and knew Carl Stokes but his engagement was by Janice Wray, TMO’s Health and Safety Manager.
- 98 I believe I would have seen a copy of the fire risk assessment at the time. It recorded amongst other things, that the fire strategy for residential areas was a “stay put” strategy

which he confirmed meant that residents remain within their own dwelling during a fire incident unless the fire is in that dwelling or it is otherwise affected, in which case they should immediately evacuate the dwelling and call the fire and rescue service. He went on to say that the fire service or TMO employees will arrange for a general evacuation of the building at any time if this is appropriate or the resident can leave at any time if they so wish. He noted that information had been provided to all residents in the form of tenants' handbook, letters and briefing sheets etc. and articles on fire safety advice and emergency procedures were also included in the residents' magazine called "Link".

- 99 He further reported that the provisions for means of escape for flats are based on the assumption that the fire is generally within a flat; that there is no reliance on external rescue (e.g. by a portable ladder) and that there is a high degree of compartmentation and therefore low probability of fire spread beyond the flat of origin so that simultaneous evacuation of the building is unlikely to be necessary. He reported also that although fires may occur in the common parts of the building, the materials and construction used there should prevent the fire from being involved beyond the immediate vicinity although in some cases communal facilities exist which require additional measures to be taken.
- 100 This Fire Risk Assessment referred to an audit having been conducted by Fire Safety Inspecting Officer Matthew Ramsey of LFB.
- 101 Mr Stokes noted that the building appeared to have appropriate fire separation and compartmentation and, from a visual inspection of the structure of the building, there appeared to be no areas that raised concern about structural damage to the building or fire stopping issues. There were no visible breaches of the compartment walls and ceiling linings at the time of this risk assessment and the fire loading of the common parts of the building was considered to be good.
- 102 He observed that the building appears to have been constructed in accordance with the building regulations at the time of construction with the layout of the building, including the travel distances, the escape routes, the width of escape routes and the number of exits appropriate for the present use. The means of escape route/the staircase leads to a final exit at the walkway level at present. The entrance/exit doors of this building all open in the direction of travel as do the flat/lift lobby area doors onto the staircase.

- 103 He also observed that there was adequate protection for the means of escape route from the building with no visual damage observed during the assessment, there are no openings on the staircase apart from the entrance/exit doors to each flat/lift lobby area. Each flat/lift lobby area has the apartment entrance doors and the refuse chute room door off it. The tenanted apartments within this building had a few years ago their flat entrance doors replaced with new self-closing 30 minute certified fire rated doors which meet the requirements of building regulations. The other flat entrance doors which have not been replaced are flush solid fire rated doors with perko self-closing devices fitted on the ones looked at, these are the originally fitted doors. He commented that if new flat entrance doors are fitted in the future then these will need to conform to the requirements of the building regulations at the time of installation.
- 104 He commented that the door to each of the refuse chute rooms was a 30 minute fire rated door fitted with a self-closing device and cold smoke seals.
- 105 I take from this report that there had been a complete fire risk assessment which, in the event of fire, required residents to remain in their homes unless the fire was in their flat in which case they should evacuate and that anyone wishing to evacuate was safe to do so via the protected staircase.
- 106 Throughout the refurbishment, there were regular attendances by representatives of LFB who attended for familiarisation visits, and to make observations and recommendations aimed at managing fire safety. On these occasions, LFB officers met Rydon to understand how the systems worked and to familiarise themselves with them.
- 107 I recall one particular occasion when the Fire Officers attended to carry out an exercise specifically in relation to the dry riser.
- 108 I attended some of the bi-monthly meetings with LFB organised and attended by Janice Wray. These meetings were office based and attended by senior LFB officers. Issues raised were across the TMO stock in the Borough and I usually attended when anything relevant to Grenfell Tower was to be discussed. There was complete transparency with LFB who examined all aspects of fire safety on a regular basis and advised us on fire safety issues. LFB continued to support a stay put policy and at no time did they or Carl



Stokes suggest that any other policy should be considered unless LFB determined otherwise. These meetings were office based and attended by senior LFB officers.

- 109 LFB had attended regularly during the refurbishment and I am aware that all the Kensington and Chelsea Watches had attended site with Rydon to gain an understanding on the internal features in the Tower and the operation of equipment. As part of this exercise I was advised by Rydon and LFB that Rydon had provided plans of the building to LFB together with instructions on how to use the automatic open ventilation (AOV) system. I had provided plans to LFB too.
- 110 There had been discussion with LFB about the property Premises Information Box. I specifically remember that at two different bi-monthly meetings, different LFB officers had said that the plans would be on their database, and anyone attending from LFB would have a device/ipad on which to call up the floorplans. The LFB asked for AOV information to be installed within the fire panel at ground floor, which it was . I believe Rydon left a set of plans in the Hub Room, as I had seen a set there previously.
- 111 At the bi-monthly meetings, the LFB said their teams all had devices/IPads that would pull up floor plans if necessary.
- 112 Carl Stokes conducted a further fire risk assessment and produced a record of his significant findings and action plan dated 26 April 2016 (CW/6:TMO10016585) which Janice Wray sent to me and which I forwarded to Rydon to complete. Rydon recorded their responses on the action plan record and I returned this to Janice Wray. This I understand was to assist Carl Stokes with his overall fire risk assessment for the building required under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order which he reported on 20 June 2016 (CW/7: ).
- 113 He noted in the assessment that he had conducted an inspection and reviewed information gathered from the buildings' occupants, TMO employees and from analysis of documents provided by TMO, and concluded, without conducting an invasive structural investigation, that the building's structure, construction and any refurbishments of the building had gone through the building regulations process.

114 He noted that new external cladding had been fitted to the building as part of the project of refurbishment/construction work being undertaken on and within this building. The original external face of the building had been over clad, the new fire rated cladding is fixed to the out face of the building by metal fixings and the whole process has been overseen by the RBKC Building Control department and officers. They have approved and accepted the fixing systems and the cladding used. He noted that “there are no apparent unusual elements of building construction that were considered to add a significant additional contribution to the fire risk.”

115 Mr Stokes referred to the “stay put” evacuation strategy and what that meant and identified that this was the general advice provided by LFB as noted on their website and as communicated to residents.

## **6. Inspections**

116 Inspections of Rydon work was specifically conducted by John Rowan and Partners engaged as Clerk of Works on behalf of TMO, and they reported regularly via site inspection reports.

117 I am aware that RBKC Building Control attended regularly to inspect Rydon’s work.

118 I am aware that LFB attended regularly to conduct fire safety inspections and make familiarisation visits and I am aware that Carl Stokes attended to carry out fire risk assessment. I believe that Exova may have attended in the early days to advise Studio E and /or Rydon on fire strategies.

## **7. Governance/ Management.**

119 My primary role was to facilitate the refurbishment works and endeavour to minimise disruption to residents and to attempt to provide for their needs during the works and following. I do not believe I can assist the Inquiry with Governance and Management issues

## **8. Communication with Residents**

- 120 As stated, my role and my focus was to accommodate the works and to endeavour to minimise disruption to residents and to attempt to provide for their needs during the works and following. My role was to communicate with residents to achieve this as best I could.
- 121 One of the first tasks I undertook on joining TMO was to prepare a Grenfell Tower Regeneration Newsletter dated 11 September 2013 (CW/8: ) which picked up on issues that had been raised from a residents' meeting prior to my joining the company. That Newsletter was principally to introduce myself to residents and to let them know of future events and drop-in sessions to be able to inform them of the planned works, progress etc.
- 122 Residents remained in situ during the refurbishment works and it was my role on behalf of TMO to keep them informed of progress and, together with Rydon and in particular their RLO, to accommodate the works being undertaken which were going on around them.
- 123 TMO kept residents informed primarily by means of regular Newsletters which I produced but also by letters, information notices, resident meetings, exhibitions, drop-in sessions, by personal contact and by SMS Messaging. I set up a "resident surgery" where I would be available to listen to and respond to any issues raised by residents. There was also a dedicated email address in addition to my own to which residents could send any issues. There was very little take up by residents to some of these initiatives but we got good engagement from residents in response to SMS Messages sent to residents' mobile phones. Rydon organised coffee mornings for residents that I also attended.
- 124 I knew many of the residents of Grenfell Tower personally and they generally preferred to raise issues with me when they saw me, by phone or by email.
- 125 I hand delivered all Newsletters to each flat in Grenfell Tower to be sure that each household received a copy. I got the lift to the top floor and then walked down the stairs delivering the Newsletters to each of the six flats on each floor. I found that I could do this in 45 minutes or in 35 minutes if the Newsletters were pre-folded, and if I had the assistance of another person from the office, together we could do it in 25 minutes.

- 126 A copy of the Newsletter together with other notices to residents was pinned to the ground floor noticeboard alongside the entrance to the building. It was sent electronically to non-resident leaseholders.
- 127 I produced regular Newsletters to residents, about 9 or 10 a year, to keep all concerned informed of developments and progress.
- 128 Rydon's RLOs became extremely adept at profiling residents in order to be able to identify their needs and requirements and such matters as knowing when they could best communicate with individuals. A lot of effort was involved to try and speak with as many residents as possible on a face to face basis.
- 129 In addition, Rydon had a very good RLO, Lynda Prentice. There were also signs up in the lifts and the noticeboard at the entrance. Lynda Prentice was very good at making sure that she spoke to residents personally.
- 130 If anything needed to be communicated to residents then either Rydon or TMO or jointly would put up notices in both lifts and on noticeboards so that residents would see the information. Again, jointly or individually Rydon and TMO wrote to specific residents to remind them of dates for access that they had agreed, for example for the installation of the heating system. Rydon also had a noticeboard just inside the main entrance where they put up notices to residents.

### **Defect reporting/complaints**

- 131 All matters of workmanship and progress were inspected by John Rowan and Partners on behalf of TMO and reported to Artelia and TMO and where appropriate they raised issues with Rydon which were confirmed through Monthly Progress Reports.
- 132 All complaints and issues raised by residents on works were initially directed to Rydon's RLOs for progression within Rydon whilst they were on site. I would then take up any matter that could not be straightforwardly resolved.
- 133 Rydon's had a defects team dealing specifically with defects as raised by residents or indeed anyone else. This was their aftercare team and they had a specific "aftercare" email address where defects could be reported or directed.

- 134 Residents could report defects to the TMO Customer Service Centre based at the Hub via a Freephone or email and any such reports would be entered onto the maintenance database system called Capita with a link directing the email to Rydon's aftercare team.
- 135 Rydon's aftercare team prepared a spreadsheet of all defects which they shared with me. I asked for this to be supplied weekly to start off and this became monthly when the number of defects reduced.
- 136 Residents might report defects to the locally based housing management team but again, that would be recorded on the Capita system and automatically directed to Rydon.
- 137 Each of the spreadsheets I received was updated cumulatively and I saved the latest versions.
- 138 I would pick up the spreadsheet and make such enquiries as I needed to check that the reported defects were attended to by Rydon. I would do this by referring it to Rydon who would demonstrate to me whether or not the defect had been attended to or contact the resident as appropriate.
- 139 My role was to monitor reported defects to be satisfied that they had been attended to, to residents' satisfaction, and by and large Rydon were very good at responding.
- 140 I do not recall any reports of defects in relation to the fitting of windows. I do however recall a leaseholder, Mr Patel (flat 56) raising an issue in relation to the external fitting of his window. I cannot recall the detail but I know Rydon went back to resolve the issue. There were several minor issues reported following handover that were being dealt with by Rydon's defect team. These are a matter of record and I do not recall the detail but nothing significant comes to mind.
- 141 Outstanding defects were monitored and chased up and at the end of the defect period one year after Practical Completion. I wrote to all residents asking them to identify any outstanding defects. I got about six or seven responses and I went round the building with Dave Hughes, Rydon's site manager, and his colleague on 28 May 2017 and 1 June 2017 to carry out the defects inspection. This was to identify any defects in the Rydon construction work which would need to be remedied at Rydon's expense within the defects guarantee period of one year.

## **Fire Advice to residents**

- 142 In the May 2016 Newsletter (CW/9:TMO10013653) I reported to residents that the cladding was complete apart from the lower level and south side facing Grenfell Walk and that the new smoke system was now operational and linked to the boiler system in case of fire.
- 143 I reported the completion of works and explained operation of the heating system. I also introduced Nicola Bartholomew the new Neighbourhood Management team leader based at the Lancaster West office.
- 144 The Newsletter referred to the fact that Rydon were leaving site and that the procedure for reporting any problems with their work and defects was now the TMO customer contact centre and gave details of where and how to report any defects that would be attended to by Rydon.
- 145 I passed on to residents the specific instruction received from LFB and stated that it had been emphasised by LFB who asked us to re-inforce the message to residents that “if there is a fire which is not inside your own home, you are generally safest to stay put in your home to begin with; the Fire Brigade will arrive very quickly if a fire is reported. The only reason you should leave your home is if the fire is inside your home. In this case you and your family should leave the flat immediately: close the door behind you, leave the building and call 999 giving your address and postcode. If there is a fire in the block near your flat and you believe you are at risk and would prefer to evacuate the building, then please do so using the stairs and wait outside the building for the Fire Brigade to arrive”. This advice was specifically identified by LFB.

## **Chronology**

- 146 I endeavour here to capture the detail above by reference to such papers as are available to me to put issues into context and into chronological sequence.
- 147 Having joined TMO on 9 September 2013, one of my first roles was to contribute to a Newsletter dated 11 September 2013 (CW/8: ) which reported on an earlier residents’ meeting that I had not attended but which had been reported to me. One of the



main objectives of the Newsletter was to update and introduce myself to the residents and to let them know I was available to discuss any issues and to arrange a drop in session.

- 148 I attended the Grenfell Design Team Meeting on 24 September 2013 (CW/10:TMO10003684) attended by various parties and a Review Tender Process Meeting on 25 September 2013 (CW/11:TMO10003680) as well as a Capital Investment Team Meeting on 25 September 2013 (CW/12:TMO10003991). My attendance at these first two meetings was very much to familiarise myself with the Grenfell refurbishment project to understand what was likely to be involved and meet some of the parties.
- 149 There was a clear intention to gain resident engagement in the project and in the tender process and TMO decided that two or three residents should be involved in the tender scoring process for the appointment of contractors to carry out the refurbishment work.
- 150 The Capital Investment Team Meeting of 25 September 2013 (CW/12:TMO10003991) noted that the OJEU procurement process was in progress.
- 151 I attended a further Design Team Meeting on 8 October 2013 (CW/13:TMO10003792) to review developments but I was not available to attend the next review tender process meeting at Artelia offices on 14 October 2013.
- 152 I attended a Design Review Meeting on 22 October 2013 (CW/14: ) and a Capital Investment Team Meeting on 25 October 2013 (CW/15:TMO10004557) to report on progress and I attended a Design Review Meeting on 5 November 2013 referred to in the papers but minutes for this meeting are not available to me.
- 153 As stated above, TMO was a “paperless” organisation so all documents produced and received were saved electronically but there were times when minutes were produced at meetings in hard form only and they were not always provided electronically as required and may not have been scanned to the system as was intended. As a consequence those minutes and agenda may not be available to TMO but they should be available to other parties who produced the minutes particularly Artelia and Rydon.
- 154 My focus at this point was to understand what the refurbishment program would involve and to be in a position to keep residents informed.

- 155 RBKC's decision to refurbish Grenfell was, I believe, made in 2011/2012 with a view to improve the internal living conditions for the tenants and leaseholders, the communal domestic hot water and central heating systems and other services to be upgraded and renewed including thermal installation to make the building more thermally efficient. This would tie in with RBKC's improvement plans for the area which included the building of the Kensington Aldridge Academy and the new Leisure Centre.
- 156 The regeneration works included window renewal, thermal external cladding to the building, new entrance lobby, communal decoration, new communal heating system with individual control, hidden homes (originally seven new flats but latterly nine); relocation of boxing club, nursery and office accommodation; fire safety and ventilation works; and environmental enhancements.
- 157 Following my early meetings, I prepared the November 2013 Regeneration Newsletter (CW/16:TMO00837536) where I reported that Planning Approval had been awaiting the sign-off of a legal agreement as part of the Section 106 Regulations and I reported that the tender would go out later in the month with works due to start in the Spring. The Newsletter summarised the survey works that had been carried out and gave an update on the tendering process with the aim of achieving a tender return in January 2014. The Newsletter identified that we were looking for residents to be involved at that stage and asked for people to identify if they would be interested in fulfilling this role. As with the previous Newsletter, there was a general invitation to discuss any part of the Newsletter or the Grenfell Tower Regeneration Project and it included my contact details for that purpose.
- 158 The parties involved prior to tender were Artelia as the Contract Administrator, Costs Consultant (QS) and CDM Coordinator (H&S), Studio E as the Architects, Curtins as the structural engineers and Max Fordham to advise on mechanical and engineering issues.
- 159 I do not think I was aware of the involvement of Exova at that time but I was later aware that they produced reports to Studio E and I therefore assume that they were engaged by Studio E to assist them with the tender specifications specifically in relation to fire safety strategies. I am aware that Exova produced reports to Studio E giving input to fire safety strategies.

- 160 I attended a Review Tender Process Meeting on 12 November 2013 (CW/17:TMO10004256) and amongst the matters discussed was the extension of the construction period to 14 months and a discussion on eco funding.
- 161 By this time, it had been identified there were five tenderers for the project, namely Durkan, Rydon, Wates, Mullaley and Keepmoat. The date for contractors to express interest in the tender had closed on 24 September 2013.
- 162 I produced a monthly progress report on 14 November 2013 (CW/18:TMO10004183) which identified the nature of the refurbishment works to be conducted and identifying the five contractors who met the PQQ requirements. Various practical issues were identified including the overlap with the work being conducted in relation to the KALC Scheme and matters including the relocation of the nursery, boxing club and the Lancaster West Housing Office.
- 163 At this point in time, the main focus of residents' attention was what they saw as the slow progress of this scheme, which had been in inception since 2010/2011 with residents consultation starting in February 2012, albeit the tender process and timings had been explained and identified to them. Overall, the residents were very keen for the refurbishment to take place and to do so as soon as possible.
- 164 My monthly progress reports were prepared principally for the benefit of the Capital Investment Team to inform on progress and issues and for the benefit of other TMO meetings for example with RBKC as well as being used for reports to RBKC.
- 165 I am aware that Artelia sent out invitations to the five tenderers on 29 November 2013 (CW/19:TMO10004645). I produced a further monthly progress report on 6 December 2013 (CW/20:TMO10040501) which largely repeated what had been identified the previous month.
- 166 In December 2013, arrangements were made for the respective tenderers to attend Grenfell Tower for a presentation to them as one group. I attended with others to show the contractors around so that they could see the Tower for themselves and understand what may be required in order to assist their tenders.

- 167 Jenny Jackson produced a PowerPoint presentation dated 5 December 2013 which the tenderers attended and various personnel attended including Peter Maddison, Jenny Jackson, myself and Philip Booth from Artelia together with Brian Sounes and Matt Smith from Studio E and Max Fordham respectively to introduce themselves to contractors and to be available to explain what may be involved.
- 168 At the Capital Investment Team Meeting on 7 January 2014, there was an update on the tender process and it was reported that planning approval was awaited. The next drop-in session at Grenfell Tower was noted to have been held on 12 December 2013 (prior to the meeting) regarding the new heating system for residents to understand how it would operate. There was another session due on 22 January 2014,
- 169 A conditional permission for development was issued by the Planning Department of RBKC on 10 January 2014. The permission was conditional upon matters such as detailed drawings or samples of materials being submitted for approval by the local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work was begun. It was specified that the materials to be used on the external faces of the buildings was to accord with the development plan by ensuring that the character and appearance of the area were preserved and living conditions of those living near the development suitably protected. Similar conditions were specified in relation to the windows and doors to ensure the appearance of the development was satisfactory and to safeguard the amenity of the area. This planning permission was sent to me by IBI Taylor Young on 13 January 2014 and I reported this to residents by Newsletter dated 16 January 2014 (CW/21: ) and confirmed that the tendering process to appoint a contractor to carry out the work was underway.
- 170 Whenever there were any public meetings involving Grenfell Tower, the meetings could become difficult with disruptive conduct from a small number of residents who took over and dominated the meetings with their comments to the exclusion of other residents who complained to me about this. As a result, at the drop in session on 12 December 2013 we undertook a survey on how people wanted to be consulted which showed the majority of people did not want formal meetings. This was published to residents in the January 2014 Newsletter (CW/21: ). This meant that subsequent consultation was largely by drop-in sessions, Newsletters and on a one-to-one basis wherever or whenever that could be achieved.

- 171 Artelia had reviewed and scored each of the tenderers in full. They concluded that Rydon offered the best balance in terms of quality and value for money. Rydon achieved an overall score for quality assessment of 36.32 against the second best being Durkan at 31.22. As part of their review, Artelia also identified further savings which could be made following the tender exercise and one of their suggestions was the change of cladding material from zinc to aluminium but at the tender stage this was something that was to be reviewed later. My understanding was that aluminium gave greater choice from an aesthetic perspective.
- 172 In February 2014, the procurement exercise independently overviewed by consultant Jenny Jackson, was completed and, based on the findings and input from Artelia's Cost Consultants, the work was awarded to Rydon as Principal Contractor.
- 173 Following completion of the procurement exercise, 2 consultants had their contracts novated to Rydon because this was to be a Design and Build Contract. That meant that all design work as well as the construction work would all be the responsibility of Rydon, who would take advice as necessary from their specialist advisers and complete the construction work using specialist constructors.
- 174 When the contract was let, the members of the consultants Project Team who were novated to the Principal Contractor were:
- Studio E, Architect , assisted by consultants Exova for fire safety strategies
  - Curtins, Structural Engineering Consultant
- 175 The works themselves were undertaken by Rydon and their sub-contractors. TMO's role was to monitor progress and budget in order to pay contractors appropriate to the works completed and to report on progress and budget to the TMO Board and to RBKC. I monitored that process as a project.
- 176 At the Progress Meeting Number 8 held on 20 January 2014 (CW/22:TMO10005273) attended by myself and David Gibson from TMO and others from Artelia and Rydon, I was required to instruct the lift maintenance team to carry out work to improve lift efficiency prior to work starting on the lift and I was also to make arrangements for the dry riser to be checked. I did both these. I was also required to update the Fire Brigade

that the works were due to start on the AOV and to report that the mechanical system was anticipated to be operational by the end of June. Again, I did this.

- 177 On 12 February 2014 (CW/23:TMO10040858) I reported to Studio E that I was arranging a “Fire Brigade session” at Grenfell with Dan Hallissey of North Kensington, together with Matthew Ramsey, who was their specialist high-rise man to consider issues relevant to the smoke ventilation system. I reported that I was hopeful that the session could take place in the week commencing 24 February.
- 178 Following completion and assessment of the tender process, I drafted a paper dated 10 March 2014 to Peter Maddison (CW/24:TMO10040921) to assist him prepare a more comprehensive paper dated 27 March 2014 to the TMO Board (CW/25: ) seeking permission to let the Grenfell Tower contract. The recommendation was that the contract be let to Rydon after a standstill period of 10 days. The contract was the design and build JCT 2011 contract.
- 179 The Fire Brigade visited Grenfell Tower on 12/13 March 2014 as arranged. In attendance from LFB were Ben Lewis, Matthew Ramsey and Dan Hallissey and they made several observations in relation to the dry riser, doors open in firefighting situation, smoke vent to lobby and stair etc. Matthew Ramsey was very unhappy with the dampers not being functional and he referred to an enforcement notice. Bruce Sounes of Studio E architects attended with me.
- 180 Following this site visit I wrote to Janice Wray, Carl Stokes and Bruce Sounes (CW/26:TMO10005515) reporting on matters and for issues in particular relevant to the Fire Brigade concerning airflow calculations, the smoke vents to each lobby, access to finger blocks and seeking confirmation that the lifts were either fireman’s or firefighting lifts. It was noted that the Fire Brigade had their own database system to which Lancaster West should be added.
- 181 On 17 March 2014 (CW/27:TMO10005474) Artelia formally advised Rydon that their tender proposals had been accepted. Their tender proposals were for £9.2 million which was above the funding available, but was thought to be achievable with some refinement aimed at saving approximately £500K. I am aware that it was identified at that stage that there could be a saving of almost £250K in respect of the cladding.



- 182 At a Capital Programme Team Meeting on 20 March 2014 (CW/28:TMO100005804) it was reported that the tender evaluation had been completed and it recorded that Rydon was the preferred contactor. It reported on some of the works that were to be undertaken.
- 183 There was a Contractor Introduction Meeting held on 1 April 2014 (CW/29: ) at which representatives of TMO, Artelia and Rydon attended and roles and responsibilities were identified. It was reported at this meeting under item 2 that there was a potential saving on a number of issues including in particular, changes to the proposed cladding, with potential savings of up to £376,175. This reflected the earlier commentary from Artelia that this saving could be achieved by changing the cladding from zinc to aluminium and using a face fixing rather than cassette. It was noted that these changes would need to be approved by the planners and that Marc Watterson of IBI Taylor Young would be Artelia's point of contact to take this forward with the planners.
- 184 It was reported under item 5 that Studio E and Curtins would be novated to Rydon and that Exova had completed the fire strategy at the tender stage, and they had not been novated to Rydon but Simon Lawrence of Rydon would contact them with a view to using them going forward.
- 185 I produced the next Newsletter in April 2014 (CW/30:TMO00837550) reporting "*it's all systems go*" and reporting that Rydon had been selected as the contractor to carry out the works. The Newsletter gave some background to that company and identified that they would have a dedicated RLO in Christina Stephanou whose job it would be to keep residents closely informed of every step of the process. It noted that she would be writing to residents in the following months to give her contact details and to invite residents to meet her individually and to discuss needs and concerns. It was also noted that there would be a "*Meet the Contractor*" event in June when Rydon would attend to explain the work that was to be undertaken.
- 186 In email exchanges on 2 April 2014 (CW/31:TMO10041023) a further quarterly meeting with the Fire Brigade was reported on with discussion of how to respond to LFB.
- 187 The proposals for changing the cladding system to aluminium were aired in correspondence and were presented to those involved that Rydon were proposing a face fixed aluminium cladding system as well as there being other refinements in other areas.

IBI Taylor Young reported that they'd had several meetings with the Planning Authority and had presented a range of materials and a further meeting with them was recommended. All of the discussions at that time centred upon appearance and cost, there was no discussion that I was aware of relating to materials other than a reference to an aluminium face.

- 188 At a pre-contract meeting on 9 April 2014 (CW/32:TMO00831757) which I attended with representatives of TMO, Artelia, Rydon, Studio E and IBI Taylor Young, the issue of aluminium face fixing cladding was raised. It was noted that Marc Watterson of IBI Taylor Young had struggled to find an aluminium product to meet the specification previously identified because of the concerns regarding the physical appearance i.e. colour, finish, the longevity and with the face fixing. The problem with face fixing was reported to be that the RBKC planners were not happy with this form of fixing because some of the fixings could be seen and this was thought to be unsightly from an aesthetic perspective. Again there was no mention at all about any other materials or combustibility.
- 189 I was involved in a review exercise which looked at avoiding any duplication of work, increasing work efficiencies and identifying other areas where savings may be achieved.
- 190 I attended a specially arranged meeting with RBKC planners on 8 May 2014 (CW/33:TMO10005900) held at RBKC Town Hall Customer Service Centre, Room 8, at which representatives of RBKC Planning Officers, Artelia, Rydon, Studio E and IBI Taylor Young attended. The meeting was specifically to discuss matters including the proposed change to the façade from zinc to aluminium composite and amongst the matters discussed were the different types of cladding samples being proposed and for RBKC to consider options. It was considered appropriate for the RBKC Planning Officer, Sarah Scannell, to visit Rydon sites where similar cladding systems had been installed.
- 191 A flat panel aluminium composite material (ACM) was proposed as the cladding material at higher levels and that the flat ACM be face fixed. My understanding was that aluminium was preferred because of the preferred colours available which the planners were insistent on having. The choice of colours was to be considered and Rydon was asked to provide approximately half-size sample panels showing the joint and fixings.

Once the colours had been decided, Rydon was also required to provide detailed drawings of the windows as well as a sample window, window frame and infill.

- 192 On 16 May 2014 (CW/34:TMO10005924) Bruce Sounes of Studio E wrote to a number of parties, including myself, to report on discussions with Sarah Scannell in the RBKC Planning Office and her preference for visual appearances and interfaces, and this prompted further discussion with Rydon. It was clear from her emails at that time that Sarah Scannell was not impressed with the appearance in terms of colour and fixing. All of the discussions at that time centred solely upon appearance.
- 193 It was reported to the TMO Programme Board on 20 May 2014 (CW/35:TMO10005928) that there were potential reductions of nearly £250K on cladding alternatives and £176K on louvred window panels with an overall potential reduction of nearly £800K
- 194 An in-house Grenfell TMO Project Group was set up at this time with a remit to monitor the progress and program the week before the Programme Board. I was not a member of the TMO Board but I received copies of the minutes when relevant.
- 195 At the TMO Programme Board on 20 May 2014 (CW/35:TMO10005928) it was reported that preconstruction activities were being progressed with Rydon in order to agree the final designs and materials for the cladding and windows to enable us to discharge the planning conditions. It also reported upon the meeting held with the planners on 8 May 2014 to discuss the cladding materials and the proposed move from zinc coated to an aluminium coated panel, omission of louvres to windows and other matters with identification of the face fixing cladding that would occur only above the fourth floor level. At the lower level, it would be by way of cassette fixing. All of these considerations were relevant to appearance only. There was no discussion in relation to combustibility.
- 196 I produced the June 2014 Grenfell Tower Regeneration Newsletter (CW/36: ) in which I announced it to be the first joint Rydon/TMO edition and I reported that TMO had been working with the Council's Planning Department in relation to the type of cladding that would be used and the work that had been done in preparation before the works could commence.

- 197 The Newsletter gave details of the Rydon team and noted that they would all be wearing Rydon ID badges with corresponding numbered hi-visibility vests for security purposes.
- 198 I reported that Rydon's Resident Liaison Team would be holding regular coffee mornings in their office with times etc. to be announced. I noted that it was "very important that residents know who at Rydon to contact and how" and I gave a '0800' telephone number and email address that they could use for that purpose.
- 199 I identified that there would be a survey conducted for all homes and that this would be carried out by Rydon's site managers and RLO. I gave the RLO's personal contact details on the Newsletter.
- 200 On 5 June 2014 (CW/37:TMO10041379) I confirmed to David Gibson and Peter Maddison that Rydon had been instructed to apply for planning permission for two additional flats and the concerns expressed by the Council relevant to the cladding materials. In this regard, Sarah Scannell had written to IBI Taylor Young on 4 June 2014 (CW/38:TMO10041379) reporting on her visit to Kilburn that week expressing her continued reservation about the appearance and robustness of the material proposed. The emphasis remained on appearance and durability with a request for further proposals.
- 201 By letter dated 12 June 2014 (CW/39:TMO10006200) Jenny Jackson dealing with procurement, advised John Rowan and Partners that their tender to provide Clerk of Works services had been successful and they were to liaise with me going forward.
- 202 A Pre-Start Meeting took place on 13 June 2014 (CW/40:TMO10041465) at which I attended with representatives of TMO, Artelia and Rydon when various preliminary issues were identified including that Rydon was in the process of appointing their Building Control Regulator as RBKC and that Rydon would be appointing other consultants in respect of specific issues including fire.
- 203 The meeting also noted the contract costs which included a notional saving of £293,368 although no cladding material had been confirmed.
- 204 I attended a TMO/Rydon Liaison Meeting on 20 June 2014 (CW/41: TMO00836414) to report on developments and to discuss amongst other things the means by which to keep residents informed.

- 205 I attended a Capital Programme Team Meeting on 24 June 2014 (CW/42:TMO10006859) at which I reported that Rydon had started on the enabling works and were looking at savings focusing presently on cladding materials. I also reported that a report had been submitted for additional funds of £600K to allow for the additional housing units, potential increased landscaping costs where KALC works overlapped, and for a contingency sum.
- 206 In my July 2014 Newsletter (CW/43:TMO10006937), I reported to residents that samples of the cladding panels had been put up for the Council Planners to look at and approve, that the refurbishment programme included the creation of seven new flats out of the space previously occupied by Social Services and the nursery, and that we were exploring the opportunity to create two more homes for which planning permission had been applied for.
- 207 The Newsletter referred to the “*emergency fire arrangements*” and recorded that “*our longstanding ‘stay put’ policy stays in force until you are told otherwise. This means that (unless there is a fire in your flat or in the hallway outside your flat) you should stay inside your flat. This is because Grenfell was designed according to rigorous fire safety standards. Also the new front doors for each flat can withstand a fire for up to 30 minutes which gives plenty of time for the Fire Brigade to arrive*”.
- 208 I personally had no knowledge or expertise in relation to emergency fire arrangements for Grenfell and I obtained that information from Janice Wray who was relaying the LFB requirements for residents to “stay put” in the event of a fire. My understanding at that time was that the building had been constructed in such a way that any fire would not spread beyond the compartment in which it started and would not spread beyond the immediate vicinity. My understanding was that the design of the building was such that a fire within a flat was not likely to spread to another flat and it was unnecessary and would perhaps impair firefighting if occupants of other flats evacuated and potentially they could put themselves in a position of danger. That position would however be reviewed by the firefighters at the scene.
- 209 That position was relayed to me by Janice Wray following her exchanges of correspondence with Ben Dewis of LFB on 8 and 9 July 2014 (CW/44:TMO10006875).

- 210 The entry in the Newsletter was in part prompted by emails sent by Eddie Daffarn noting that he believed Rydon's site compound was taking up the Grenfell designated evacuation meeting point. The entry was to reinforce the fire safety strategy and the instructions and guidance of LFB that all occupants, except those occupying the flat where the fire was, should remain in the flat rather than evacuate to a meeting point.
- 211 There were references to LFB involvement principally in relation to access and site traffic raised at the meeting on 11 July 2014.
- 212 The first formal Progress Meeting No 1 involving TMO, Artelia and Rydon took place on 15 July 2014 (CW/45:TMO00829152). It was at this meeting that I confirmed that a Clerk of Works had been appointed to advise TMO. This was John Rowan and Partners and their role as Clerk of Works was to visit the site regularly, to report back to the project team on quality of works and progress, if there were demonstrably any problems.
- 213 At this meeting of 15 July 2014, it was also reported that the mock-up for the cladding had been completed. There was later some record that the initial feedback from the planners was that they would prefer the champagne to brushed aluminium and they were not keen on the face-fix. These were all for aesthetic reasons.
- 214 There were email exchanges from 22 July to 24 July 2014 (CW/46:TMO10007050) recording feedback on the selection of cladding which again were solely to do with the appearance. I did a Holiday Status Report on 23 July 2014 (CW/47:TMO10041592) prior to going on holiday and I attended a Capital Programme Team Meeting on 24 July 2014 (CW/48:TMO10007294). My holiday note made reference to planning issues relevant to the cladding and noted that internal works of windows and heating would take place after Christmas. The concerns were exclusively in relation to appearance and programme. It was noted at the Capital Programme Team Meeting that Rydon were looking at savings focusing presently on cladding materials and reporting that a further £600K of extra funding was being applied for.
- 215 The correspondence at that time continued to refer to the Planning Authority's reservations in relation to cladding fixings and colour and I remained in discussion with Mark Watterson at IBI Taylor Young to see what could be achieved. That would satisfy the planners in terms of colour and fixings. Studio E were at this time looking at product



options, getting material samples and amending architectural drawings/ elevations to show different appearances. There was concern expressed by the local planning officers that the natural aluminium brushed colour of the panels would not represent a high quality finish when placed across the whole building and they were more comfortable with the champagne metallic panel, which was similar to the existing concrete colour and it was thought that this would give greater warmth to the building and a higher quality finish than the aluminium colour. There continued to be discussions about the durability of the panels with the local planning officer, having seen that cassette panels had been damaged and dented potentially by service vehicles.

- 216 Rydon's SHE operational inspection on 28 July 2014 (CW/49:TMO10007077) recorded that fire risk assessment had been discussed in some detail with a review of documentation having been undertaken and it was noted that this would need to be updated within three months. The accompanying schedule records that there was no record of an initial fire risk assessment having been undertaken by Rydon. It noted that the client's fire risk assessment was out of date, but would be reviewed by Rydon in three months' time with some outstanding issues closed.
- 217 I attended a TMO and Rydon liaison meeting on 15 August 2014 (CW/50:TMO00831317) which included reference to there having been 2 fire watches attending Grenfell to understand the implications of moving the entrance to the upper walkway. It was recorded that Christina Stephanou of Rydon RLO asked for some samples of the cladding to show to residents. It was also recorded that champagne cladding had been preferred by the planners and that material approval was expected to be received by 28 August 2014.
- 218 I attended Progress Meeting No. 2 on 19 August 2014 (CW/51:TMO00836822) which recorded that I was going to organise a new fire risk assessment as the entrance to the Tower was now upstairs. This was done and a new fire risk assessment was produced.
- 219 At a Grenfell Programme Meeting held on 27 August 2014 (CW/52:TMO10007302) which I attended with others from TMO, various fire considerations and smoke dispersal systems were referred to and Peter Maddison referred to the Grenfell blog having referred to the need for 2 exits.

- 220 I had seen some blogs at some point and I decided that they were negative and vitriolic and that I would not look at them again. Those blogs were ultimately blocked on our system so they could not be viewed.
- 221 It was noted that the Fire Brigade had attended to make familiarity visits with Rydon at the start of the project, and most recently when the new entrance at walkway level had been formed. Reference was made to the stay put policy having been reinforced in the August Newsletter and that I would put something in the September Newsletter about the fire requirements. I was actioned to check if “*do not use lifts in case of fire*” was required.
- 222 It was recorded that the existing smoke dispersal system may or may not be in full working order. It was noted that this should be a priority for the M&E works and it would have to go through Building Control procedures including Fire Brigade approval. It was noted that this needed to be prioritised because of the risks during works.
- 223 All issues relative to fire were referred by me to Janice Wray to liaise with Carl Stokes and LFB.
- 224 LFB attended regularly and were given all information and accommodation to understand the nature of the works and its impact on fire safety. I am aware that the LFB met up on site with Rydon’s managers and that they liaised with Janice Wray and Carl Stokes on fire strategies so they could decide between them what strategies would be required. These attendances by LFB were not simply in relation to fire evacuation processes during the course of the works but were concerned with looking at the longer term in terms of fire safety following completion of the works and the operation of fire safety equipment.
- 225 It was also reported at this meeting that the target date for the planners to confirm cladding materials and colour choices was 27 August 2014.
- 226 I reported various progress issues at the Capital Programme Team Meeting on 28 August 2014 (CW/53:TMO10007566), and at the TMO/Rydon Liaison Meeting held on 29 August 2014 (CW/54: ) I reported that planning approval had been due to be given the previous day, 28 August and there was understanding that the Council had opted for the champagne option but written confirmation was awaited.

- 227 In a one-to-one meeting note prepared by David Gibson dated 29 August 2014 (CW/55: ) it was recorded that new proposals for external cladding finishes were just received from Rydon for comment prior to submission for the discharge of planning conditions. It recorded that there was some confusion regarding the number of different finishes being proposed and further clarification was required possibly with a full materials board showing all proposed finishes. There was no reference to column and crown (top layer) finishes for which clarification was also required.
- 228 I prepared a progress report for the Grenfell Project Team in September 2014 (CW/56: ) listing developments to date. I also noted that the costs for the scheme had been approved at £9.7M and a report was taken to RBKC Cabinet on 19 June 2014 (CW/57:TMO1000612) which approved an increase in the total scheme costs to £10.3M. It also noted that the Grenfell Action Group Blog continued with negative comment.
- 229 In my September 2014 Newsletter (CW/58:TMO00837259) I referred residents to various issues and in relation to cladding, I recorded that we were awaiting planning approval for the actual type of cladding. I recorded that the Council were given a small range of colours and materials to choose from as per the sample on the building. There were further references made to home visits, coffee mornings and drop-in sessions etc. In a draft version 2 of the Newsletter (CW/59: ), I noted that in October and November, an external frame to the building would be fixed to accommodate the installation and that planning approval for the cladding materials and colour choice had just been received. I reported that the planners had asked that a particular palette of colours/materials were chosen and they were offered the choices which were on the “mock up panel” and they had chosen champagne as the predominant colour.
- 230 At the Artelia Progress Meeting No 3 dated 16 September 2014 (CW/60:TMO0083008), it was reported by Rydon that John Hoban and Paul Hanson had been appointed Building Control Inspectors direct from RBKC to achieve faster responses. It was intended at one point that Rydon would appoint independent Building Control Inspectors to give approval etc. but ultimately it was concluded that they would be able to deal with matters more quickly if they engaged the RBKC Building Control Inspectors direct.
- 231 By email exchanges on 18 September 2014 (CW/61: ) Bruce Sounes of Studio E reported on his discussions with RBKC Planners. He reported that he had initially been

hoping for the brushed aluminium but the Planning Officers preferred the champagne and Cllr Rock Fielding-Mellen preferred the grey or “smoke silver metallic”. He commented that he found this a little too much like a battleship grey but he reported that Cllr Fielding-Mellen quite liked this comparison when they discussed it. He reported that there was consensus that the metallics looked best.

- 232 Neither I nor anyone at TMO had input to the choice of suppliers of the cladding or indeed the choice of any suppliers or materials or the tradesmen and subcontractors contracted by Rydon to install it. I believe Rydon had put Harley in their list of proposed subcontractors in their proposal.
- 233 I reported developments at the Capital Programme Team Meeting on 25 September 2014 (CW/62:TMO10007549) and in the October Newsletter (CW/63:TMO00837599) I reported to residents that the Council had selected a smoke silver metallic colour for the cladding and advised residents that a sample could still be viewed above the main entrance. I also reported in the Newsletter that connecting the communal heating pipes and installation of new double glazed windows would be carried out in the New Year and alerted residents that access would be needed to their homes. For this purpose, Rydon’s on-site team would talk to the residents further closer to the time.
- 234 Planning permission following application to provide two additional hidden homes was given on 7 October 2014 (CW/64:TMO10005554).
- 235 In their first Site Inspection Report dated 15 October 2014 (CW/65:TMO00836785) John Rowan & Partners referred to the survey exercises that were being conducted ahead of the new rain screen cladding that was due to start late November. They recorded that Building Control Mr John Hoban had been to site and discussions were ongoing. His last visit was recorded to be at the beginning of September. Photographs supplied showed the mast climbers having been installed.
- 236 I am aware that on 17 October 2014 Carl Stokes conducted a Fire Risk Assessment (CW/5:TMO10042446) for Grenfell Tower under the Regulatory Reform Order.
- 237 As indicated, I believe I would have seen a copy of the fire risk assessment at the time and it recorded amongst other things, that the evacuation strategy for residential areas

was a “stay put”, which Carl Stokes confirmed meant that residents remain within their own dwelling during a fire incident unless the fire were in that dwelling or it were otherwise affected, in which case they should immediately evacuate the dwelling and call the fire and rescue service. He went on to say that the fire service or TMO employees would arrange for a general evacuation of the building at any time if this were appropriate or the residents could leave at any time if they so wished. He noted that information had been provided to all residents in the form of tenant handbooks, letters and briefing sheets etc. and articles on fire safety advice and emergency procedures included in the residents’ magazine called “Link”.

- 238 This appeared to be a comprehensive assessment of all fire safety issues and he further reported on the provisions for means of escape. He reported that the flats were based on the assumption that the fire was generally in a flat; there was no reliance on external rescue (e.g. by a portable ladder) and that there was a high degree of compartmentation and therefore low probability of fire spread beyond the flat of origin so simultaneous evacuation is unlikely to be necessary; and although fires may occur in the part of the building, the materials and construction used should prevent the fire from spreading beyond the immediate vicinity (although in some cases communal facilities exist which require additional measures).
- 239 This Fire Risk Assessment referred to an audit having been conducted by Fire Safety Inspecting Officer Matthew Ramsey of LFB who issued a Notification of Fire Safety Deficiencies relating to:
- (a) A system of monitoring should be implemented for the smoke ventilation system installed on the flat/lift areas and a maintenance schedule put in place so the system is kept in good working order.
  - (b) A maintenance schedule should be put in place for the emergency lighting system installed in this building and the system kept in good working order.
  - (c) Training on fire issues should be given to staff who work in the ground floor level reception area of Grenfell Tower.

- 240 Mr Stokes noted that there were no other further written or verbal comments received from LFB and there were no comments made by LFB in relation to the building layout, the means of escape rooms, compartmentation etc. and no other adverse comments in relation to any other matters.
- 241 Mr Stokes referred to hazards introduced by outside contractors and building work and commented that the building appeared to have been constructed in accordance with the building regulations at the time of construction with the layout of the building including the travel distances, the escape routes, the width of the escape routes and the number of exits appropriate for the present use.
- 242 He noted that the means of escape route/the staircase lead to a final exit at the walkway level at present. The entrance/exit doors of this building all opened in the direction of travel as did the flat/lift lobby area doors onto the staircase. He noted that there was adequate protection for the means of escape route from the building with no visual damage observed during his assessment.
- 243 Mr Stokes noted that the building appeared to have appropriate fire separation and compartmentation and, from a visual inspection of the structure of the building, there appeared to be no areas that raised concern about structural damage to the building or fire stopping issues.
- 244 He identified that there were no obvious signs in the areas covered that bad workmanship would mean that the fabric or fire integrity was or could be compromised. He reported that no invasive structure investigation was undertaken to complete his risk assessment. There were no visible breaches of the compartment walls and ceiling linings at the time of this risk assessment and the fire loading of the common parts of the building was considered to be good.
- 245 He also observed that there was adequate protection for the means of escape route from the building with no visual damage observed during the assessment, there are no openings off the staircase apart from the entrance/exit doors to each flat/lift lobby area. Each flat/lift lobby area has the apartment entrance and the refuse chute room door off it. The tenanted apartments within this building had a few years ago their flat entrance doors replaced with new self-closing 30 minute certified fire rated doors which meet the



requirements of building regulations. The other flat entrance doors which have not been replaced are flush solid fire rated doors with perko self-closing devices fitted on the ones looked at, these are the originally fitted doors. He commented that if new flat entrance doors are fitted in the future then these will need to conform to the requirements of the building regulations at the time of installation.

246 He commented that the door to each of the refuse chute rooms is a 30 minute fire rated door fitted with a self-closing device and cold smoke seals.

247 He commented that when this building was constructed it was not a requirement under the building regulations standards at the time to have cold smoke seals fitted to fire doors, changes to the Building Regulation standards are not retrospective. The internal fire doors that do not have smoke seals are close fitting and shut tight. If these fire doors are to be replaced, repaired or any refurbishment work carried out that involves these fire doors, then they will either be upgraded smoke seals fitted to the door or in the surrounding frame or replaced with doors that already have smoke seals fitted.

248 He raised the issue of conformity by leaseholders and indicated that this was a private matter between the leaseholder and the enforcement authority. He said that there had been meetings on the subject between TMO and the local LFB fire safety team leaders and noted that minutes were available.

249 I took from this report that there had been a complete and successful fire risk assessment, which in the event of fire required residents to remain in their homes unless the fire was in their flat in which case they should evacuate, and that anyone wishing to or requiring to evacuate was safe to do so via the protected staircase, and which an automatic ventilation system operated following fire detection and with complete 30 minute self-closing fire safety doors and chutes etc., all of which were compliant with building regulations standards as reported.

250 In their Progress Report No 4 dated 17 October 2014 (CW/66:TMO00831995) Rydon reported upon progress of works and identified that the *“Cladding condition details have been submitted and revised in line with the Planning Officers comments following the mock-up. Main cladding colour to be ‘smoke metallic grey’ and all cladding panels to be ‘cassette’ fixed”*.

- 251 There had been a debate and discussion about cost savings by fixing the panels to the walls but that was not the preferred choice of RBKC Planners who did not wish the fixings to be visible and preferred a cassette fixing by which the fixings to the wall were not visible.
- 252 Rydon also recorded that the appointed Building Control Inspector John Hoban had visited site to meet the team and to introduce himself.
- 253 I attended the Artelia Progress Meeting No 4 on 21 October 2014 (CW/67:TMO00830526) where I reported that we were awaiting confirmation that the Key Decision Report presented to RBKC Housing and Regeneration Board was accepted on 11 September 2014 and that final approval for the planning application was expected on 17 November 2014.
- 254 It was also recorded that Carl Stokes had been to site to look at the fire system and that Rydon were working on a design to bring the fire system back up and running by Christmas. It was recorded that I would be speaking to Janice Wray to consider fire panel review procedures and it was noted that the Fire Brigade were aware that the fire alarm system did not work.
- 255 There were further references to John Hoban and Paul Hanson having been appointed on behalf of Building Control and there were ongoing discussions regarding the smoke extraction system.
- 256 I updated the Capital Programme Team Meeting on 23 October 2014 (CW/68:TMO10007704). I noted that the Grenfell Tower project was five weeks behind schedule but that this was not critical as Rydon felt at this stage they would be able to make up the time that had been lost.
- 257 I also noted that the architects had informed the project team that there was a design issue with the proposed new windows. As a result, the windows format and ironmongery were changed with restricted fitters.
- 258 I gave residents a full update on progress in my Newsletter of November 2014 (CW/69: ).

- 259 By email exchanges on 7 and 10 November (CW/70:TMO00837709) with Simon Lawrence at Rydon and Bruce Sounes I reported their observations on the window drawing 1279 SK12 issue one, issued by Rydon and referring to Max Fordham's report of September 2012.
- 260 I asked if there were options that would comply with building regulations regarding the window sizes and the use of restrictors as necessary, all aimed at preserving the efficiency of the new heating installation. Simon Lawrence responded identifying that the options were based on a central pivot style window rather than a tilt and turn style based on preferences within Max Fordham's Stage C report and he commented that he thought it would be prudent for him to "*first discuss the financial and manufacturing implications with my supply chain so we have an idea of this type of window in comparison to the tendered one*". He referred to the central pivot or reversible style windows not being manufactured by all suppliers so choice may be reduced, which might lead to cost being increased.
- 261 Rydon were then working on the basis of tilt and turn windows as per the tender documents but the TMO asked them to look at centre pivot as a result of concerns on the overheating issue. Fully reversible windows were not looked at because there were safety issues over leaning out too far to clean and causing falls or items to drop.
- 262 Bruce Sounes responded in terms, indicating that the central pivot windows were initially proposed by Max Fordham as being optimum for ventilation and they performed slightly better. Bruce Sounes indicated that the decider was that the windows need to be cleaned safely from inside and improve the existing barrier condition both for safety and to discourage people throwing things out. They felt that the reversible window would create an unacceptably large opening with the likelihood of having to reach out to pull the window back in. The preference, therefore, from the safety perspective was to install tilt and turn windows.
- 263 On 11 November 2014 (CW/71:TMO10042345) I produced a paper summarising the position regarding the windows. It reported that the client team on design inception requested that the design of the windows met the requirement of preventing falls as well as deterring residents from throwing things out of windows and noted the initial proposals which moved firstly from a large central pivot with tilt and turn with a small casement.

- 264 It was clear that cutting larger structural openings to every resident's window may cause difficulties and disruption, particularly in relation to internal fixtures and fittings.
- 265 It was therefore proposed that the windows would fit within the structural openings which would remove these additional issues and Rydon were to confirm that the new proposed windows will meet the existing building regulations for refurbishment standards.
- 266 The respective pros and cons were identified and it was concluded that "subject to Rydon confirming the tilt and turn windows will meet building regulations, the recommendation is that tilt and turn windows are used at Grenfell". There was no consideration and discussion regarding the materials to be used for fitting the windows.
- 267 At the Artelia Progress Meeting No. 5 on 18 November 2014 (CW/1:TMO10007909) the matter of window sizes was raised and Rydon reported that if the windows were sized to fit in existing opening they could overlaid on the existing trim around the internal windows and give a clean finish internally avoiding resident disruption and making good. A sample window was to be fixed to the pilot flat for December so that residents could see what the new window looked like as a finished product. Simon Lawrence of Rydon was instructed to prepare drawings for the non-material amendment application and put application into the Planning office as soon as possible with efforts made to getting it processed faster. Consideration was to be given as to whether to order windows ahead of planning approval because of the impact of delay. This was confirmed in writing by Philip Booth of Artelia by email dated 26 November 2014 (CW/2:TMO10007968).
- 268 I updated the Capital Programme Team Meeting on 27 November 2014 (CW/3:TMO10008749) and reported that a mock-up of the window design would be ready for December. I referred to Rydon's RLO (Maxine Igbinedion) being removed from the site after she was threatened with a knife by a resident who was later taken to court by TMO over this.
- 269 I gave residents an update on progress in the December Newsletter (CW/72:TMO00833966).
- 270 There were numerous email exchanges in early December seeking tentative approval from the planners and discussion on the costs of ordering the windows ahead of approval.

Artelia's assessment of the window material costs from Rydon's tender was roughly £1.28m and all of this discussion was to do with programming the windows and their cost of ordering ahead of planning approval. There was no discussion regarding the method of installation or by whom.

- 271 In the event, on 2 January 2015 the Planning Authority gave approval to a non-material amendment to "*change window sizes to be as existing*".
- 272 In their Progress Report No. 6 dated 5 December 2014 (CW/73:TMO10042700), Rydon reported that John Hoban from Building Control was making regular visits and there had been a meeting with Mr Hoban and his colleague, Mr Hanson, regarding a way forward with the AOV system in Grenfell Tower. At the Artelia Progress Meeting No. 6 on 11 December 2014 (CW/74:TMO00833997), it was recorded that Rydon's specialist AOV contractor had presented a scheme to Building Control who were apparently happy with the principle and requested a few changes. It was my role to update the Fire Brigade and risk assessment in January, which I did.
- 273 John Rowan and Partners reported in their Site Inspection Report of 12 December 2014 (CW/75:TMO00835977) that Rydon had issued a new contract programme to Artelia with the details of the implications of the change of design of the windows which were then yet to be agreed. It was recorded that with the change of design and the exterior cladding and size of the windows, the site manager was not sure of the programme implications. Approval was expected on 7 January 2015 so it was thought hopeful that Rydon could order new windows from the week commencing 12 January 2015. It was also noted that the last Building Control visit was on 26 November 2014, two weeks earlier.
- 274 I updated residents in the January 2015 Newsletter (CW/76:TMO10023233).
- 275 David Gibson updated the TMO Programme Board on 15 January 2015 (CW/77:TMO10008807) regarding the windows by explaining that planning permission for the non-material change had been granted.
- 276 In Artelia's Progress Meeting No 7 on 20 January 2015 (CW/78:TMO10008776) reference was made to the detailed design of the AOV submitted to Building Control and

extending it to additional floors. I was required to advise LFB that the works were due to start. I did this.

- 277 The Programme Board was updated on 26 January 2015 (CW/79:TMO10008699) to confirm that previous permission allowed for all windows to be widened by approximately 150mm but there were concerns about increased disruption this would cause to residents with the contractor spending more time in each units, increased decoration allowances and possible claims for new curtains, blinds etc, and awaiting this permission had caused some delays and potentially increased costs even though there was less work in each unit which should allow the contractor to recover some lost time. I also explained that the windows were awaited for resident consultations expected by 2 February 2015.
- 278 It was noted also that Eddie Daffarn had complained about the lack of choice in window selection. It was noted that the planning permission required to convert offices to flats had been received on 30 December and that two additional flats had been agreed increasing the original number from 7 to 9.
- 279 In my Newsletter of February 2015 (CW/80:TMO00007075) I updated residents with what had been happening and introduced them to our Clerk of Works who had been on site looking at communal issues for a number of months by this time but this was to inform residents that those gentlemen would need to gain access to their flats from time to time to carry out inspections and that this would be organised by the Rydon's RLOs.
- 280 By email dated 3 February 2015 (CW/81:TMO10008744) Neil Crawford on behalf of Studio E wrote to Terry Ashton at Exova to raise a query in relation to electrical risers which were said to be fire-sealed at each floor. It was noted that the access panels to the electrical cupboards were in some cases chipboard, and Terry Ashton was asked whether this was compliant and whether there was a need to introduce a false ceiling in these lobbies which may require some modification to these panels and whether they needed to be fire rated at 30 minutes or 60 minutes.
- 281 Terry Ashton replied stating that the risers are fire stopped at every floor level and there would be no need for the access doors to be fire rated as well. This information was later relayed to me on 10 February 2015 as it had been an issue raised by the Fire Brigade at



the unannounced visit on 10 February 2015 with Simon Lawrence of Rydon. Simon Lawrence through Studio E took Exova advice and reported back as above.

- 282 Rydon reported there was an unannounced visit that day from the local Fire Brigade, who were carrying out checks on Grenfell as a whole (CW/82:TMO10008744) . The officer went to the site office and asked to be shown Rydon's works, particularly in the communal areas. It was reported that "*when they stopped on a random floor the officer went to check the dry riser and noticed that an electrical riser panel was broken in half*". I referred the matter to Janice Wray, who sought an opinion from Carl Stokes, who responded by email on 10 February (CW/83:TMO10008744) stating that "as the risers are fire stopped at each floor level there is no requirement for the panels etc. on to the lift lobby areas to be fire rated, this is as per the building regulations requirements". He commented "the fire officer is correct in stating that the fire resistance between a shaft and a lobby area is generally 30 minutes, but this is not a shaft as there is fire stopping at each floor level, a shaft travels through floors with not fire stopping, as long as the floor slab is not breached by gaps and holes etc. then this is a floor and the cables and any pipes etc could be accessible". He offered to attend site on Thursday and Janice Wray agreed to him doing so.
- 283 John Rowan and Partners reported progress on 4 and 17 February (CW/84:TMO00832024) (CW/85:TMO00833931) in their Site Inspection Reports, and the impact of design changes on the programme.
- 284 My March 2015 Newsletter (CW/86:TMO10008984) referred amongst other things to the respite flat, flat 145. This flat was available and used as an area of respite while work was being done to individual homes. This flat was also used for drop in sessions and impromptu meetings, etc.
- 285 John Rowan and Partners reported further on 2 and 11 March 2015 (CW/87:TMO00831691) and Rydon reported progress in their Progress Report No. 9 dated 12 March 2015 ( CW/88:TMO00833787)
- 286 I met Daniel Hallissey of LFB shortly before 10 April 2015 and I emailed him on 10 April with information that he had requested in relation to the programmed lift works and

I provided him with a summary in that regard. I also put him in touch with Simon O'Connor, Site Manager at Rydon to consider whether a further visit was necessary.

- 287 John Rowan and Partners reported progress in their report dated 13 April 2015 (CW/89:TMO00832732) and David Gibson attended the TMO Programme Board on 16 April 2015 (CW/90:TMO10009164) to report progress on site. Included in that report was reference to the fact that we had received positive feedback in relation to the windows samples but Eddie Daffarn was saying that residents would have less daylight. He said that he did not want new windows to be installed in his property until he had obtained legal advice on the issue. Questions of access to the flats was raised and it was noted that Peter Maddison had taken Cllr Blakeman to see the works so she was up to date with progress.
- 288 In their **Progress Report No. 10, dated 17 April 2015 (CW/91:TMO00830385)** Rydon **reported progress on the fixing of angles and façade brackets and mast climbers as work for the cladding commenced** and it recorded there that the original client changed to aluminium rain screen with aesthetics and colours approved by the local planning authority. They also referred to the client change sample window installed and approved by client and recorded that residents had also viewed a sample.
- 289 The report noted that Building Control had been on site on 17 November to inspect.
- 290 In the Artelia Progress Meeting No. 9 on 17 March 2015 (CW/92:TMO00829504) it was recorded that TMO and Rydon were to keep the Fire Brigade informed about works on site and there were particular references to the AOV system in this regard.
- 291 Further reports were received from John Rowan and Partners throughout 2015 and in turn I reported progress to the Grenfell Project Team and updated all concerned with the progress of the refurbishment. Residents were kept informed by further Newsletters.
- 292 I updated residents with my Newsletter of May 2015.
- 293 In their Progress Report Number 11 dated 15 May 2015 (CW/93:TMO00832911), Rydon reported amongst other things that Building Control had been on site on Friday 15 May 2015 to inspect the top three floors for insulation, fire break and window installation on

three elevations and had no adverse comments. This was repeated in the Artelia Progress Meeting No 11 dated 19 May 2015 (CW/94:TMO00832901).

- 294 In their Site Inspection Report dated 12 May 2015 (CW/95:TMO00829424), John Rowan and Partners reported that the last Building Control site visit was Friday, 15 May, and *“the only observation was that further details of the cladding fire breaks were required. Rydon to confirm if they have done this”*. Jon White of John Rowan and Partners indicated that he would start inspecting the cladding externally the following week and Rydon said they were due to start the internal window works the following week so that could be inspected at the same time.
- 295 I had no understanding of the detail of the cladding fire breaks but I took some comfort that these were being considered by John Rowan and Partners, Rydon and RBKC Building Control.
- 296 There had been some concerns raised by residents in relation to the location of the HIU within the interior of flats and these were changed as a consequence of consultation. Reference to this was made in the Newsletter that went out in June 2015 (CW/96:TMO00835236).
- 297 I reported to the Capital Investment Team meeting on 23 June 2015 (CW/97:TMO10009556) that Rydon had advised that the programme would complete on time. I reported that there had been problems with heating, water and lifts, that these were being attended to and I also reported that there was some disquiet amongst the residents regarding access. I also recorded that on a positive note the “cladding looks good”. This reflected the widely expressed views by residents and others that the appearance of the cladding was impressive.
- 298 Further Progress Reports followed, identifying that Rydon were slipping behind in their programme for fitting the cladding and in my Newsletter of July/August 2015, (CW/98: ) I reported to residents that completion was getting closer.
- 299 In my September 2015 Newsletter (CW/99: ) I reported that we had received positive feedback about the installation of the new windows and confirmed that when each flat’s windows had been fitted, Rydon would show the residents how they operated

and they would be given a useful handbook. I pointed out that the windows were a slightly different size to the old ones and open in a different way and some residents may find their blinds and curtains needed altering. If they had any problems in this regard, they should contact Rydon's RLO.

- 300 In their Progress Report Number 15 dated 11 September 2015 (CW/100:TMO10009943) Rydon reported that there had been a visit from RBKC Building Control to check the external cladding and fire break.
- 301 In the Artelia Progress Meeting Minutes of the meeting on 18 September 2015 (CW/101:TMO00829072) it was reported that the cladding contractor had gone into liquidation. The remaining panels required were already manufactured and Rydon planned to purchase these directly from the liquidator and to supply a new installation subcontractor. Rydon had arranged a novation of the contract from the old contractor to the new one for fixing only. There were no reported changes to the formalities of the warranty.
- 302 I updated the Capital Investment Team on 24 September 2015 (CW/102:TMO10010552).
- 303 In my Newsletter for October 2015 (CW/103:TMO10011410), I reported that nine new homes on the lower floor were nearly finished and that we had received positive feedback in relation to the installation of new windows, repeating that the windows were of a different size to the old ones and opened in a different way, such that residents may find the blinds and curtains may need ordering, and that this should be referred to Rydon.
- 304 In their report of 17 November 2015 (CW/104:TMO00833024), John Rowan and Partners referred to the RBKC Building Control visit that day. They reported that they were looking at the cladding and apart from identifying damaged panels and some bits of making good the Inspector was generally happy.
- 305 Further reporting from John Rowan and Partners throughout 2015 expressed continuing concerns about slippage in the programme but no other major concerns
- 306 In the Artelia meeting minutes of 17 November 2015 (CW/105:TMO10011410), there was reference to the new CDM Regulations 2015 and it recorded that where the Principal

Designer appointment finishes before the end of the works, then the Principal Contractor takes on the Principal Designer role and in so doing put together the health and safety file for that client. However, it was agreed that Rydon were not the Principal Designer under the 2015 Regulations and TMO as client would be identified for this role as a formality even though TMO had no design capability and there was no design element left within the contract. TMO took on this role purely to fulfil the CDM requirement.

- 307 In my Newsletter of December 2015 (CW/106:TMO10023046) I was able to report to residents that the external cladding to the building was nearly complete and in their report of 3 December 2015 (CW/107:TMO00829693) John Rowan and Partners reported that the snagging of the cladding had started.
- 308 In their Site Inspection Report of 10 December 2015 (CW/108:TMO00835939), John Rowan and Partners reported that all 120 windows had been fitted but the external cladding from the third floor down on all elevations was not at that time ready for snagging. It was reported that RBKC Building Control was last on site two weeks earlier looking at the cladding and that apart from the damaged panels and bits of making good, the Building Control Inspector was generally happy.
- 309 Rydon and Building Control met on 6 January 2016 which gave rise to some fire issues prior to final certification and Building Control recommended that a Fire Risk Assessment should be conducted to reflect that access to the building had changed and the additional occupation of new flats. In Artelia's minutes of 26 January 2016 it was noted that the Inspector had identified areas of existing fire compartmentation which needed addressing and it was suggested that it would be beneficial for TMO to carry out these works to improve the condition of the building. It is not identified what these works were but they were to be reviewed in conjunction with the TMO fire risk assessor.
- 310 In the Artelia's Progress Report of 26 January 2016 (CW/109:TMO00832425) it was noted by Rydon that the Building Control Inspector had identified areas of existing fire compartmentation which needed addressing and Steve Blake of Rydon was actioned to produce proposals for the work. I cannot recall what this related to.
- 311 In my February 2016 Newsletter (CW/110:TMO00830724) I referred to a door-knocking exercise we had conducted on 18 and 21 December whereby we visited every flat to



check all was well in preparation for the Christmas period. Such issues as had been identified were recorded in the Newsletter.

- 312 In their Site Inspection Report of 10 February 2016, John Rowan and Partners reported that the external cladding was still not finished but most of the mast climbers had now been dismantled. The bottom three floors had yet to be finished but would be snagged mainly from a cherry picker. It was also noted that the last Building Control site visit was the previous month (January) and it was noted that the Fire Brigade visited for a site familiarisation on 2 February 2016 walking around the building with Rydon.
- 313 At the Artelia Progress Meeting No. 21 on 22 March 2016 (CW/111:TMO10012438) the question of fire compartmentation was tabled and it was recorded that Steve Blake of Rydon had met with Carl Stokes, TMO's fire risk assessor. It was reported that Rydon were advised not to introduce or alter any further fire protection works and nothing further was to be progressed other than the remedial work required of the Clerk of Works in relation to Rydon's own works.
- 314 I liaised with Carl Stokes on this and it was recorded that Carl Stokes would produce a report in the form of a fire risk assessment identifying any shortfalls which would be submitted to me on or near completion. There was a request that this assessment be included in the CDM health and safety file on completion.
- 315 In the April 2016 Newsletter (CW/112:TMO00831635) I reported to residents that the cladding was complete apart from the lower level and south side facing Grenfell Walk and that the new smoke system was now operational and linked to the boiler system in case of fire.
- 316 Of significance perhaps, I passed on to residents the instruction that had been emphasised by LFB who asked us to re-inforce the message to residents that *"if there is a fire which is not inside your own home, you are generally safest to stay put in your home to begin with; the Fire Brigade will arrive very quickly if a fire is reported. The only reason you should leave your home is if the fire is in your home. In this case you and your family should leave the flat immediately: close the door behind you, leave the building and call the 999 giving your address and postcode. If there is a fire in the block near your flat*



*and you believe you are at risk and would prefer to evacuate the building then please do so using the stairs and wait outside the building for the Fire Brigade to arrive”.*

- 317 At Artelia’s Progress Meeting Number 22 on 19 April 2016 (CW/113:TMO10013225), it was reported that Steve Blake of Rydon had met with Carl Stokes, who had advised Rydon not to introduce or alter any further fire protection works and nothing further was to be progressed other than the remedial works required of the Clerk of Works in relation to Rydon’s own works and that I was to liaise with Carl Stokes and confirm that this was indeed the case. It was identified that Carl Stokes would produce a report in the form of a fire risk assessment identifying any shortfalls which would be submitted to TMO on completion.
- 318 By email dated 27 of April 2016 (CW/114:TMO10013128) I wrote to David Hughes of Rydon requesting a copy of the latest fire strategy document. He indicated that he had only the original version from Exova and indicated that as far as he was aware it had not been updated from the tender. I also asked where the disconnection of the gas main was referenced in the fire strategy in relation to the smoke ventilation system as the boilers turn off if the smoke alarm system was activated.. He indicated that they had followed Max Fordham’s specification, which would have used the outline fire strategy as guidance.
- 319 Carl Stokes conducted a further fire risk assessment required under the Regulatory Reform Order because of the change of use of the property, and he produced a report and a record of his significant findings and action plan dated 26 April 2016 (CW/6:TMO10016585) which I forwarded to Rydon for completion and which they recorded their responses in the action plan record.
- 320 He noted in the assessment, that he had conducted a visual inspection and reviewed information gathered from the buildings’ occupants, TMO employees and from analysis of documents provided by TMO and concluded that, without conducting an invasive structural investigation, the building’s structure, the construction and any refurbishments of the building had gone through the building regulations process.
- 321 He noted that new external cladding had been fitted to the building as part of the project of refurbishment/construction work being undertaken on and within the building. The

original external face of the building had been over clad and the new fire rated cladding was fixed to the out face of the building by metal fixings and the whole process has been overseen by the RBKC Building Control department and officers. They have approved and accepted the fixing systems and the cladding used. He noted that *“there are no apparent unusual elements of building construction that were considered to add a significant additional contribution to the fire risk”*.

- 322 Mr Stokes referred to the “stay put” evacuation strategy and what that meant and identified that this was the general advice provided by the LFB as noted on their website and as communicated to the residents.
- 323 In the May 2016 Newsletter to residents (CW/9:TMO10013653) I introduced residents to Nicola Bartholomew, who was TMO’s new neighbourhood management team leader, who started on 3rd May and who was the new point of contact with Rydon having left site.
- 324 In that Newsletter I made further reference to the “stay put” fire policy and identified that the smoke detection systems had been upgraded and extended.
- 325 I also relayed to residents the Fire Brigade’s message which they wished me to reinforce namely that *“if there is a fire not inside your own home, you are generally safest to stay put in your home to begin with; the Fire Brigade will arrive very quickly if a fire is reported. The only reason you should leave your home is if the fire is inside your home in this case you and your family should leave the flat immediately: close your door behind you, leave the building and call the 999 giving your address and postcode. If there is a fire in the block near your flat and you believe you are at risk and would prefer to evacuate the building then please do so using the stairs and wait outside the building for the Fire Brigade to arrive”*.
- 326 By letter dated 2 June 2016 (CW/115:TMO10013670) John Allen of Building Control wrote to Rydon identifying some of the issues that remained outstanding prior to a completion certificate being available.

- 327 Carl Stokes produced his fire risk assessment for Grenfell Tower on 20 June 2016, in which he identified that he had consulted with me, Rydon and the residents of the building.
- 328 He made reference to the new external cladding and particularly that the building had been over clad with a new fire rated cladding fixed to the out face of the building by metal fixings and the whole process has been overseen by RBKC Building Control Department, who had approved and accepted the fixing systems and cladding used.
- 329 He made further reference to the stay put policy and identifying that residents could remain within their own dwelling during a fire incident unless the fire is in that dwelling or their dwelling was affected by the fire in which case they should immediately evacuate their dwelling and call the fire and rescue service and the fire service or TMO employees would arrange for a general evacuation of the whole building at any time if this was appropriate to do so. Alternatively the resident can leave their dwelling at any time if they wish to do so, and he recorded that TMO provided this information to all residents by various means.
- 330 His fire risk assessment predicated on the integrity of the compartmentation and the approval works by RBKC Building Control and he noted that “during the construction work this building. The LFB fire safety and operational fire crews had visited the building on numerous occasions and no adverse comments had been received in relation to the work being undertaken or regarding far services access to the building or site”.
- 331 Throughout all of this project I received and passed on reports relative to the progress and the monitoring of work against budget with a view to informing the Asset Management Team, the Grenfell Project Team, TMO Board and most importantly to keep residents informed as to progress and so they were aware of the potential impact on their daily lives and to be able to accommodate the works.
- 332 In the March 2017 Newsletter (CW/116:TMO10031157) some months later I drew attention to the fact that several residents had carried out minor adaptations or alterations to their homes. I reminded the residents that any changes to the layout of a flat must be approved by the TMO.

- 333 By email dated 28 March 2017 (CW/117: ) Emma Kelly on behalf of Rydon reported that they had attended and reported upon the number of reports in relation to reported defective windows at four different flats within the Tower and all were deemed to be the consequence of misuse and not defects for which Rydon were responsible.
- 334 I joined TMO in September 2013 and remained with the Grenfell Tower Refurbishment project from that date until its completion. My role and my focus was to accommodate the works with the aim of minimising disruption to the residents and to attempt to provide for their needs during the works and following. My role was to communicate with resident to achieve this as best I could. TMO was the client or customer in the project and I considered myself to be representing the residents' interests in this regard. I believe I did this to the best of my ability to do so.
- 335 My role included keeping residents informed and liaising with them and various parties within TMO and the consultant project team. It was specifically a monitoring and coordination role to make the project run as smoothly as it could. The role was one of facilitation not decision-making. It was not our role to be involved in those issues which were within the technical expertise of the specialist contractors engaged for that purpose. The project team of consultants were the experts engaged to design and develop the refurbishment work to meet the project requirements and to ensure that all completed works would be compliant with all legislation regulation standards and guidance.
- 336 I have by this statement endeavoured to answer all points raised and identified by the Inquiry and to do so as helpfully as I can to assist the Inquiry identify all safety lessons. I would be happy, by way of further statement, to clarify any points made here as necessary and to respond to any other issues Inquiry wishes to raise.

**The contents of this statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief. I am content for this statement to form part of the evidence before the inquiry and published on the Inquiry's web site.**

Signed... Claire Williams ...  
Dated... 15/2/2019 ...