

**KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA
TENANT MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION**

Grenfell Review Scoping Meeting

**Wednesday 24th February 2016 at 5pm
Board Room, 346 Kensington High Street**

Present:	Paula Fance	TMO Board Member
	Councillor Condon-Simmonds	TMO Board Member
	Kush Kanodia	TMO Board Member
	Anne Duru	TMO Board Member
	Deborah Price	TMO Board Member
	Sacha Jevans	Executive Director of Operations
	Yvonne Birch	Executive Director of People and Per

Item	Minute	Action
1.0	<u>Welcome and Purpose of meeting</u>	
1.1	Sacha Jevans welcomed attendees.	
1.2	Sacha Jevans explained that the purpose of the meeting was to review the Grenfell project in light of the speech made to RBKC's Scrutiny Committee by a resident. Scrutiny Committee suggested that a panel of TMO Board Members review the concerns raised and feedback on their findings.	
1.3	Sacha Jevans also noted that a full review of the work carried out at Grenfell and satisfaction survey will be carried on completion of the project. Contractors are still on site until the end of March.	
1.4	It was agreed that a formal report would be the most appropriate method of feedback to Scrutiny Committee. It was further <u>agreed</u> that the TMO would draft the report and allow the Board Panel to review before sending to the Council. The final report will be submitted by the Board.	
2.0	<u>Structure of the Group</u>	
2.1	Paula Fance was nominated as the Chair of the Panel and agreed to lead the discussions and report back.	
3.0	<u>Scope of the Review Day</u>	
3.1	The panel reviewed the list of concerns that will be addressed on the Review day. Yvonne Birch noted that it is not certain how many people the resident is representing and it is therefore difficult to say who shares these concerns.	

3.2	Paula Fance asked the Panel if they had anything to add to this list at the scoping stage.	
3.3	Deborah Price would like to consider and review how Board Members	
3.4	communicate with residents. Deborah Price would like to know if the correct process was used by Cllr Blakeman to report complaints to the Board.	
3.5	Paula Fance agreed but advised that the review meeting is not the appropriate forum for this discussion. Deborah Price would like this to be addressed in another forum if necessary. Paula Fance recommended seeking the guidance of the Company Secretary on this issue. This was agreed with the panel.	
3.6	Anne Duru suggested clarifying the procedures for Solicitor's letters and addressing the lack of response from the CSC. Yvonne Birch noted that the CSC have not been the focus of the complaints but rather the fact that complaints have not been answered.	
3.7	Sacha Jevans noted that there are two RLO's based at Grenfell Tower from Rydon's for resident issues and then escalated to Claire Williams. Claire Williams publishes her direct line on the Grenfell newsletter. Anne Duru suggested the link between RLO's and the TMO and how information is communicated between Rydon's RLO's and the Project Manager is not clear.	SJ
	Sacha Jevans to confirm that liaison meetings are held between the Project Manager and RLO's. Anne Duru and Paula Fance stated that the RLO's should be taking detailed notes of the enquiries they receive.	
	Kush Kanodia suggested having a dedicated Officer for residents and communications for each project and producing a list of changes in residents' circumstances. There could be a sign off process for checking whether circumstances have changed e.g. Growth of family. Kush Kanodia also suggested that issues affecting a group being reported as a group concern specifically for projects e.g. HIU location. There should be a way to expedite and look at complaints within a group for regeneration projects.	SJ/YB
	Kush Kanodia also suggested adding lessons learned for future projects and the Procedure for sending solicitor's letters to the scope of the review meeting.	SJ/YB
	a) <u>Lack of consultation/resident engagement</u>	
	Paula Fance suggested reviewing what evidence there is to support that a proper consultation was carried out.	
	A timeline of the engagement and copies of newsletters and letters sent to all residents would be useful. It was agreed that a sample of the communication would be taken due to the large volume of information. Summaries of the communication should also be provided. Any members of the group who would like an in depth bundle they should let Sacha Jevans and Yvonne Birch know.	SJ/YB
	Anne Duru requested copies of all letters sent to residents.	

	<p>Kush Kanodia would like to know what the sign off process is to show that a resident has understood the communication. Sacha Jevans responded that at the start of the project the RLO's visited all residents and there should be evidence of this.</p> <p>b) <u>The positioning of HIU's in hallways</u></p> <p>Paula Fance noted that this was consulted on and it was agreed that variations could be made.</p> <p>Kush Kanodia asked to clarify if there was ambiguity in the communication given to residents as to how residents were consulted on this issue. Yvonne Birch explained that Peter Maddison will be able to go through the technical reasons behind the decisions made by the TMO and how this development in the project was communicated to residents.</p> <p>c) <u>Threats, harassment, lies and intimidation</u></p> <p>Paula Fance stated that this view is subjective and would therefore be difficult to comment on whether this happened. Sacha Jevans added that the only accusations of this nature are in the speech and are only in relation to the issuing of Solicitor's letters. There is no further evidence of threats/harassment. The Panel can therefore only review the procedure for issuing Solicitor's letters.</p> <p>The Board Panel discussed the appropriateness of reviewing Cllr Blakeman's emails. It was <u>agreed</u> that the report should mention that resident complaints from meetings were later not substantiated with evidence and therefore cannot be reviewed.</p> <p>d) <u>Lack of response to legitimate complaints</u></p> <p>Yvonne Birch advised the TMO have reviewed every complaint received on this (all recorded through the formal complaints process. A summary of each complaint will be provided for the Review day.</p> <p>SJ noted that this is a wider issue as it feeds in to numerous service improvements that are being addressed on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>PF said that they need to consider the success of the complaints procedure in capturing the concerns of the residents. SJ drew distinction between complaints through the normal procedure and complaints in the context of Grenfell Tower which relate to the</p> <p>Poor Workmanship and Site Management</p> <p>KK noted it will be difficult to measure as the panel will only see the project at the end of the process. YB advised that information is being pulled together on the number of sign offs received. The COW has produced reports on each visit and assessment that was done.</p> <p>SJ noted that there was disruption which should be acknowledged and Peter</p>	<p>SJ/YB</p> <p>SJ</p>
--	---	------------------------

	<p>Maddison will explain on the review day the technical detail behind this issue.</p> <p>KK suggested looking at the state of the communal areas that have apparently been left worse than before. KK would like to make sure communal areas are left in good condition. SJ noted that there was disruption and that the project is not yet finished.</p> <p>AD would like information on how the RLO's record enquiries. SJ and YB confirmed that the RLO's re on site and would deal with concerns on site on a case by case basis. PF suggested looking at this at the meeting.</p> <p>Compensation The outcomes of the compensation requests will be looked at on the review day. YB noted the Council considered a petition for compensation and it was not agreed. We can include the TMO's compensation procedure. Requests for compensation have been made for £1500 for the level of disruption experienced.</p>	
4.0	<u>Format for Review Day</u>	
4.1	SJ circulated a draft of the timings for the review day. SJ will ask Peter Maddison to address the specific issues raised at the scoping meeting.	
4.2	it is suggested that the presentation will be done at the 346 office.	
4.3	YB advised it is important to show the board that this panel has considered the information brought forward and what the lessons learned are. Is there any substance to the allegations made. Scrutiny want to ensure that this has been investigated but need to ensure that this is not expanded beyond the remit of this investigation.	
4.4		
4.5		
4.6		
4.7	DP noted that the board may need to acknowledge that there will be a level of disruption for residents when regeneration takes places whilst residents are in situ. Can look at the strategy for future projects.	
5.0	<u>Timings for the Review Day</u>	
5.1	Sacha Jevans circulated a document outlining the suggested timings for the Review day.	
6.0	<u>AOB</u>	
6.1	YB wanted to clarify the board are happy with the structure of the day and are happy that no information is circulated before the review meeting but will be available on the day.	
6.2	SJ and YB and PM will be available on the day.	
6.3	CM to arrange lunch - sandwiches etc.	

--	--	--