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Monday, 26 April 2021
(10.00 am)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to
    today's hearing. Today we're going to hear evidence
    from some additional employees of the TMO.
        So, Mr Gadd, who is our first witness?
MR GADD: Good morning, Mr Chairman. Good morning, members
        of the panel. Can I call Siobhan Rumble.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you.
                    MS SIOBHAN RUMBLE (sworn)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. Now, sit down
    and make yourself comfortable.
            Right, yes, Mr Gadd.
            Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY
MR GADD: Good morning, Ms Rumble.
            Can I start by thanking you very much for attending
        at this public inquiry to give your evidence. We're
        very grateful to you.
            If you have any difficulty understanding any of the
    questions I'm going to ask you, please say and I' II ask
    them again or put them in a different way.
            If you feel you need a break at any time, please let
        us know. We will aim to break once in the morning at
        least, but if you need a break at any other point, just
        signal and we'll aim to break then.
            1
        The other thing I would ask you to do is please try
        to keep your voice up, so that the transcriber, who is
        sitting to your right, can hear you very clearly and get
        down your evidence.
A. Yes.
Q. It also helps not to nod or shake in response to any
    questions, but to say audibly "yes" or "no".
        You have made three statements to the Inquiry.
        Could I please take you to them. They're in a folder on
        your desk and they will appear on the screen.
            The first statement is dated 8 February 2019. On
        {TMO00000891/15} there is a signature. Is that your
        signature?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you sign that statement on 8 February 2019?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to call that your first statement.
            Can we go to the next statement, {TMO10050001}.
        That is a statement dated 31 August 2019. Can we go to
        page 4, please. Again, do you recognise that signature?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it yours?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you sign that on 31 August 2019?
A. Yes.
```

Q. I'm going to call this your second witness statement.

Can we then go to $\{T M O 00870943\}$. That should be a statement dated 12 May 2020. The signature is on page 5. Again, is that your signature?
A. Yes.
Q. You signed that on 12 May 2020?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you read those statements recently?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you confirm that the contents are true?
A. They are, but there's an error I noticed. I started in November 2011, not 2012, as my statement says.
Q. That's very helpful.

Aside from that, are the contents true?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you discussed your statements or your evidence with anyone else in advance of coming here today?
A. About a year ago, I did, because I wanted to clarify the spreadsheet, because that kept coming back in the witness statement, and I couldn't remember, and I needed to remember. So I did ask my colleague at the TMO, which just clarified for me.
Q. We may come on to that spreadsheet --
A. That's fine, yeah.
Q. -- in due course, so you can inform us of your knowledge
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at that point.
A. Yeah.
Q. As you say, in your witness statement you referred to starting in November 2012, but we now know then it's November 2011.
A. 2011.
Q. Thank you.

I'm going to ask you some questions about your background and training.

You set out at paragraph 6 of your first witness statement $\{$ TMO00000891/1\} that you began your career at the London Borough of Southwark, and then you moved to Sanctuary Housing Association and, over the page \{TMO00000891/2\}, Hyde Housing and Crawley Borough Council.

Now, in those roles, did you ever come across personal emergency evacuation plans, or PEEPs?
A. No.
Q. In any role at all? So you were at Southwark. Did you hear --
A. Never.
Q. -- of PEEPs at Southwark?
A. Never.
Q. Did you receive any training in any of those roles in relation to fire safety?

```
A. I'm sure I would have done, but I can't remember any
    specific training.
Q. Can you remember any general topics that you would have
        covered in that training?
A. In regards to fire safety?
Q. Mm-hm.
A. Not really.
Q. Would you have carried out any training in respect to
    residents' fire safety in general needs housing?
A. Not really, no.
Q. You joined the TMO in 2011, and your title was area
    housing manager for Lancaster West; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you recall who interviewed you for that role?
A. Alasdair Manson, and it was the board, so Bob -- I can't
        remember his surname now, but Bob was the Chair of the
        board.
Q. That's the TMO board?
A. Yes -- no, the EMB board.
Q. The EMB board?
A. Yeah,I think it was just Alasdair and Bob.
Q. Did you know either of those two before you had your
        interview?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. Did you have any formal qualifications that were
```
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relevant to that role at TMO?
A. It was -- I mean, my experience, I'd done the HNC in
housing, went to college for four years, but if I'm
honest, I don't remember too much about those
four years. But a lot of it is practical on-the-job
learning. You learn through experience.
Q. Just for clarity 's sake --
A. Sorry.
Q. -- when was it that you were at college prior to -- how
long was it before you were at the TMO that you were at
college?
A. So I started my career in 1991. I think maybe 1997.
Q. So 15 years?
A. Yeah.
Q. Something like that.
Did you have any experience when you joined TMO,
recent experience, of resident engagement and
communications?
A. Well, yeah, because you're always getting involved,
whatever's going on on the estate, wherever you work,
there's always communications and resident engagement,
and previously where I worked we'd had a youth worker,
so you'd always be engaging with the residents on some
level.
Q. As part of the application process, either as part of
6
your written application for the role or during the interview, were you asked about fire safety training that you'd undertaken?
A. No.
Q. Never asked --
A. It wouldn't be part of -- I've never been asked that in any interview that I've had, no.
Q. Whether at TMO or prior to that?
A. No.
Q. Were you asked at any stage during the application process about interaction or experience dealing with vulnerable residents, or what might be termed vulnerable residents?
A. I couldn't tell you what the questions were, if I'm honest.
Q. Can we focus then on your role as area housing manager and some of the detail of that role.

Again, turning to your first witness statement, you say at paragraph $8\{$ TMO00000891/2\} that you were based at Lancaster West housing estate. You see that at paragraph 8?
A. Yeah.
Q. At paragraph 9, your responsibilities included the day-to-day running of the estate and ensuring that antisocial behaviour was addressed.
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A. Yep.
Q. Can you help us with, in terms of seniority, were you
    the most senior person working for the TMO based at the
    Lancaster West Estate?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you have been the main point of contact between
    the goings on on the Lancaster West Estate and the TMO?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it your role to ensure any health and safety checks
    that were carried out on the estate were carried out
    properly, correctly?
A. In regards to the estate inspections, yes, because those
    were responsible to me.
Q. Well, we'll come on to those in a moment.
            If any health and safety issues arose on the estate,
        or you were made aware of them, would it have been you
        that was responsible for liaising with the TMO health
        and safety team?
A. No.
Q. Who would have been responsible?
A. The caretakers -- well, caretakers; the estate services officers would do their inspections and they would ring through to the repairs and raise those repairs, and it was only if things weren't being done, they would come to me and then I would escalate it.
```

Q. As well as being the area housing manager for

Lancaster West, you were also, as I understand your statement, in charge of the income team across the TMO?
A. Correct.
Q. That's across all housing stock?
A. Yes.
Q. And the entire borough?
A. Yes.
Q. What did that role involve?
A. Making sure people paid their rent, getting people the help and support they needed to pay their rent, and if they didn't, then escalating it to the courts to get orders to make sure they paid their rent.
Q. Can you help us with the amount of time that you spent working in that role as income team leader compared to your role as area manager for Lancaster West? Could you help us with the division of labour?
A. Oh, I mean, most of my time -- I mean, I was always at Lancaster West, so that is where I worked and all my work was around Lancaster West and dealing with antisocial behaviour of youths. I'd be out and about -I wasn't a manager that just sat in the office, so I would be out and about and getting my hands dirty. That's just how we were down there. We all worked together.
Q. Did you feel that your role as income team leader impinged in any way on your ability to carry out your role on Lancaster West Estate?
A. Not at all, no.
Q. Can we look at training that you did with the TMO, and you talk about this in your second witness statement, if we could please pull that up, paragraph 3 ,
\{TMO10050001/1\}.
You say in that --I don't know if you just want to refresh your memory -- that you don't recall receiving any health and safety training while at the TMO.
(Pause)

Just to restate that, then, is your recollection that you don't recall any training in the four years that you were at TMO?
A. I don't. To be honest, I can just about remember like last week, but even where I currently work, I know I've done a load of training, but if someone asks me, "What training have you done?", I'd have to really sit and think, "What training have I done?", even though I know I've done a lot. So I'm not saying I didn't have any, but I really can't remember what training I had.
Q. Does that apply to fire safety training specifically as well? You may have had it but you can't recall?
A. I really don't know, I can't remember.
Q. Can I ask you whether you recall having any training on the TMO's fire safety strategy?
A. That, definitely no.
Q. The TMO's health and safety policy?
A. I can't remember, no.
Q. Can you recall ever requesting training on either of those things, on fire safety or health and safety?
A. No, I remember $--I$ can't remember for what reason, but I know I asked for some refresher training for the estate services officers, Paul and Rob, and I think that might have been when we had the issue with the fire extinguisher, and I think there was some refresher training. I do kind of semi-recall that, but not for myself, no.
Q. You didn't go on that training?
A. No.
Q. Can we look at your first witness statement again, paragraph 29 \{TMO00000891/6\}.

You say that before the refurbishment you were aware that Grenfell Tower had fire alarms, fire extinguishers, a ventilation system, communal fire doors, lifts and emergency lighting.
A. Yeah.
Q. You were also aware that there was a Fire Brigade drop key which could be used by the ESAs or the
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Fire Brigade to open the lift doors.
A. Yes.
Q. When you were recruited by the TMO, were you given any specific briefing on these various fire safety measures? A. No.
Q. Did you know anything about them other than the fact of their existence?
A. Just that they exist. And the guys had worked there a long time so they knew the estate very well.
Q. The Fire Brigade drop key, who told you about that? Who informed you about it?
A. I think just Paul and Rob, when they done their checks.
Q. Were you told what it was for, how it was to be used, who it was for?
A. Not in any detail, no, but I think it was to check that it was working.
Q. Right. Is that something that you gleaned or did someone come and specifically tell you that this is what it's for?
A. I don't remember anyone coming to specifically tell me that.
Q. You mentioned previously about the checklists and the estate services assistants -- is that the correct name for them?
A. Yes, ESAs.

```
Q. Now, I'm going to ask you some questions about ESAs.
            Part of your role involved supervising them; is that
        correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So Paul Steadman and Robert Regan?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you first about your supervising role in
    relation to the inspections.
    Do you recall the ESAs being trained to conduct the
    inspections that they carried out at any stage?
A. They may have done. They was already in post when
    I came to the role.
Q. So you're not aware if they were trained prior to that
    or not; is that fair?
A. No.
Q. And you wouldn't then have been involved in any training
        for them?
A. Not that I'm aware.
Q. Do you recall whether they were given any written
    guidance about those checks and inspections?
A. They had a check sheet to follow, so anyone could really
    come in and follow that check sheet, it wasn't kind of
    rocket science.
Q. You don't remember any kind of guidance document about what you should look for in those checks specifically?

\section*{A. No.}
```

Q. Specifically dealing with fire extinguishers, do you recall whether there was any guidance for checking those?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Or any training or guidance in relation to fire alarm tests, testing fire alarm systems?
A. No, it was just making sure they worked, and I think the fire extinguishers were part of the RGE contract, if I remember rightly.
Q. What was the consequence of that, were they --
A. They were our --1 think they were the electrical engineers. They used to be based in the office where we then got put.
Q. And that's on Lancaster West?
A. Yes.
Q. Right.
Can we go back to your first witness statement, paragraph 38, please, operator $\{$ TMO00000891/18\}.
You provide there some examples of what was included on the inspection sheets used by ESAs. If you look at example (e), you refer to the communal fire doors and chute room.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. Can we then go to your second witness statement at

```
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\]

A. Yes.
Q. Having raised that as an issue, do you know if they ever followed it up?
A. Well, it was part of their job to follow it up, so when they would do their next inspections, they would be checking that the stuff they raised previously had been actioned, and that's where sometimes I might get involved if weeks had gone past and something wasn't resolved.
Q. You would get involved how?
A. To then contact whoever at the hub to say that
a repair's been ordered, it's been several weeks, why
\[
10
\]
10
11 M
\[
12
\]
17
18 Q
20 A
hasn't it been done, because the estate inspectors knew
that they had to follow up. You don't just raise
a repair and then walk away from it; you then have to
follow up to make sure it's done.
Q. May I summarise my understanding?
A. Yeah.
Q. The check is made, let's say the self-closer is too slow. The repair is requested through the repairs desk. The estate inspector then checks again a couple of weeks later. If it hasn't been done, they then raise it with you. You then contact the repairs centre.
A. Yeah, not exactly, it might be they might have gone back to the repairs desk again, or they might come to me or they might come to me the second time, third time, you know, because they're going back to check, and if something's not done, then ...
Q. If you hadn't had any success with getting it repaired, either quickly or at all, what would you do? Who would you raise that with?
A. I mean, I know I could have gone to Janice Wray, being the health and safety officer, but I don't think we ever did, because I think once you chase something up, it gets -- however it's stuck in the system or whatever, it would end up getting done.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Can I just ask, do you know whether
\[
17
\]
there was any time within which ESAs had to go back and check whether a repair had actually been done?
A. No, they were doing weekly inspections anyway, because where we was situated, we was literally in the heart of the estate, so they was always out and about and in and out of the blocks all the time.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So they would check up as and when it was convenient?
A. Yeah, but they would do their regular inspection weekly. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
Just on a slightly different topic, in terms of flat doors, so the flat door entrance and closers on it, was there ever any discussion as far as you can recall for a routine inspection of flat entrance doors?
A. No, they never formed part of the ESAs' inspections, front entrance doors.
Q. Do you recall it ever being discussed not with ESAs but, say, higher up the TMO or with Janice Wray?
A. No.
Q. Can we go back to your second witness statement at paragraph 10 \{TMO10050001/3\}. Again, if we can zoom in on paragraph 10, thank you. Just have a quick read of paragraph 10, please.
(Pause)

Now, you may have picked up from the
19

Metropolitan Police Service tag in that, but it 's a document provided by Paul Steadman to the police labelled "Picture diagrams with explanations of the checks I did". It's dated 16 November 2016, so that obviously postdates your appointment at the TMO.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember seeing either that document or something similar to it in your time at TMO?
A. No, not at all.
Q. Anything even remotely similar to it?
A. No.
Q. Nothing at all?
A. No, sorry.
Q. Now, I'm going to come on to the checklists that you touched upon earlier.

So, again, you mentioned a correction or that you had discussed these with someone else, but when we're going through these questions, if you just tell again the Inquiry anything that you think they ought to know.
A. \(M m-h m\).
Q. Would you accompany ESAs on any inspections to ensure that they were being conducted appropriately?
A. No.
Q. Never?
A. No.

What you say there is you can't recall.
Now, would it be the case that if they had been carrying those checks out, would you have known about them? Would you have known that they were carrying those checks out?
A. Yes, I remember the ones for the finger blocks more specifically because they often got stuck open, so we had some issues trying to get them ones closed, but
I can't remember Grenfell.
Q. Can I just ask you to pause there.
A. Sorry.
Q. What was stuck open in the finger blocks?
A. The vents. If a smoke alarm goes off, it's almost like a conservatory roof and it just opens.
Q. That was in the finger blocks --
A. I remember the finger blocks one but I can't recall the Grenfell one.
Q. Right.

Can we look at a document \(\{\) MET00065673\}, if you
could pull that up on the screen, please, operator.
Could you just have a look at that document.
(Pause)
Q. Would you have known if they were being conducted appropriately or not?
A. Well, yes, because they had to fill out a sheet, and I can -- they would come back and it would be in a folder, before they got the PDAs, so I could inspect them any time I wanted, but like I say, we was in the middle of the estate, and I could see Paul leave to go to Grenfell, or I could see Robert leave to go and do the other blocks, so I didn't have any concerns that they weren't doing their block inspections.
Q. You trusted that they were doing them?
A. Yes, I did, yeah.
Q. Do you recall if Paul Steadman or Rob Regan ever raised a concern with you that they were overloaded with work, they had too much to do, they didn't have time to conduct their checks?
A. No, I think that came a bit later on, not long before I left. I think where some caretakers had left in the north and south of the borough, they was asked to take on extra work, I think, but not generally just when we was at Lancaster West, when they had their own blocks.
Q. Right. Can you help us with the time that that occurred, that issue with covering other blocks?
A. It must have been maybe the last year I was there, so 2015.

\section*{Q. So 2015 into 2016?}
A. 2014, 2015, maybe, yeah.
Q. And the issue was they were effectively asked to cover other blocks within --
A. Yeah, I'm sure -- I mean, again, I couldn't say \(100 \%\), but I know that when people were leaving, they were asked to go and cover other blocks.
Q. Right.

In terms of their inspections in each estate, was there any time limit set for how long they had to conduct them?
A. No.
Q. Do you recall if they were given, say, 10 minutes, 20 minutes, 30 minutes, none at all?
A. Not from when they reported in to me, no. As I say, we was on the estate and I wouldn't give them a time limit, you do it until you've finished doing your block inspection properly, rather than say, "You need to be done in 15 minutes" and they're racing around and don't do what they're supposed to do.
Q. It took the time it took; is that effectively your answer?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And you had no concerns that they were either rushing it or --
```

A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. Did you ever have any concerns about whether the
inspections were carried out properly or not?
A. I honestly didn't, no.
Q. Can we go to paragraph 38 of your first witness
statement, please $\{$ TMO00000891/8\}.
You say there that the results of weekly health and
safety checks were recorded manually on inspection
sheets until the handheld devices were issued.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that?
Can you recall when the PDA, the handheld -- if I
refer to them as PDAs --
A. Yes.
Q. -- when they were issued to the ESAs?
A. I can't, but I'm making the assumption it must have been
maybe six months before I left, because I didn't really
have a lot to do with those and checking any of those.
Q. Prior to the PDAs being issued, the hard copy
checklists, where would they have been --
A. They were kept in their office, because they used to
have an office that was next to Baseline Studios, and
then when we went into the tower, they then came in and
we was all together, but they had loads of files .
Q. Do you know, were they stored for a particularly long

```

\section*{23}
period or how long they were stored for?
A. Yeah, I think so. I know Rob definitely kept everything.
Q. You say at paragraph 40, if we can scroll down in your witness statement, please, that ESAs would carry out monthly health and safety checks.

Now, in terms of these monthly checks, were they recorded in the same way, the information from them?
A. To my knowledge, they were.
Q. So was that in hard copy prior to the PDAs and then on the PDAs?
A. I'm sure, yeah.
Q. Can we go to your second witness statement at paragraph 5 \{TMO10050001/1\}. Thank you. Just have a quick look at paragraph 5, please.

> (Pause)

You refer there to minor issues arising from the inspections. Do you recall saying that?

\section*{A. Yeah.}
Q. Can you recall any particular minor issues being raised by the ESAs in relation to fire safety specifically?
A. It would probably \(-\mathbf{I}\) mean, this is not \(100 \%\), but in the work we do, it was probably someone's bike being left on the landing or someone putting plant pots outside on the landing, which obviously you're not

\section*{allowed.}
Q. So just help us with the process of resolving that as an issue, how would that be resolved?
A. Then they would report that back, and Janice Jones was the area housing manager, so she would then write to them to say, "You need to remove your bike or your plant pots", and then we'd go and check that they've removed them.
Q. You say occasionally bigger issues emerged which required you to liaise with Janice Wray. If you could help us, please, with the dividing line between a minor issue and a major issue that would require escalation to Janice Wray.
A. The only one I can really think of is when there was large amounts of rubbish dumped, and I'm not sure whether that was -- there was one particular one where it 's at the side of I think it was Camelford, and we - I'm sure it was Janice that I liaised with, and we had to look at a plan of how we could design out that area because there was just - - it was almost like a fly tip, just dumped, and people add to it, people set fire to it . But I couldn't say \(100 \%\) whether it was Janice I had that conversation with, it may have been, but we ended up putting big, like, flower beds in that area so people couldn't dump their rubbish there anymore.

\section*{25}
Q. The determination of whether to refer something to the health and safety team, that was down to you, was it?
A. Yeah, because my guys would come to me.
Q. Right.
A. And if it was something we couldn't resolve \(--I\) mean, nine times out of ten we could, because a lot of it is common sense stuff - - then obviously I always knew Janice was there, and she was really helpful, approachable, I could always go to Janice, so ...
Q. Were you ever given any guidance or direction from Janice or anyone within TMO about issues that could be dealt with by you and your team and issues that should be escalated?
A. No, not specifically .
Q. Can I ask you about the process of reporting issues to Repairs Direct.
A. \(M m-h m\).
Q. The Repairs Direct came in in 2013; is that right? You would have been in the TMO.
A. I don't know, but I guess so, yeah, I do know Repairs Direct.
Q. You were familiar with the process of reporting to Repairs Direct in any event?
A. Yes.
Q. How would an issue, a repair issue, be reported to

Repairs Direct?
A. Generally people would call Repairs Direct themselves. We didn't really get involved in the repairs. It's only if things weren't being done, or we might have a resident come into the office and complain that their heating's been out for four days, no one's been in contact, so we would then ring up and try and find out -- just to be helpful to the resident, ring the repairs desk and say, "What's happening, we've got a resident in front of us", you know, and try and get it resolved that way.
Q. How would Repairs Direct respond to you or your team?
A. Well, obviously, by just telling us, "Yes, this is noted, this is the job number, it's on a five-day turnaround", whatever it was, but at least we then knew because we could then say to the tenant, "Well, you reported it two days ago, unfortunately they're not going to come out, you've got an appointment for Friday", or -- you know, just to give them that information.
Q. So would you monitor then the request at all?
A. No.
Q. Would you only be aware if it hadn't happened when the estate service assistants checked and noted that it hadn't happened or a resident said it hadn't happened

\section*{27}
yet; is that correct?
A. Yeah, because repairs wasn't, like, under my management, so ...
Q. So you would become involved at that point, then?
A. Yeah, I would just literally get involved to be the liaison and try and get things resolved.
Q. Would anyone from your team or within TMO, as far as you're aware, check - - if Repairs Direct said they had carried out a repair, for example, to a door-closer, self-closer on a door, would anyone check the work that they'd done?
A. They would check, obviously, on the next inspection that it had been done.
Q. So if Repairs Direct had, for example, removed a door-closer as opposed to fixed it, would that be picked up by anyone, as far as you're aware?
A. Yeah.
Q. Who would --
A. So if it was Grenfell, it would have been Paul. If it was on any of the other doors, it would have been Rob.
Q. So, again, if I may, if it occurred, as an example, to a flat entrance door, would that only be picked up if Paul Steadman checked that flat entrance door on the next occasion?
A. He wouldn't be -- to my knowledge, he wouldn't be
checking front entrance doors, and I wouldn't be aware whether the door-closer was working, not working, whether they had one or whether they didn't have one. I had no involvement in the front entrance doors whatsoever.
Q. On this issue of reporting matters, what was the procedure if a tenant reported an issue with a fire safety measure or any fire safety advice? What was the process in that circumstance?
A. Well, quite often the issues around fire safety were through complaints from a particular resident when residents -- residents were allowed to bring large bulky items down to the ground floor level, put outside, and we had our contractors, OCS, that would clear it every three days, or sometimes Rob or Paul might pick it up and bring it over to Baseline Studios. So we had a big room where we would put all the bulk rubbish and, once it was full, the lorry would come, fill it up and then take it away.

Residents should not have been dumping rubbish in the communal entrance, and I'd written to people to say, you know, that's the fire hazard, and quite often it would either be from a particular resident saying that it 's fire safety and we haven't done anything. Every day - - almost every day there was rubbish dumped in the
A. Yes.
Q. You're aware that the fire assessor was called

Carl Stokes. You rarely spoke to him.
A. Yes.
Q. Over the course of your time working for the TMO, could
you tell us how often you did speak to him or how many times you did speak to him?
A. I don't think I did speak to him.
Q. You didn't at all ?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Right. So it would follow you didn't ever raise any concerns about fire safety with him?
A. No.
Q. Were you ever provided with the assessments that Mr Stokes carried out for Lancaster West or

\section*{31}

Grenfell Tower?
A. Not that he done, but when we saw him on the estate we knew that a spreadsheet would be coming from Janice Wray, because whenever he went round, then we'd get this big spreadsheet from Janice, colour-coded what was urgent, and then I would cut and paste the bits what related to Paul and the bits that related to Rob and say, "Right, you need to do these", because Janice used to report back, I believe, to the corporate health and safety group, and we didn't want her not being able to report back to say that things had been completed.
Q. So you would never have actually seen the fire risk assessments, just Janice Wray's categorisation of --
A. Yes.
Q. -- actions arising from them?
A. Yes.
Q. If you didn't ever see the fire risk assessments, could you have known about the range of fire safety measures that were present and necessary on Lancaster West and in Grenfell Tower? Would you have ever known that?

\section*{A. No.}
Q. Was consideration of the fire risk assessments
an important part of your role for TMO at all?
A. Well, yes.
Q. And that's in the context of having actions from them --
A. Yes.
Q. -- completed by Rob and Paul?
A. Yes, and to my knowledge it would go up the line. So I didn't want anyone coming back to us saying that we wasn't doing our job, so we would make sure they were done. But quite often, because Carl would pick up on really little things, which obviously was good, but quite often the guys would go round and stuff would already have been removed. So it might be black bag outside such and such an address and fridge outside here, and when the guys went round, they'd already been cleared. So he would pick up on, yeah, everything, which was good.
Q. You've talked a little bit about the actions that arose. So paragraph 31 again of your witness statement, which is up, the last sentence says Janice Wray would generate spreadsheets, which is I think what you told us about. How soon after seeing Carl Stokes on the estate would you receive these spreadsheets?
A. I couldn't say, because we wouldn't always see him around, but when we did, we knew that we'd be getting spreadsheets following his visit. So I don't think it was too long after.
Q. Can you help us with hours, days, weeks, months?
A. Probably be unfair if I did, but it wouldn't be hours,

\section*{33}
it wouldn't be months, so I guess it would be within weeks, because like I say, when we'd see him, we thought: oh, here comes a load of work from Janice, and that's just ...
Q. So you said weeks there, is that --
A. I think so, I think that's fair to say, but I couldn't say with \(100 \%\) accuracy.
Q. Right.
A. Obviously you would have to know from when he done his inspection to when Janice emailed those over.
Q. Right.

I think you told us those spreadsheets were colour-coded.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you remember the colour-coding?
A. Yeah, the amber -- red, amber and green.
Q. Three colours?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the timeframe for each, can you recall?
A. So red was -- well, straight away, red. Amber you had a bit more -- I couldn't tell you the times, but we looked at them all the same. Whatever was on those lists, again, because we was so centrally based, it was like: just get out, do the job, so we can send it back to Janice saying, "All completed".
```

Q. You said red straight away, can you --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- give us a little bit more detail on what straight
away meant?
A. Well, I would say the same day, but that's just me from
my looking at it. If I got something like that, red
means it's urgent, and we're all on the estate, there's
no reason why Paul couldn't go and do it that same day,
and likewise with Rob, and I don't think there was ever
an issue with them doing that.
Q. So may I again summarise what I understand you to be
saying.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. Spreadsheet would come in from Janice Wray. You look at
the red actions, Paul or Rob maybe sitting in the office
with you --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and you would say, "Can you go and complete those
actions".
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. How would you monitor that they'd been completed?
A. Because they had to report back to me, because I then
had to complete -- put the information into the
spreadsheet and I was the one responsible for sending it
back to Janice.

```

\section*{35}
Q. So it would depend on them telling you; you didn't go and check yourself, for example?
A. No, because otherwise I would have been doing those inspections.
Q. Did you ever, in an appraisal exercise, check that they'd done what they said they'd done or did you just trust them?
A. No, but I walked round the estate myself as well sometimes, so --
Q. On those occasions -- sorry, I interrupted you.
A. No. So no, but not that I sat back in the office and just believed everything they told me. I knew they was out there. Carl -- I don't know how often he done his visits, but he would be back. If something wasn't done then it would come to light some way, or a resident would complain.
Q. You said you would have walked round the estate --
A. No, I often walked round the estate, yeah.
Q. Would you ever have done so with the spreadsheet of FRA actions to check that they'd been done?
A. Can't say I did, no.
Q. So you would have assigned that work to them, they would have come back and said, "Yeah, it's done", you would have checked that off and sent that information off to Janice Wray.
```

A. Yes.
Q. Again, how would you have done that? In an email,
spreadsheet?
A. On the actual spreadsheet that she sent. So there was
a box where you could put your information in, save it
and then send it back.
Q. Right.
Did residents ever complain about the length of time
it would take for the TMO to resolve any issues
identified in the fire risk assessments?
A. Not to my knowledge, no.
Q. You don't recall?
A. I don't think they knew that we'd done the fire risk
assessments.
Q. Can we move now to the minutes of the health and safety
operational meeting on 23 February 2015. The document
reference is {TMO00869479}.
Could you just look at that document. Now, to be
clear, you're not listed as being in attendance at this
meeting
(Pause)
You weren't at the meeting?
A. No.
Q. Would you ever have attended these meetings, the health
and safety operational committee meetings?
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\section*{A. I don't think so.}
Q. Would you ever have attended any health and safety committee? There were a number of health and safety committees at the TMO during the course of your employment, would you ever have attended any of them?
A. I don't recall, unless I'm on any minutes of any, but I don't recall, no, I was really -- anything to do with Lancaster West was -- we got on and done our own stuff at Lancaster West. The TMO had meetings I wasn't involved in.
Q. Would you have been sent the minutes of health and safety committee meetings?
A. I doubt it.
Q. If you had been sent them, do you ever recall reading any minutes?
A. Well, if I had them, I'm sure I would have read them, but I don't ever recall being --it's not the same structure that -- how I kind of work in now, you know, if there is meetings, you get minutes, people keep you involved. It wasn't like that at the TMO. Lancaster West was pretty much on its own.
Q. Okay.

Can we look at these minutes at the bottom of the page, under the heading "FRA stats". You see what's recorded there:
"JW confirmed that there had been an improvement in the number of outstanding FRAs. AB had a contractor who was undertaking the FRAs in each. After a recent review Lancaster West has now become a priority and JW and Siobhan Rumble are in discussions about this."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you remember that, that 2015 --
A. I don't, no.
Q. You don't remember any discussion with Janice Wray about outstanding FRA actions on Lancaster West?
A. No. Not saying it didn't happen, but I don't remember it, yeah.
Q. Do you recall why Lancaster West may have become a priority at that stage?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Carl Stokes carried out a fire risk assessment on 17 October 2014 on Grenfell Tower. Do you recall whether there were a lot of actions arising from that that were a priority?
A. My recollection is whenever we received those spreadsheets from Janice, I would send Paul and Rob to go and check the stuff that was on there. As I say, it wasn't major stuff on there, to my knowledge, and then we would send it back.

\section*{39}
Q. You don't recall any specific incident or issue arising in 2015, no?
A. No. The only one from the FRA I really remember was the Camelford, they had like little cages in -- next to the houses, it was like a communal entrance, and they was all blocked up with people's belongings, and that was raised by Carl, and I remember speaking to Janice about that, because I think several years earlier, Janice had done a letter saying what you can and can't keep in these cages, and then -- so I remember her giving me the detail of that letter and we then wrote to people. We had to go and follow it up and make sure they cleared all those cages.
Q. Can I ask you again about these self-closing devices on doors briefly.

Can we look at \(\{T M O 00859693\}\), and that should be an email from Janice Wray to you. Thank you. That email, she sends it to you on 17 December. Just have a look at that. It says:
"Hi Siobhan
"Our fire risk assessor has raised his concern that in conversation with a few of the tenants at
Grenfell Tower they have advised that Seamus had disconnected the self-closers on their flat entrance door - in at least one of these cases this was said to
```

    be due to the tenant perpetually locking himself out of
    his flat."
                    (Pause)
        Do you recall that email?
    A.No.
Q. Can we scroll up to your response, which is at the top
of the chain.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Before we do, can you just remind us
who Seamus was?
A. Yeah, Seamus was our handyman.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
Yes, Mr Gadd, sorry.
MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
So that's Seamus Dunlea; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in this email you told him.
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, do you remember a conversation with Mr Dunlea where
you discussed removing self-closers?
A. Yeah, I actually don't, and when I saw this email,
I thought obviously me and Janice must have had
a conversation, and from Janice's email she's saying
that they've found out he's removing them, please tell
him to stop doing it, and so obviously I must have had
a conversation with him because my response was "Told
be due to the tenant perpetually locking himself out of
(Pause)
Do you recall that email?
A. No.
Q. Can we scroll up to your response, which is at the top of the chain.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Before we do, can you just remind us who Seamus was?
A. Yeah, Seamus was our handyman.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
Yes, Mr Gadd, sorry.
MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
So that's Seamus Dunlea; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in this email you told him.
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, do you remember a conversation with Mr Dunlea where you discussed removing self-closers?
A. Yeah, I actually don't, and when I saw this email, I thought obviously me and Janice must have had a conversation, and from Janice's email she's saying hat they've found out he's removing them, please tell a conversation with him because my response was "Told
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        him". This is where I actually rang a colleague,
        because I was thinking, I don't remember this, because
        we didn't really touch front doors, and I said, "Do you
        remember this, and why would he have taken those off?"
        And he said that the doors were really stiff and
        sometimes old people found it really hard to get in
        their properties or open the door to get out, and he
        removed some of the door-closers. But I didn't know
        that at the time.
Q. Right. Your evidence is that you don't recollect this
        discussion?
A. No, I didn't. This is why I clarified with a colleague.
Q. You may not recollect then whether you checked he'd
        stopped doing it.
A. Well, if I've responded to Janice to say, "Told him",
        then I've \(100 \%\) had a conversation with Seamus.
Q. Do you recall if you checked whether he was doing it at
        any stage after this email correspondence between you
        and --
A. No, and to be honest, I wouldn't have known the
        implications of taking that closer off a front entrance
        door.
Q. You wouldn't have known the implications?
A. No. Maybe I should have done, but no, I don't.
Q. Well, yes.
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him". This is where I actually rang a colleague, we didn't really touch front doors, and I said, "Do you remember this, and why would he have taken those off?"
And he said that the doors were really stiff and sometimes old people found it really hard to get in removed some of the door-closers. But I didn't know that at the time.
Q. Right. Your evidence is that you don't recollect this discussion?
A. No, I didn't. This is why I clarified with a colleague.
Q. You may not recollect then whether you checked he'd oing it
A. Well, if l've responded to Janice to say, "Told him", then I've \(100 \%\) had a conversation with Seamus.
Q. Do you recall if you checked whether he was doing it at any stage after this email correspondence between you and --
A. No, and to be honest, I wouldn't have known the implications of taking that closer off a front entrance door.
Q. You wouldn't have known the implications?
Q. Well, yes.

Did you take any action in relation to the
door-closers that Mr Dunlea had removed?
A. No, because, like I say, I wouldn't have known that they were part of the fire regs on their front entrance door.
Q. Do you know if anyone replaced the door-closers that Mr Dunlea had removed?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know if Mr Dunlea did that?
A. I don't know. I doubt it, if he took them off.
Q. Did you ever ask or check whether any other TMO staff were or may have been removing door-closers?
A. I doubt it. Seamus was the handyman, so if he was -you know, Rob and Paul wouldn't be doing stuff like that, not to my knowledge.
Q. What about external contractors engaged by TMO?
A. Then I wouldn't know, because if they've got any contract with the front entrance doors -- because, like I say, they weren't part of our inspections, it was only the communal doors, not front entrance doors.
Q. Right, and you wouldn't have checked after they'd been to look at a door?
A. No.
Q. Would anyone have checked?
A. I don't know.
Q. Can we look next then at some email correspondence which

\section*{43}
is about the stay put advice given, so that email is at \{TMO10001677\}.

The first email in the chain, if we can scroll down, is on the third page of that \(\{\) TMO10001677/3\}, if we can scroll down to the bottom, please, operator. There is an email from you to Janice Wray on 9 October 2012. You say:
"Good afternoon Janice,
"I have been going through our security document with the manager at Axis and there were 2 things he asked me that I wasn't sure about and was hoping you could help me?
"He wanted to know who our Fire Marshalls were?
"He asked if we have an evacuation procedure for Grenfell Tower in the event of a fire?"

Again, do you remember this email exchange?
A. No. It's a long time, no.
Q. Can you remember who Axis were?
A. Other than contractors, no.
Q. Can you remember why the manager of Axis wanted to know about the evacuation procedure?
A. I really don't, sorry.
Q. What type of contractors were they?
A. I don't know.
Q. In terms of an evacuation procedure, did you know before
you emailed Janice Wray if there was one in place at Grenfell Tower?
A. No, I know that it was a stay-put policy, like many, many blocks are, and I think there's lots of documentation that was out there to say it was -- saying it was stay put. I think there was leaflets near the lift or I know that it was put in our newsletters, and that's ... yeah.
Q. Can we look, then, at Janice Wray's response. She responds the same day \(\{\) TMO10001677/2 \(\}\) :
"Hi Siobhan
"According to our last list the fire marshals for
Grenfell were Victoria and Adelola. I realise Adelola relocated and Victoria off just now but we do train the estate officers and the estate inspectors annually in fire safety training so any of them should be able to act in this capacity."

That's as a fire marshal at Grenfell Tower.
Were you aware of that, that there was an expectation that they would act in the stead of Victoria and Adelola, prior to this email?
A. I can't recall, no.
Q. Did you ever discuss acting as a fire marshal with any estate inspectors?
A. No.

\section*{45}
Q. You told us a moment ago about the stay-put policy. Did you know any of the detail of the stay-put policy?
A. No, only that obviously if the fire was in your flat, then you get out, it 's common sense, but other than that, stay in your flat. It was a concrete building, so it would never have spread, and if it was a flat, the Fire Brigade would come and put the fire out that was in that flat and then people would be okay.
Q. Did you ever ask Janice Wray for assistance with how someone would evacuate if the fire was in their flat, for example?
A. I don't remember, no.
Q. You were aware that there were residents of Grenfell Tower who could be described as having mobility issues or vulnerabilities ; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever discuss with Janice Wray what to do in the event of a fire for those residents?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever question anyone in TMO about what --
A. No.
Q. - - those residents would do or should do in the event of a fire?
A. No, because, again, my understanding is there's a stay-put policy, the Fire Brigade will come and
A. Not to my knowledge, other than \(--I\) think it was when
it was reported one of the fire extinguishers was condemned, and then I put \(--I\) think \(--I\) can't remember \(100 \%\), but I think that's when I might have asked for some refresher training for Rob and Paul.
Q. Right.

Can we look next, please, at email correspondence from October 2014. The reference is \(\{\) IWS00001948\}. If we could zoom in on that chain, please, operator.

If we scroll down to the bottom \(\{\) IWS00001948/2\}, please, it 's from Beverley Coleman to you, 3 October 2014, and what Ms Coleman says is:
"Following our conversation, above resident called regarding the Walk Way of Grenfell Tower stairs, has been blocked off, not in use since last night. Resident was very annoyed due health \& safety, in case of a fire . Also said she called both RLO, for Rydon, Maxine is on holiday, and Christina mobile went straight to voicemail."

Your response, if we can scroll up to it, please, I'd like you to look at the second paragraph there, do you see:
"In the event of a fire ..."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
they' ll deal with the situation.
Q. Ms Wray in that email goes on to say in the final paragraph:
"On a related can you please advise who carries out the weekly test on the Grenfell fire alarm. If there is a training need which is preventing this from being tested then please let me know and I will ask Ricki to sort."

Your response, which should come above that email, if we can scroll up to that, please, operator,
\(\{\) TMO10001677/1\}, you see your response there:

\section*{"Ok great.}
"Yes there is a training issue, would be grateful if you could arrange for us to have this."

Now, what has happened is Janice Wray has asked you whether there is a training need. You haven't gone directly to Janice. It's a reactive as opposed to what might be described as proactive; is that correct?
A. In this instance, yeah.
Q. Were there any other occasions where something similar happened, there was a reactive request for training as opposed to, say, a proactive request?
A. Not that I can remember.
Q. So would any training have been done on a reactive basis then?

\section*{47}
```

Q. "... as we know there is a stay put policy and
evacuation would be via the lift not the stairwell, any
how the barrier would be moved in this case."
So we see there what appears to be your knowledge of
there may be circumstances where evacuation is necessary
with a stay-put policy; is that correct?
A. Yes, but even reading that now, I know you shouldn't get
in a lift if there's a fire, so -- but it says what it
says, yeah.
Q. With that, can you recall why you said that at the time?
A. No, because obviously there was only two ways out,
either the stairs or the lift, and they had I can't
remember how many floors in Grenfell Tower.
Q. Can I ask you to think about that response. Can you
recall whether you referred to use of the lift because
you had been told to say that or because you assumed
that was how evacuation should be conducted?
A. I really don't know. But I don't think -- well, I don't
know.
Q. Can I move on now to asking you some questions about
responding to deficiency notices.
Now, are you aware of what a deficiency notice from
the London Fire Brigade is? Have you ever heard that
term before?
A. I think I have, but I don't know in relation to what.

```
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Q. Perhaps we can look. Can we go, please, to an email 1
    sent on 27 March 2014, \{TMO00856923/3\}. We should have
    an email from Janice Wray. You see that at the bottom
    of the page? Thank you, operator. Just have a look at
    that, please.
                    (Pause)
        Do you recall that email?
A. Not specifically, no.
Q. Can we look at the deficiency notice itself . So that is
        at \(\{T M O 10005646\}\).
            Now, looking at that, does that document ring any
        bells with you? Do you recall seeing that?
A. Just looking at it, no, I don't.
Q. Could we scroll to the third page of that
        \{TMO10005646/3\}, which is the schedule. I'll just point
        out to you, then, this is the schedule, including areas
        of concern that the LFB had noted.
            Does this ring any bells or cause you to recall --
A. It really doesn't, no. But I know I'm copied in on the
    email, but no.
Q. Can you help us with whether you would have opened the
    document up and looked at it?
A. I'm sure I would have done, if it was sent to me to ask
    for me to comment, but I'm just wondering if it was
    something -- because where Alex was copied in, I can't
remember his job title, whether it was something he done and I was copied in, I don't know. But this is not something I'd look at and say, "Oh, I remember those".
Q. Can you recall whether you took any action in respect of this deficiency notice?
A. I can't recall, because I don't even remember this notice.
Q. Can you recall whether anyone else did?
A. No.
Q. Would you have known if anyone else had taken action in respect of it?

I'm going to move on to a slightly different topic, we touched on it a moment ago, this issue of residents with restricted mobility or vulnerable residents in Grenfell Tower.

Whose responsibility was it to collect information on residents with disabilities or mobility issues or vulnerabilities in Grenfell Tower?
A. I don't think it was anyone's responsibility to go collecting it. When people were on the register for housing, then that information should have been given to RBKC as part of their request for housing. Then that would have been looked at by the people who done the allocations, and if they thought that they were fit and it met their need, then they would be housed.
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After that, if they had any mobility issues, then they would speak to Janice, the housing officer, who would liaise with RBKC and get them whatever support they needed. Because sometimes -- oh, sorry.
Q. No, no, carry on.
A. Sometimes when people -- they might have been okay when they moved in, but then have issues later on and have to move out. So what would happen is they would speak to Janice, she would take the details, she would liaise with -- they had two support workers at RBKC, and they would then speak to them, they might have to contact the doctor to get medical advice and support their application for a move. That's how it would work.
Q. Right. Can I just ask you to clarify, the Janice you're talking to is ...?
A. Janice Jones, my housing officer, yeah.
Q. Were you ever told that you were responsible for collecting information about vulnerabilities in TMO premises?
A. Not directly like that, but sometimes -- we done lots of exercises where we would do tenancy audits, not that that was -- that wasn't part of collecting that information, but there might be where we'd have to -- we filled in lots of questionnaires and forms when we were doing the regeneration and, to my knowledge, I think we
were then looking at people who -- to move out. So
I think you're constantly looking at stuff like that.
Q. Right.

You told us very helpfully that there were lots of
ways in which -- lots of questionnaires and things. Can
you help us in a little more detail what kind of
questionnaires or the names of those questionnaires or exercises were? You referred to tenancy audits. Were there any others?
A. I mean, the tenancy audit we done was literally -- it was primarily to see if people were subletting, so it was a pretty straightforward form, but then a new form was introduced by Teresa Brown what was about kind of 50 pages long, from what I remember, so that would have collected loads and loads of data. But there would be other forms. I mean, some obviously -- I've listened to the Inquiry, but some we knew -- you know, we would knock -- how do people want to be consulted, because, you know, we would do evening meetings and we'd be sitting there, there might be two people turn up. So we'd do afternoons, mornings. So you'd gather information and ask them about the works and what they liked or didn't like, so there was lots of communications going on.
Q. I understand.
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Can I ask you to look again at your first witness
statement, paragraph 37, please, operator
\{TMO00000891/7\}. You see that?
A. ves
Q. So what I'm going to ask you about is this spreadsheet recording information about vulnerable residents.

Now, can I ask you to look at document
\{TMO00880587\}, please. Do you recognise that document?
A. Not \(100 \%\), but I think that looks like what I'd asked
for, the information for the vulnerable list or elderly
list I wanted for Seamus. It was for some extra work
for Seamus to do. But I think it's kind of got a bit blown up in my witness statement because I couldn't remember exactly first whether we held a spreadsheet, whether we updated it, and then I remember David Noble, he was kind of like the go-to person for information, and the only reason I'd asked for this information was because sometimes Seamus, he was a handyman and he had some time on his hands, he cared about the people on the estate, so what I done, I thought if I get a list of all -- and I can't remember whether I actually said vulnerable people or elderly people in Grenfell Tower, so I had asked David for that list, and then I set Seamus a target of try and do six courtesy calls a week, and that was just to fill his downtime, and that was
literally just to do a door-knock and say, "Is there anything I can help you with?"

So it might have been -- you might have had an elderly or a vulnerable person sitting in the dark because they couldn't change a light bulb, and that was obviously not part of our job, but Seamus could do that. So he would fix people's doors or change washers on taps, and that's why I had that spreadsheet, and he would work his way through that spreadsheet.
Q. Right. Can I just go back a couple of steps from what you've said.

This spreadsheet, does it look similar --
A. It does look similar because it was just a list of names and addresses.
Q. And the way you'd obtain such a spreadsheet is by asking someone to provide it to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Right.

The information that was inputted that made up that spreadsheet, do you know where it came from?
A. Sign-ups, the information from sign-ups, stuff that we gathered on the estate, because, as I say, people -like, the team knew people on the estate very well and got on with them very well, they'd worked there for years, so you might have someone who's just come out of
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hospital or having an operation and is quite unwell, so they would feed that back to David Noble, if it was something that was going to be maybe long-term, so we would just -- I guess they would just email David through.
Q. Would that process, that helpful example of someone who's just come out of hospital, would that information then be fed through on a -- was it required to be fed through or was it just on an ad hoc basis?
A. Yeah, on an ad hoc basis, I believe.
Q. Right.

This information, then, was in existence or these lists were in existence before you started working for the TMO?
A. I don't think they were lists . I think they're all in the system. So you could say to David, "Could you give me a list of all the maybe Portuguese speaking people", whatever it was, I think he could take that data out of the system.
Q. Right, and you would then give the list to Seamus Dunlea, and ask him to go and pay courtesy calls?
A. I did. That was a one-off exercise I wanted to do with Seamus to fill some downtime, but also to help the residents on the estate.
Q. I understand, and the criteria for that exercise was, do
you say, elderly or vulnerable?
A. You know what, I honestly can't remember whether I said -- because as I'm reading this, I'm going: did I say vulnerable or did I say elderly? I suspect it might have been whoever was on the vulnerable list, because it's to help whoever you can help.
Q. As part of that help, was there any consideration given by you or anyone to asking residents about needs in the event of a fire --
A. No.
Q. -- evacuation --
A. No.
Q. - - anything like that?

Was it clear to you that there may have been such people living in Grenfell?
A. That?
Q. Would have had difficulty in the event of a fire.
A. I don't doubt, yes. But like I said, I believed that it's a stay-put policy, the Fire Brigade would turn up and they will then help those people to safety. That was my understanding.
Q. We may come back to that issue in a moment, but sticking with these sheets, were these spreadsheets, as far as you're aware, spreadsheets that were retained as a spreadsheet on the system or were they always
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generated depending on the requests that were made?
A. Yeah, my understanding is that he generated this one for me, sent it to me in an Excel spreadsheet, which is what I kept and then gave to Seamus, probably emailed it to Seamus saying, "This is the list, start at the top and work your way through and try and do" -- I believe I gave him a target of six a week.
Q. Can we look at your first witness statement, paragraph 37 \{TMO00000891/7\}, please, operator. Last sentence, Ms Rumble.
A. Yeah.
Q. "Janice Jones or Deon Wilkes would add residents to this list if needed."
A. Yes.
Q. Now --
A. I don't think -- yeah, I think I've mixed that up. When I say I believe the list was in -- already in existence, I mean the information was already in existence, and, as I say, I couldn't remember whether they updated it or not, but I now know that they didn't, and I think even when I watched David, it clarified for me, listening to David, exactly how that information was updated. I couldn't --
Q. Is it possible that Janice Jones and Deon Wilkes may have contacted David Noble with information about --
A. I'm sure they did. I'm sure they did.
Q. And again, that would have been on an ad hoc basis; is that right?
A. Yes, it would, and it would be just via an email.
Q. Can we look at your third witness statement at paragraph 13 \{TMO00870943/2\}. It's about the Capita system, paragraph 13. You say you can't recall using it.
A. No.
Q. Would others have used that system, the Capita system?
A. I'm sure -- I mean, I've worked in different places and there's always different names for different systems, so I really can't remember this one, and quite often, when you're managing a team, they're the ones who are using the system, you don't usually have to use the system,
you're managing them to use it. But CRM wasn't there, I think that was introduced after I left. Well, I think I know it was introduced after I left .
Q. You have told us that the information was inputted on an ad hoc basis. Would you accept that, as a consequence of that, there may have been residents who did have vulnerabilities or issues that may have been missed from this list or this --
A. I'm sure, but unless a resident comes forward and tells you that they need support or help, you're not going to

\section*{59}
know, unless you're visiting them for another reason and it comes out in conversation, you wouldn't know that, you just wouldn't know that.
Q. There is no system or process or audit in place to ensure that the information was accurate? No one ever checked it?
A. Checked what, sorry?
Q. The information contained on the system held by the -that David Noble could access? No --
A. I guess it would have been put in at the time, and accurate at the time. Whether that was reviewed, I can't tell you that. But we wouldn't have been the ones to review that.
Q. Was there any guidance given of what exactly constituted a vulnerability or someone whose information should be added to --
A. Yeah, I don't think at that time specifically, but vulnerable was -- it could be anybody, anybody who needed extra help. So whether it was, you know, some mental health issues, it could -- as I say, someone could have broken their leg, they're in a cast for eight weeks. It really does depend, yeah, whoever needed support and help.
Q. Would you ever have considered whether ability to evacuate in the event of a fire was something that
A. Yeah. But who would do that, I'm not sure.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, that's the question.
A. Yeah, who would do that, I'm not sure.

\section*{61}

\section*{SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.}

MR GADD: One more question on this issue, Mr Chairman, if I may.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Of course.
MR GADD: The sheet that we looked at, who could access it?
Was it only David Noble or could anyone generate that sheet?
A. Like I said in the statement, at the beginning, I was thinking I'm sure we could all access it, because I had the Excel spreadsheet. But, no, the data that went via David in his system, I don't believe we had access to that.
Q. Was the only way of accessing that --
A. Asking.
Q. -- through Mr Noble?
A. Yes, and there was no issue, because if we needed something then David would give us what we needed, providing it was -- we was allowed to have it.
Q. And if I may, in the context of an emergency, if you'd needed a list of that information, you would have had to have gone to Mr Noble; you couldn't have generated it or found that information in another way yourself?
A. I don't believe so.

MR GADD: Mr Chairman, those are the questions on that issue. Would it be an appropriate time to break?
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SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. Are you moving on to something
else?
MR GADD: Yes.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, it probably would be a good
time, then, wouldn't it? Yes, all right, thank you.
As I think we said, Ms Rumble, we have a break
during the morning. You probably know that anyway. So
we will take it at this point, and we will come back at
11.35, please.
I have to ask you, as I've asked all other
witnesses: please don't talk about your evidence to
anyone while you're out of the room.
THE WITNESS: No worries, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. Would you like
to go with the usher, then, please.
(Pause)
Good, thank you, Mr Gadd.
Just for my own interest, how are we going along?
Are we roughly in line with expectations?
MR GADD: I would hesitate to say, I think we might be
slightly ahead of expectations, Mr Chairman, sir.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's not a message we often get.
All right, thank you very much.
MR GADD: I shouldn't have said it.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We'll see.
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    11.35, please. Thank you.
    (11.18 am)
(A short break)
(11.35 am)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, Ms Rumble, ready to carry
on?
THE WITNESS: Yes, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much.
Yes, Mr Gadd.
MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
Ms Rumble, in the break l've discussed the
transcript feed which comes through with the
transcriber, and one issue is that if you or I talk over
each other, it gets missed in the transcript. I will
try my best to make sure I don't talk over you, and
would you mind --
A. I' Il do the same, sorry.
Q. Not at all, it's one thing that happens with these.
I'm}\mathrm{ going to ask you first of all about some
evidence that you gave us earlier this morning, and
I will ask you to look at the transcript.
Operator, could you go to the [draft] transcript
from this morning, page 13, please. It's line 10. Do
you see that, Ms Rumble? I asked a question
{Day120/11:24}:

```
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    "You were also aware that there was a Fire Brigade
    drop key which could be used by the ESAs or the
    Fire Brigade to ..."
    And there is an example of --
    A. Yes.
Q. -- talk over.
On down the transcript, at the bottom of page 13
{Day120/12:10}, I asked the question:
"Question: The Fire Brigade drop key, who told you
about that? Who informed you about it?
"Answer: I think just Paul and Rob, when they done
their checks."
Now, can I just ask you about that again: what were
the checks that you were referring to there?
A. I think that it was to make sure the doors opened.
I think the drop key was at the top of the lift and it
was like a T key, from memory.
Q. So the drop key was kept by the lift?
A. No, I don't think it was kept by the lift, I think it
must have been in their office with all the keys.
Q. Right, sorry .
A. They used to go round like jailers with loads of keys.
Sorry.
Q. The T that you were referring to, that's a box into
which the key was inserted; is that correct?
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A. I think it was like -- you know, like an FB1 key,
they're like -- it's like a T shape, and I remember
there's like a little hole at the top of the lift, and
this is just from memory, I might be wrong, but I think
they'd put the key in and turn it and I think it opens
the doors, and it was just to check that was working.
Q. And that key -- sorry.
A. If I've got that right.
Q. That key, as far as you recall, was kept in the office
or on their --
had honestly lots and lots of keys because they was
always about the estate, so ...
Q. The checks that were carried out, they were done by Paul
and/or Rob.
A. Yes.
Q. Did the Fire Brigade ever come and carry out checks?
A. I'm sure they did, because there's lots of reference to
the Fire Brigade coming and conversations between the
Fire Brigade and Janice, but I wasn't involved in
arranging any of those, so I didn't meet them.
Q. Would you have been involved in any way? Would they
have come into the office, for example, beforehand and
asked for the key or anything?
A. Not to my knowledge, no.
17 Q

## Q. Do you recognise it?

A. Yeah.
A. I don't, no.
Q. Do you recall if you would have provided any information to Mr Stokes to assist him in the preparation of this fire risk assessment?
A. Not at all. I never -- I don't ever remember having a conversation with Carl Stokes. He would primarily just be walking around the estate, picking up issues and then reporting back to Janice Wray, and we got that information via the fire risk assessments sent through from Janice.
Q. Right.

Can we look at page 20 in that document \{CST00003084/20\}. Do you see there there's a title, "13. Disabled people"?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that? You see then underneath that it says:
"It is considered that the building is provided with
reasonable arrangements for means of escape for disabled people?"

The box is ticked "Yes". Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you ever have seen that aspect of that report?
A. Not that I recall, not at all.
Q. Were you aware of what the reasonable arrangements for means of escape were for disabled people?
A. No.
Q. In the comments box, Mr Stokes has written:
"At the time of the risk assessment there was no evidence of any resident within the premises who suffers from sensory impairment to such a level that would prevent them from hearing a shouted warning of fire or a loud knocking on their entrance door to warn them."

This is perhaps a year after you joined TMO, but what Mr Stokes has said in that assessment, does that accord with your recollection of the residents in Grenfell in November 2012?
A. It doesn't, but my question would be where he got this information, because how would he know that?
Q. Do you know where he got the information?
A. No, I don't, no.
Q. He never asked --
A. But he would have to speak to someone to get that

```
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a comprehensive programme of information-gathering, is
that incorrect as far as you're concerned?
A. No, maybe -- it was probably correct, but that was something the TMO done and maybe held and not necessarily shared with us at Lancaster West.
Q. Probably correct but you didn't know about it?
A. No.
Q. Then I think it's over the page \(\{\) CST00003084/21\}, if we could go over the page, please, operator, Mr Stokes says:
"The additional information will be used to assess if residents may require additional devices to provide them with early warning of smoke/fire in their home and/or development of [PEEPs] ..."
Now, again, you mentioned PEEPs before the break. You're familiar with it now?
A. Now I am, yeah.
Q. When did you become familiar with it, first?
A. When all this -- when I was being asked to give evidence, and I saw PEEPs, and I was thinking -you know, I looked into it and I thought: well, we've -I've never done any personal evacuation plans.
Q. Have you ever heard of it before?
A. I don't recall that I had, no.
Q. You don't recall ever hearing discussion of personal
```

information unless he door-knocked people, which I don't think he would have done.
Q. The next paragraph is:
"TMO have recently introduced a comprehensive
programme to gathering information about tenants including any disabilities and their physical ability and mobility to respond to any emergency situations. This information will be imputed on a 'TP Tracker system' and held centrally."

Were you aware of a comprehensive programme other than that which we discussed before the break?
A. I wasn't, no.
Q. Would you have been aware of it if it had existed, do you think, if --
A. Not always, because the TMO done lots of things and I wasn't - - we wasn't always made aware, because obviously it wasn't just Lancaster West, there was the north and south of the borough, so we wasn't always involved in everything they did.
Q. There was reference there to a TP tracker system. Did you ever know of it or have access to such a system?
A. No, the first time I heard that was when I was listening to David's evidence.
Q. Right.

Inasmuch as Mr Stokes says that there is
69
Q. What about your previous roles? I think you --
A. No, because they were different roles. I was a head of income, so that didn't have any bearing on this, and then previous roles before that were like housing officer roles, so I wouldn't have been aware.
Q. Do I take it that it follows, then, that you never referred any resident to --
A. Definitely not.
Q. -- for a PEEP?

Would you have known who to refer such a resident to?
A. Yes, if I'd have known about PEEPs, then my go-to person would have been Janice.
Q. Looking back now, do you consider that, during the time of your employment with TMO, there may have been residents in Grenfell Tower who you may have referred for a PEEP had you known about them at the time?
A. $100 \%$, there would have been people definitely that we would do PEEPs with, but I didn't know that at the time.
Q. Can we move two years ahead. Mr Stokes produces another fire risk assessment in October 2014. That's at \{CST00000092\}. I hope I've got that right.

Now, that's a similar document to previously. The
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date has changed, obviously, 17 October 2014. It's
during the time of your currency at the TMO.
Do you remember seeing that document?
A. I don't. I can only assume that these maybe were what Carl filled in and sent to Janice, just looking at them, but I know I wouldn't have seen anything like this.
Q. You wouldn't have seen this?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Can we look at page 21 \{CST00000092/21\}.

Now, we looked at this in the 2012 FRA. In this one two years later, the wording appears to be the same; do you agree?
A. Yes.
Q. And what Mr Stokes says is, again, a recently introduced system. So:
"TMO have recently introduced a comprehensive programme to [gather] information ..."

That appears to be the same language.
A. I believe so.
Q. You say you didn't see this FRA.

In October 2014, was there or were you aware of a recently introduced system to gather information about vulnerabilities or disabilities ?
A. No, not that I can remember.
Q. Is the answer the same as before: there may have been
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    one, you just weren't aware of it?
A. Yes.
Q. In 2014 - - sorry, I won't ask you that question.
            Can we look next at a document, which is the fire
    safety strategy. Please go to {TMO00830598}.
        This document is the TMO fire safety strategy. Have
    you seen this document before?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. You don't recall reading it, then?
A. No, and I don't know -- yeah. No.
Q. Did you know such a document or do you recall such
    a document being in existence?
A. I don't, no. Again, not saying there wasn't one, but
    not that I can remember.
Q. Forgive me.
                    (Pause)
        Can we look at Janice Wray's witness statement, or
        one of her witness statements to the Inquiry, please.
        The reference for that is {TMO00847305/35}, please,
        operator, paragraphs }114\mathrm{ and 115. Could you just have
        a read of those two paragraphs, please.
            (Pause)
A. Yeah.
Q. Having seen what Janice Wray says about PEEPs, can you
    recall being advised of any system whereby you could
        7 3
    advise the health and safety team of a vulnerable
    resident who may require a PEEP?
A. No.
Q. You were never aware of this as a --
A. I wasn't, no. I mean, my colleagues would see
    vulnerable people and speak to them about their needs,
    but not in relation to having a home fire safety visit .
    Maybe they did, but I can't recall that. I know that
    the Fire Brigade did go round when, I think --
    whether -- to do with the smoke alarms, but I'm not sure
    who arranged those visits.
Q. In the years that you worked as a manager in
    Lancaster West, was there any circumstance or time at
    which you considered or were asked to consider the
    evacuation of vulnerable residents?
A. No, never.
Q. It was never something that came up, as far as you
    recall?
A. Never, no.
Q. Can I ask you some questions now about communications
    you had with some residents.
        Throughout the project, the refurbishment project,
        you attended resident meetings; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we look at your second witness statement, please, at

\section*{A. Yes.}
```

Q. In 2014 -- sorry, I won't ask you that question.
Can we look next at a document, which is the fire
safety strategy. Please go to \{TMO00830598\}.
This document is the TMO fire safety strategy. Have you seen this document before?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. You don't recall reading it, then?
A. No, and I don't know -- yeah. No.

> a document being in existence?
A. don't, no. Again, not saying there wasn't one, but
Q. Forgive me.

> (Pause)
Can we look at Janice Wray's witness statement, or one of her witness statements to the Inquiry, please. The reference for that is $\{$ TMO00847305/35\}, please, operator, paragraphs 114 and 115 . Could you just have a read of those two paragraphs, please.
(Pause)
A. Yeah.
Q. Having seen what Janice Wray says about PEEPs, can you recall being advised of any system whereby you could
A. I wasn't, no. I mean, my colleagues would see vulnerable people and speak to them about their needs, but not in relation to having a home fire safety visit. the Fire Brigade did go round when, I think -whether -- to do with the smoke alarms, but I'm not sure who arranged those visits.
Q. In the years that you worked as a manager in
Lancaster West, was there any circumstance or time at which you considered or were asked to consider the evacuation of vulnerable residents?
A. No, never.
Q. It was never something that came up, as far as you recall?
A. Never, no.
Q. Can I ask you some questions now about communications you had with some residents.
Throughout the project, the refurbishment project,
you attended resident meetings; is that correct?
Q. Can we look at your second witness statement, please, at

```
paragraph 7 \{TMO10050001/2\}. You tell us there about opinions that you offered during the meetings.

Can you give us any more detail about the subject matter of your opinions or what kind of things you would have given an opinion on?
A. I'm not too sure at the ... I mean, I know I attended the meetings, but I was more of a liaison between Rydons and the TMO, but ...
Q. I think you give us an indication of that in your first witness statement. Perhaps we can just look at that, \{TMO00000891/5\}, paragraph 22, please. Thank you. If you don't mind refreshing your memory there, you say:
"Essentially I was there as a familiar face for the residents and to be the liaison between the residents and those directly involved in the refurbishment."
A. Yes.
Q. Can you recall at this stage what the general consensus or opinion was of residents in respect of the refurbishment? Were they in support of it or were they against it?
A. I think initially the majority of residents were quite happy that there was going to be a lot of money spent on the tower, it was well needed, but unfortunately there was just literally a handful of residents that had an issue from before my time who, no matter what you

\section*{75}
done, they would just -- you couldn't have an evening meeting, there would be shouting and screaming in the meetings, we'd have to stop the meetings, they would discourage people from coming to the - - like to consultation meetings. And it was just really difficult, because I think most people were happy that they were getting new windows and new heating systems, you know.
Q. Do you recall any concerns that were raised? Can you give us some detail about particular concerns that may have been raised by residents with regard to the --
A. There was a few. I mean, I remember when - - they was originally told the HIU unit was going in their kitchen, and then when the work started, we then found out that some people were saying they're being told it 's going in the hallway and they wasn't happy, and I remember being at a meeting at the TMO and in that meeting said, you know, "Is this true, are they being put in the hallway, because people are not happy". It was true, and I just -- I said, "Well, I'm not being funny, if I thought in my house it was going in the kitchen and then someone tried to put it in the hallway, I wouldn't be very happy either". So I remember kind of sticking up for the residents then. But then it became such an issue, I think that's when Mr Daffarn was telling people
to put all notices on their door and stop people doing any works, that I think that was overturned in the end and people could then have it in the kitchen.
Q. Right.

You mentioned Mr Daffarn. Can I ask you about specific correspondence between you and Mr Daffarn. It's an email that you were sent on 15 June 2012. The reference is \(\{\) TMO10037666\}.

So the second email on that page, do you see it's the email from Mr Daffarn sent at 9.39 on 15 June. It starts :
"Dear Siobhan,
"Please would be kind enough to email me and let me know ..."

Just have a read of that, please.

> (Pause)

So he's asking about consultation with architects and to influence the designs.

The next email at the top of the page, you say:
"Good morning Eddie
"Mark emailed me yesterday to say he was busy but would call last night, I am guessing he was still busy as he didn't call.
"I am about 10 minutes from the hub so will pop into his office and have a word with him if he is in."
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Do you recall discussing Mr Daffarn's request with

\section*{Mark Anderson?}
A. I probably discussed lots of Mr Daffarn's emails with

Mark Anderson. Yeah, I mean, without being
disrespectful, Mr Daffarn was very challenging sometimes, and even if he got an answer to an email, an email would come back with a different question, and you could never actually get to answer his question. We would always want to - I mean, nobody wants to deal with complaints that go on forever and ever, you want to just deal with the complaint, leave them satisfied and you're satisfied. No matter what you said, Eddie would not accept the answer, and the communications were -they had to come outside of the complaints process in the end, because they were copied in to hundreds of people, all different requests, and all mixed up with other requests, and you could never get to literally what is the complaint.

There was lots of consultation, and I have heard following the Inquiry that, "Oh, we wasn't consulted and we wasn't asked". I was there, and I can say people were consulted, people chose either not to come out or listen to Mr Daffarn, or berated us in those blogs, and it was very difficult, and very unpleasant at times.
Q. You mention that you had many conversations with

\section*{A. Yes.}
Q. I appreciate it 's a difficult question to answer now, but can you recall your discussion about this issue, consultation with architects?
A. I can't, there was too many.
Q. Can we look at what you say in relation to evening meetings in your first witness statement.
A. Yeah.
Q. That's at \(\{\) TMO00000891/11\}, paragraph 52 , if we could pull that up, please, operator. You see the final sentence:
"At some of these meetings Rydon produced samples of cladding materials, design options for the windows and information on the proposed heating system ..."

\section*{Do you see that?}
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall being present when physical samples of cladding were shown to residents?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Can you --
A. I think it was only one, in all fairness, it was one, because I remember it being a champagne colour and then there was an issue with the colour with the planners, but that's all I recall from that. But, yes, there was

\section*{79}
samples, and the same with windows.
Q. Now, this won't have been picked up in the transcript, but as you answered that question you gave us some shapes with your hands. Can you give us an idea, using perhaps something that would help us get an idea, of the size of the samples?
A. From memory, I'm sure it was a - - like a square about this big (indicated). It's like a champagne colour.
Q. I appreciate that you said, "It was this big" and used your hands.
A. \(\mathrm{Oh}--\)
Q. Could you please -- a TV screen, something like that?
A. Maybe - I'm just thinking of a tile now --

600 metres(sic) square tile. Maybe not as big as that.
Q. About a 600 -millimetre square tile?
A. Yeah, tile. I think it was probably a bit smaller than that, because I remember seeing the -- and I thought it was really nice, I think it was like a champagne colour and then there was an issue with the colour with the planners, I believe, but I wasn't that involved in that part. As I say, I attended the meetings to be a familiar face, yeah, and that was it.
Q. You said champagne colour; was it just one sample?
A. Yes, I think there was, yeah.
Q. Can you help us, was it just the cladding panel, was it
```

    mounted on anything, or was it just simply a panel that
    was about 600 millimetres square?
    A. You know what, I'm not sure. I think it was like
a panel -- I don't think it was just a thin piece of
material, so I think it must have been an actual piece
of the cladding.
Q. Mounted on a wall or --
A. No, just on the floor.
Q. On the floor.
Can you recall what residents were told about the
cladding at this meeting?
A. Not too much, I mean, it was so long ago, but I'm just
trying to remember when we was there, it was like, "This
is the cladding, you can come and have a look, ask any
questions". It was that kind of -- it was just an open
meeting for them to ask any questions. I'm not sure if
they had something with other colours. I know there was
an issue they didn't want it to be exactly the same as
the school. But that's probably all I can remember, if
I'm honest.
Q. When you say "they", who do you mean?
A. Residents.
Q. Residents didn't want it to be the same colour as the
school?
A. Yeah.

```
Q. Do you recall any discussion about whether actually the residents had any input on the decisions, whether it might be the planners who in fact would decide? Was there that kind of --
A. I don't know ultimately, but I know there was lots of opportunity for residents to be involved, lots of questionnaires, how do you want to be involved, meetings, drop-in sessions, because obviously one size doesn't fit all, we would stay and have late evening meetings, we would do stuff in the middle of the day, we would do drop-ins in the morning, we would do one-to-ones going to people's flats and speaking to them individually, because I do remember some residents not wanting to come to the meetings, because it was just a screaming match. I mean, nobody wanted to be there.
Q. Can we move forward to early 2014.

Now, you will recall presumably Claire Williams who worked at the TMO and was the project manager for the refurbishment?
A. Yeah.
Q. She came to give evidence to the Inquiry in the autumn of last year, and she told us in her evidence when it came to finding residents to assist in scoring tenders for the project -- if we could pull up that evidence, \(\{\) Day54/162:1\}. Do you see at the top of that page,

Ms Rumble, the A is her answer, she says:
"I think we'd been looking for a while, but I was still comparatively new so I was finding out who people were. So I think I'd looked -- I think I'd asked housing management if they had anybody who they could identify, because it would take people's time, and when I did ask, I think I'm aware that I'd asked 12 people for the 7 March interviews, and I think those people were referred by housing management to me as being people who possibly may be available."

Housing management that Claire Williams refers to there, would that have been you?
A. Would have been us, yeah.
Q. Do you recall being asked by Claire Williams for a list of residents who could assist with scoring tenders?
A. It's very familiar, I couldn't say \(100 \%\), but I think it does kind of ring a bell, because sometimes they would say, "Can you recommend any residents?" You would know the residents who wanted to get involved and the ones who didn't, so we might say, "Oh, yes, X number, you know, this one, they'll probably be willing to get involved". So I would say that's probably true.
Q. So did you give her a physical list or just tell her?
A. I couldn't tell you. No doubt we might have sat there between us in the office just giving her names and

\section*{83}

\section*{addresses.}
Q. And the determination of those names and addresses would be down to you in the office?
A. Yeah, who we thought -- because you'd want to get people involved, and quite often, it doesn't matter what organisation you work for, people don't tend to want to get involved, so it's quite difficult sometimes.
Q. So you were thinking of people who would --
A. Who would get involved, yeah.
Q. Was one of those people Mr Daffarn? We know he's been involved up to that point. Was he considered?
A. I have no idea, but I'm sure that if we'd have asked him, because he wanted to be involved, he would have probably then said he's not coming to the meeting. It's kind of how it worked, it was quite difficult .
Q. Well, let me take a step back. Did you consider asking him? Did you discuss Mr Daffarn as a potential person?
A. I couldn't tell you \(100 \%\) whether we did or not.
Q. Did you consider asking any members of the Leaseholders' Association at Grenfell Tower, the GTLA --

\section*{A. I mean --}
Q. - - or putting them forward? Sorry, I overspoke.
A. That's okay. I think is it -- there's four people that make up the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders' Association, I believe, and I'm not sure -- one of those didn't live
in the flat. Whether we asked the others -- I'm sure -we wouldn't have excluded them, but then I suppose you're just trying to just give names of who would get involved, and if Eddie was one of those who was going to get involved and be constructive, \(100 \%\) we would have wanted him on board.
Q. Right. So you wouldn't have excluded Mr Daffarn or any of the members of --
A. Absolutely not, no.
Q. Going back to your first witness statement at paragraph \(12\{\mathrm{TMO} 00000891 / 3\}\), you say in that first sentence:
"During my time at the TMO I would say that for the most part I had a good relationship with the residents of Lancaster West."

Do you accept that that wasn't necessarily the case for every resident, or do you say that you had a good relationship with every resident?
A. No, you're never going to have a good relationship with every resident. Lancaster West was quite a close-knit community and so was the staff in the office, and we had a good relationship with the majority of the residents. I would say - I could probably pick three people on my hand, Mr Daffarn being one of them, who it was difficult. It was -- in his defence, my colleague said 85
that he was actually quite nice prior to the KALC
project starting. I didn't have that benefit. He was
just, yeah, very rude sometimes, and it was difficult,
because we were there to help people, and if maybe he'd have dropped his guard a bit, we could have helped him a lot more. But he would never let you in. They were
blogging about us, they were very rude, often inaccurate, and it was really hard. But the majority of people on the estate were lovely, and that's why we still done our job, we were happy working at Lancaster West, because the majority of people were good, nice people.
Q. Can I ask you about communications with the -- we touched on them a moment ago -- Grenfell Tower Leaseholders' Association. You don't mention that association or the GTLA in your witness statements. Were you aware of them?
A. Yes, I was aware of them.
Q. Can you help us as to why you don't mention them in your witness statements?
A. Because I think there was a lot of toing and froing of who could be an association, and I can't remember exactly now whether they were recognised as an association, because there was a residents' association, but they didn't want to be a part of it,
and I know there was a lot of work done with Janet, who was the resident engagement manager. But I know it consisted of -- I think it was four people, Eddie, Mr Ahmed, Keith Mott, I believe, and one other, Tunde, who didn't actually live in the tower. He had a tenant in there. And, yeah, they were literally the group that were doing these emails that were ... yeah.
Q. Well, let's -- sorry.
A. Sorry, yeah. The emails that you just couldn't answer and ever resolve an issue because they were pages long, they went to probably everybody in the borough, and you' ll be being chased for a response but they'd copied in so many hundreds of other people, and it's who's responding, and that's why often I'd speak to -- I'd go to Mark or we'd speak to other people and say who's going to respond to this, because there was so much different issues in these emails, you couldn't just look at it and answer it. Had to go round and speak to everybody else.
Q. Can we look at one of those letters or emails. Please look at \{TMO00842290\}. Thank you.

Now, that's a letter from Tunde Awoderu of the GTLA addressed to Paul Dunkerton and also to you, dated 12 July 2012. You see the reference on that is "Appointment of Studio E, Architects for Grenfell Tower
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\section*{improvement not Maintenance".}

Now, can we just skip down, please, operator, to the final paragraph on the first page. Thank you. It says:
"We did not expect you to appoint an architect without consulting us. Please find the forwarded emails copied to Siobhan Rumble ... and hand delivered to her dated 7th March 2012 in relation to building a better relationship. We find it bewildering that you are not aware of these emails as project manager when the area manager of Lancaster West Estate Ms Siobhan Rumble is very much aware of what is going on ..."

Do you remember this letter?
A. Not specifically, but there were many, many communications like this.
Q. Had you been ignoring emails sent to you by the GTLA about the project?
A. Not deliberately ignoring emails, no, but some emails would come in and they'd be so loaded and asking stuff that I wouldn't be involved in, so I would then either speak to Janice or speak to Mark or speak to Peter Maddison once Mark left, and we would try and get a response together, because they would come at you in all different angles, and some of this stuff was not -I mean, I didn't appoint architects or do any of that kind of work, but that's how they unfortunately --
保
\[
3
\]
Q. You mentioned some individuals there, so Mark Anderson - -
A. Yes.
Q. -- Peter Maddison --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and Janice. Janice being --
A. Janice Wray.
Q. Janice Wray?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you raise the concerns with Paul Dunkerton, who at the time --
A. I'm sure I did at the time. Paul was good. I worked -we worked well with Paul. But we'd always try, when you get an email, to try and answer. We want to answer the question so then you can send it back, it 's answered and it goes away.
Q. Can we look at an email sent by Keith Mott on 25 July 2012, it is at \(\{\) RBK00045656/3\}. So the email from Mr Mott, if we look at the first paragraph:
"I tried to call you but no reply, I have hand delivered the Letters to you dated 23rd July 2012; first of all it is always very difficult for us the GTLA to get the straightforward simple answer from the KCTMO."
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Can you help us now with why the GTLA had not received a response from the TMO to their letter that we looked at a moment ago?
A. Well, that's dated -- he said the 23 rd, so two days before, on the Monday. It may well have been in the system waiting for a response. It's only two days.
Q. Would you have spoken to Mark Anderson or Paul Dunkerton following receipt of the letter?
A. Probably.
Q. The letter dated 12 June (inaudible).
A. Oh, 12 June, I beg your pardon. I'm not aware of -I mean, we would deal with complaints and enquiries and whatever you want to call them, but I think some of these, and I've read some of the stuff that's in my statements, and it says, like, "where Siobhan Rumble didn't give us a response", and I clearly did give a response but it wasn't what you wanted, so they will come back again. So some of this stuff is, like, just repetitive. But we wouldn't deliberately ignore correspondence, not want to respond to correspondence, that I know.
Q. Can we look at your response to this email. If we just scroll up, please, operator. So the second paragraph in particular beginning:
"I do not think these emails are very helpful and

I would suggest we meet as a group in person to discuss any issues you may have."

What was the issue with the emails themselves?
A. Because they would come from I think it's Tunde, and then you would respond to him and then you'd get told, "Why are you responding to Tunde, it should have been to the GLA", or you respond to GLA and it's, "Mr Mott wrote you that, you should have responded to Mr Mott". It was that kind of - - you know, I was there and I lived it, and that's the \(--I\) mean, my response says it all:
"As the letter was signed by yourself I emailed you to acknowledge I had received it, as I remember the last time you hand delivered to letter to me I was scolded for responding to Mr Mott (the general email) and not responding to you directly."

So it was a case of you're damned if you do and you're damned if you don't.
Q. You mentioned a few moments ago in your evidence about an issue with the residents' association and whether GTLA were a residents' association.

Do you recall Mr Daffarn, who wasn't a member of GTLA, applying to form a residents' association?
A. I do, but it kind of went back and forth and involved lots of people. I know Janet was very good in trying to get things set up, and it involved RBKC, but I know it
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kind of went round in lots of circles, whether they could, whether they couldn't, then I think they was asked to join the actual residents' association and they didn't want to. So I think at the time they was being told it wouldn't be recognised, and then I think later on down the line it was, I can't remember.
Q. You said later on down the line it was; is that your evidence?
A. I think it was. I think we agreed to respond to them as an organisation, I can't remember the detail, but there was a lot around that time in regards to that.
Q. Were you involved in any of the decisions about that or just in the correspondence about it?
A. No, probably just the correspondence, because Janet Edwards, her name was, she was the resident engagement manager and very good at trying to get people together and get residents' associations up and running. So I know she would have done a lot of work, but I would have left that to Janet.
Q. You produced as one of the exhibits to one of your witness statements a Grenfell Action Group blog. That exhibit is at \(\{\mathrm{TMO} 10017466\}\), please, operator. If we could zoom in at the top of that, we see that's titled "Fire Safety Scandal at Lancaster West", and it's dated 28 January 2013.

You exhibit that to your statement; did you read these blog posts regularly?
A. No, not really. But it would be someone would say to me, "Oh, there's a blog and he's mentioned you again", so I would then go and look at it. And I think this one, where it shows there's correspondence where I did act on it and I think the Fire Brigade did come down and they said there was no -- it wasn't a fire hazard where they were parked, and I think it was Mr O'Connor wasn't happy, and then he wasn't happy, he wanted me to invite him to a meeting with the fire guy, which I didn't arrange that meeting anyway. But it was things like this.

I mean, this parking, I mean, it wasn't ideal because as you go further up the road there, it goes under into the car park, and people should not have been parking there. There was not a lot we could do because there was no -- it was private land so it didn't come under the Kensington and Chelsea parking people who removed the cars. So what we done, we didn't have to, but where Eddie and they was -- Francis O'Connor was always writing this, I thought, you know what, let's just try and stop people parking there. And it wasn't just contractors, it was residents as well. So we had some stickers made, "Do not park here otherwise your car
will be removed", and we couldn't really remove it, but we thought we'd try, and then we stuck all this sticky stuff on the back and literally plastered them over all the windows, because I thought that might be a deterrent. Some people stopped parking there and other people didn't.

So then obviously these blogs were always around, so I then spoke to -- there was a guy who had a \(--I\) 'm not sure, like a mechanic under the arches, and so me and Rob went to speak to him and I said, "How much would it cost to just tow the cars away?" So he told us. So I remember going to the main Kensington and Chelsea building asking if I could have a budget just to kind of make a stand, really. So we put the stickers on and said, "If your car's not removed in 24 hours, it will be removed".

So some people -- I called this guy and he hooked up the car and he would take it off the estate and then leave it somewhere, and then it would get picked up and ticketed and taken to the pound, and then we had someone complain and go to the TMO, and then I got called in by Teresa Brown and asked what I was doing, what I thought I was doing and who gave me the right to do that, and I remember saying, "It's the only way to remove the cars". So I was told to stop doing it, so I did.
Q. Can we look at an email exchange from February 2013, the reference is \(\{\) TMO10026451\}, please.

Now, the exchange includes Steven Cunningham of the LFB, Francis O'Connor and Councillor Blakeman. You're copied in to the exchange as well.

Can I ask you to look at the email from Mr O'Connor to Councillor Blakeman, which is on the second to third page \(\{\) TMO10026451/2 \(\}\). Thank you.

\section*{A. Yeah.}
Q. I' II just check for a moment. On the second to third page, if we could scroll down to the next page, and at the bottom of that page, do you see Ms Rumble the sentence that begins at the bottom of that page:
"We were intending to simply expose these failings on our blog, rather than waste our time and effort ..."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you just read that:
"... as we had previously, in non-productive email exchanges with Ms Rumble and Ms Wray, who appear, as far as we can judge, not even to have read the current assessment."

He is referring to the fire risk assessment carried out by Mr Stokes.

So is he correct? I think you told us earlier that
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you didn't recall them, you hadn't read them. Is that correct?
A. No, but with regard to these cars, we -- there was lots of correspondence and I know the Fire Brigade did go and check, and we'd done everything we could, but he wasn't happy, and I think on the previous bit it says he wasn't even happy with the guy from the Fire Brigade's response.
Q. Having received this email, which makes a comment or a criticism of you for not reading the fire risk assessments, did you then go and read the fire risk assessments?

\section*{A. No.}
Q. Councillor Blakeman responds to Mr O'Connor. She notes in her email, which is on the first page \(\{\) TMO10026451/1\}, if we can scroll back up to it, in the middle paragraph, the third sentence from the bottom, which is at the end of the line, begins:
"What we are no longer prepared to address ..."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. "... are complaints that are couched in tendentious, abusive, offensive or bullying terms. Neither will we tolerate visits to our surgery that are conducted in a similar fashion. I believe that CIIr. Coleridge has
```

    given out much the same message."
        Did you feel that the Grenfell Action Group, the
    blog, had been abusive or bullying?
    A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall if you took any action in responding to
Mr O'Connor's complaint following receipt of his emails,
other than that which you've just told us about?
A. The blog, yes, there was one blog, and I think from
memory it was -- there was "Rumbles of discontent" and
"Ms Rumble and her cronies", and I just thought: I'm not
going to tolerate that from Mr O'Connor. So I rang him
and said, "Stop writing about me in your blog otherwise
I'm going to seek legal advice" and get a legal letter
sent to him to tell him to stop it, because he was rude
and it was offensive and it was often inaccurate.
And then there's something in my witness statement
that he then comes back, "Further to your threatening
phone call", but underneath I said it wasn't
threatening, I merely -- just being robust and practical
and just saying to him, "Stop it, because I won't
tolerate that". And then I think he kind of -- he did
quieten down a bit.
Q. Can we look next at another complaint. The reference is
{IWS00001597/2} and it's an email on the second to third
page of that email chain. If we could go on to the
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third page {IWS00001597/3}, and the second paragraph, if
we could just zoom in on it. Just have a look at that,
please. It says:
"The area manager Ms Siobhan Rumble verbally told
the secretary of the GTLA Mr. Miguel Alves on
31st January }2014\mathrm{ that she and the council had got
better things to do but read emails from the GTLA."
Then:
"It proves conclusively how arrogant Ms Rumble is to
make such a comment on behalf of the councillors of
RBKC.
"We strongly believe somebody has to take
responsibility for this. She has lost our trust and
respect as a neighbourhood manager of Lancaster West.
She is not suitable and capable to be part of the team
to handle the £9.7m Grenfell Tower regeneration project.
It's important you restore that trust immediately as
a tenant led organisation."
Were you aware of the strength of feeling against
you personally from the GTLA?
A. It was, as I say, probably about four people, and
I don't believe this statement to be true, because
I would never have said -- I know I can be outspoken,
but I would never have been that rude, but this is what
they would do, do letters and refer to you like that,
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and say this is -- the same way Francis O'Connor said,
"Siobhan Rumble threatened me". No, if I'm just telling you to stop doing something, that is not a threat. But it's the same. I don't believe I'd have said, "We've got better things to do". I don't talk like that, and I'm more than capable of -- I was more than capable of doing my job down there, and \(I\) did and \(I\) enjoyed it at the time I was there.
Q. Did anyone talk to you about this email within the TMO, Robert Black or any other senior manager?
A. I don't think so. We was all used to seeing this kind of correspondence.
MR GADD: Mr Chairman, I've come to the end of my prepared questions.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, thank you very much.
Well, Ms Rumble, as you hear, Mr Gadd thinks he has exhausted his questions, but we always have a bit of a break at this stage to enable him to take stock, and also to enable others who are not here to suggest further questions we might want to put to you.

So we will have a break now. I'm going to say 12.40 , please. We will come back at 12.40 , unless we're told that further time is required. If we are, it might be a little longer.
THE WITNESS: Sure.
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SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And then we will see if there are
any more questions for you at that stage.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right? Thank you very much.
And again, please don't talk to anyone about your
evidence while you're out of the room. Thank you very
much.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(Pause)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, Mr Gadd. Well, we will say
12.40. If you're told that more time is needed and if
a good reason is given for it, then of course we will
consider it sympathetically.
MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
(12.26 pm)
(A short break)
(12.55 pm)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, Ms Rumble, I'm sorry we kept
you waiting longer than I --
THE WITNESS: That's okay.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: -- indicated. Whether that means
there are a lot of questions or not very many questions,
I'm not sure. We'll find out.
Yes, Mr Gadd.

```
```

MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
Ms Rumble, you were giving us evidence this morning
about Seamus Dunlea and the removal of the self-closing
device on the door, do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I take you to the [draft] transcript, please. It 's
page 40, line 15. I asked you a question
{Day120/41:18}:
"Now, do you remember a conversation with Mr Dunlea
where you discussed removing self-closers?"
You said:
"Yeah, I actually don't, and when I saw this email,
I thought obviously me and Janice must have had
a conversation, and from Janice's email ... please tell
him to stop doing it, and so obviously I must have had
a conversation with him because my response was 'Told
him'. This is where I actually rang a colleague,
because I was thinking, I don't remember this, because
we didn't really touch front doors ..."
My question is: who is that colleague that you spoke
to?
A. My colleague was Rob Regan.
Q. And did you speak to Rob Regan at the time that Janice
sent the email or just --
A. No, no, no, no, recently. This was in -- because I was
1 0 1
coming here, I was thinking I needed to know because
I didn't realise about these doors, and so I rang and
said, "Did you know Seamus took these off some doors?",
and he said, "Yeah", and I said, "Why did he do it?" and
he said because some of the people, some of the elderly
people, the doors were too stiff. So I said, "Oh,
right, okay", so I thought at least I know now, so --
but that's why I asked, because I wanted to know,
because I didn't know why he had taken them off.
Q. At the time that Janice Wray sent the email, did you
speak to any colleague about it, do you recall?
A. No.
Q. Can I ask you some questions about the evidence you gave
this morning about Janice Jones liaising with RBKC --
A. Yes.
Q. - - whenever someone would move in, and you also told us
about questionnaires that were sent to residents.
Would the information that was contained in the
questionnaires, for example on disabilities or
vulnerabilities, be passed to Janice Jones?
A. I --
Q. Or would she conduct the questionnaires?
A. No. Sometimes we might get asked -- there was
a door-knocking exercise and we would fill out sheets.
I can't remember the detail of all of them, but it was
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obviously to do with the works, the regeneration works.
So we might go round and door-knock people, but I can't remember what was in the questionnaires, but I know there was lots of different occasions we done that. It wasn't just to collect disability stuff. I'm not aware it was specifically for that.

But as I say, with regards to anything like that, Janice -- if there had been like a drop-in session or one of the Rydon RLOs had spoken to a tenant and found out that they had some issues or concerns, they would come back to Janice and us and just say, "Oh, such and such needs some assistance on this, that and the other". So then Janice would go, take all the details, and should they need assistance or support, Janice would then liaise with the support workers at RBKC and then try and put in place some support.

And that was the same with hoarding. Hoarding was a big issue. So Janice was very involved with helping people -- and obviously because of the works, that was a priority, to get some of those places emptied, because obviously they couldn't get in to do the works, and Janice was really good at dealing with the people who were vulnerable like that, and just saying, you know, "Put a few bits outside and we'll come and collect it". She done that a lot. So it's things like that.
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Q. You mentioned the role that Janice Jones would play in collection and collation of information such as that. Would David Noble have had any role in that? Would he have liaised, for example, with RBKC housing or social services or occupational therapy, as far as you're aware?
A. Not as far as I'm aware, but it was only really in relation to our residents, and if they needed to move for whatever reason or we had to engage them with some mental health support, then Janice would be the one leading on that, and that would be just us at Lancaster West.
Q. Is it fair to say that there didn't appear to be any comprehensive system for the collection and collation of such information, vulnerable resident information for Grenfell Tower?
A. There may well have been in David's role but, as I say, that would never always come down to our level. For whatever they were doing at the TMO and collecting their data for other stuff, I do believe that that's what his role was all around that kind of work.
Q. If there was such a system, you weren't aware of it --
A. No.
Q. -- is that fair?
A. No. Yes.

```
Q. Now, if we can go to the [draft] transcript again, page 79, line 20 \{Day120/84:19\}. The question was about the Leaseholders' Association at Grenfell Tower putting themselves forward for the tender exercise, and I think you said that there were four people that make up the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders' Association.

Can I ask you, then, to look at an email which is at \{TMO00842290\}. Could we go to that, please, operator. If we can scroll to the bottom of that email, you see a list of names there, nine in total. It suggests, wouldn't it, that there were at least nine members of the Leaseholders' Association?
A. Maybe there was. I think there was 12 leasehold properties, I believe, but the only people I was aware of in regards to the Grenfell Leaseholders' Association and all the correspondence was Tunde, Mr Daffarn, Mr Mott and Mr Ahmed. They're the only ones that I recall dealing with.
Q. Can I ask you to look at a couple of petitions that were submitted by the Grenfell Tower Leaseholders' Association, the first one in 2013, and that is \(\{\) RBK00002270/8\}, the last page in this document. We see there the 94th entry is Mr Daffarn.

Now, that's a petition submitted by the Leaseholders' Association, isn ' \(t\) it?

\section*{A. I guess so.}
Q. Do you accept that 94 signatories of that petition is a significant number of the residents of Grenfell Tower?
A. It is, but I don't doubt that Eddie was out door-knocking and saying, "Sign this document", because if that was the case, that that many people were unhappy, we would have known about it.
Q. This is a petition in relation to the power surges that occurred in --
A. Yeah, and the power surges, from memory, it was like a handful of people to start with. I don't know whether other people - - I don't know how many - - because Janice and I think Deon as well at the time literally went out -- there's a lot of correspondence back and forth, what I've sent that's in the pack, and we went to take a list of all the items. But originally it started off just a couple of people, because the calls were coming in, and we thought, "That's a bit odd", you know, "My laptop's blown up" or "My fridge has blown up", and then -- so we sent people out to go and have a look, and first we thought it was just a couple of properties, but then I can't remember how many were on the list. It certainly wasn't 94.
Q. Well, this document suggests that 94 people signed a petition that was submitted by the GTLA. That would
at the very least suggest, wouldn't it, that 94 people may have been concerned about power surges? The GTLA were representing the concerns of those 94 people; is that fair?
A. I guess so. But it's how that -- I'm sorry, but it's how that information came about, you know. Yeah.
Q. Can I ask you to look at the board meeting minutes of the TMO dated 21 November 2013, and the reference for that is \(\{T M O 10028444 / 7\}\).

You will see there that these are minutes of the programme board meeting. Under "Grenfell Tower", the last sentence of that paragraph is:
"It had been agreed to hold no more public meetings because of the stand being made by the Grenfell Tower leaseholder group."

Do you know what was being referred to there by "the stand made by the Grenfell Tower leaseholder group"?
A. I'm not sure, but I am guessing it's in relation to -we had a couple of evening meetings where Eddie and another guy, I think it was Willie, had came in, and one of Mr Daffarn's favourite sayings was, "This is a slum, we're living in a slum, you're doing nothing", and we were there actually holding a consultation meeting, telling them how much money we were going to spend on the tower, wanting their involvement. But he was just
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screaming it was a slum. I remember Peter Maddison was there, and I just said, "If that's how you're going to behave, leave", you know, because it wasn't constructive, and it made other people feel uncomfortable. I mean, they wasn't well turned out, the meetings, anyway, and I think it's because people knew that it would just turn into a circus, and I think after that -- and I'm not sure if that was the same meeting, because there's some reference to Councillor Blakeman being at a meeting, who witnessed this kind of behaviour, and we thought, you know, we give up our evenings to come and try and consult and help you, we don't come there to be abused and actually get nowhere. Do you know what I mean? There was nothing constructive about it.

So I think that's why they probably decided, "Let's stop this and do it another way", and we asked people, "How would you like to be consulted?" And I think people preferred us to go to their house. But, as I say, there was a room put together in Grenfell, so that was manned I think all day, and people could pop in and out and speak to Rydons, they could speak to us all the time because we was always in the office just at the bottom, sometimes we spent time in that room and just being there to answer any questions people had and just,
yeah, support the project really .
Q. My final question, Ms Rumble, is: is there anything else that you would like to tell the panel that you think might help them in their investigations and deliberations from the time that you worked at the TMO?
A. No, not really I think, obviously, from the Inquiry,

I just hope -- well, even without the summing-up at the end of all of this Inquiry, we're all going to learn something from it, and just hope that, you know, nothing like this ever happens again.
MR GADD: Mr Chairman, I've come to the end of my questions and those that have been submitted, and there are no more questions for Ms Rumble.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good. Well, thank you very much indeed.

Well, Ms Rumble, it is a little later than we had hoped to break for lunch, but I think it's very important that we all thank you very much for coming here to give your evidence. We've all found it very useful and interesting to hear what you have to tell us, so thank you very much indeed.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Now, that is all the questions, and you're free to go.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.

\section*{109}
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SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
(The witness withdrew)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, Mr Gadd, we'll break at that
point. We have another witness, do we, this afternoon?
MR GADD: We do, Ms Bartholomew.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK:Good, thank you very much. Then
I think we will resume at 2.10, please, and we will take
her then.
MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
(1.10 pm)
(The short adjournment)
(2.10 pm)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, Mr Gadd, we have another
witness, don't we?
MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman, yes. Can I call
Nicola Bartholomew, please.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
MS NICOLA BARTHOLOMEW (sworn)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. Would you like
to sit down and make yourself comfortable.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. Do pour yourself some water,
we'll wait a minute.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.

```

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. When you're ready, Mr Gadd. Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY
MR GADD: Ms Bartholomew, can I start by thanking you very much for attending at this public inquiry to give your evidence. We are very grateful to you.

If you have any difficulty understanding any of the questions I'm going to ask, please say and I' II ask the question again or put it in a different way.

If you feel you need a break at any time, please let us know. We will aim to take a scheduled break this afternoon, but if you need a break at any time, please signal and we'll aim to break at that point.

The other thing I would ask you to do, please, is to try to keep your voice up, so that the transcriber, who sits to your right, can hear you very clearly and to get your evidence down.

It also helps not to nod or shake your head, but say "yes" or "no", so that the words you say can be written down on the transcript.

You have made a number of witness statements to the Inquiry, but for the purpose of today's questions I'm going to focus on three. Could I please take you to them. They are in a folder on your desk and they will hopefully appear on your screen as I take you to them.
A. Thank you.

\section*{111}
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Q. The first one is \{TMO00000894\}. That's dated
7 February 2019. Could we go to page 8, please. There
is a signature on that page.
A. Yes, there is .
Q. That's your signature?
A. That's correct, it is.
Q. Thank you. I'm going to refer to that witness statement
as your first witness statement.
Can I then ask you to look at \{TMO00842401\}. Could
we go to page 5. Again, a signature. Is that your
signature?
A. Yes, it is
Q. Did you sign that on 4 October 2019?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. I'm going to refer to that as your second witness
statement.
A. Okay.
Q. Could we now go to $\{$ TMO00871021\}. On page 8, we should
see a signature. Is that your signature?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Did you sign that on 4 June 2020?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. I'm going to refer to that as your third witness
statement.
A. Thank you.

```
Q. Have you read those witness statements recently?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Can you confirm that the contents are true?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. Have you discussed those witness statements or your evidence with anybody before coming here today?
A. No, I have not.
Q. I'm going to ask you some questions about your qualifications and experience prior to joining the TMO.

You say at paragraph 5 of your first witness statement, if we could just pull that up, please, \{TMO00000894/1\}:
"At the time of the tragedy at Grenfell Tower, I had been working in housing management in the London Boroughs for twenty years. I have a degree in housing and I am a member of the Chartered Institute of Housing."

Pausing there, your degree in housing, when did you obtain that degree?
A. I believe it was around 2013/2014.
Q. Shortly before you --
A. Yes, I had --
Q. -- joined the TMO?
A. Yes, sorry. I had a break. So I did some formal qualifications upon leaving school, and then I had
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a break for a number of years, and then I went back to study my housing degree later on in my career.
Q. As part of your degree course, was health and safety taught or considered as part of that course?
A. Not that I recall. Not specifically as a module, as part of that course, not that I can recall, I'm afraid.
Q. Were any general issues of health and safety considered from your recollection?
A. Not to my recollection, no.
Q. What about fire safety?
A. No.
Q. You say in the same paragraph that you had worked in London boroughs for over 20 years. Where were you working immediately prior to joining the TMO in May 2016?
A. Immediately prior to the TMO I was working in -- for a company called Red Kite in High Wycombe, and then prior to that I had worked in the London Borough of Hillingdon I think twice, Slough Borough Council, and I had worked for some housing associations that had contracts with London boroughs, and I'd worked for the London Borough of Harrow as well previously.
Q. With any of those previous employers and in any of your previous roles, were you responsible for health and safety or fire safety?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any responsibility at all or interaction with health and safety teams or with fire safety in those roles?
A. There would certainly be interaction, but directly responsible for the delivery of health and safety, no.
Q. Delivery of fire safety?
A. Fire safety, no, not directly responsible for fire safety.
Q. Did you have any fire safety training in any of those roles?
A. Not to my recollection, not specifically fire safety training.
Q. Would you have had any training in assisting vulnerable persons or what might be described as vulnerable persons in the context of a fire or emergency?
A. No, I don't believe I had had specific training on dealing with vulnerable people in the context of a fire or an evacuation due to a fire. I don't think there was anything specific to that at all.
Q. You're a member of the Chartered Institute of Housing?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Any training as part of that membership?
A. I don't believe I have undertaken any training specific to fire safety via the Chartered Institute.
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Q. What about health and safety via the same institute?
A. Not that I can recall. I haven't, probably, done much training via the Chartered Institute of Housing, I don't think, specifically.
Q. Can we look at paragraph 6 of your first witness statement \(\{\) TMO00000894/1\}. You say you applied for the role of neighbourhood team leader after seeing a website advertisement. Your predecessor, who was not your immediate predecessor but one before that, was Siobhan Rumble; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know that she had the title area housing manager for the Lancaster West Estate?
A. I may have been aware of that, there may have been some legacy paperwork that I may have seen, but it wasn't something that was immediately brought to my attention, I don't think, that the job titles were different.
Q. Right. It wasn't explained to you that this was a new role or different role to that which had existed before?
A. Certainly not at the time. I think as the interview progressed, and after getting the job, I think it became obvious then about the direction in which the organisation wanted to travel, in terms of aligning my job role title with that of the other team leaders that worked within the TMO.
```

Q. Right.
A. So, sorry, just to be clear about that, I think there
was already a team leader for the north and a team
leader for the south, so I would effectively become
another team leader alongside those two existing roles.
Q. Right, and that was a team leader for which area?
A. For the area that I was covering, that would come on to
becoming the team leader for the west. So I would be
neighbourhood team leader for the west post the
restructure.
Q. Did you report to Kiran Singh?
A. I did.
Q. And he in turn reported to Teresa Brown; is that
correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. They weren't based at Lancaster West Estate; is that
correct?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. Does it follow, then, that you were the most senior
person employed by the TMO based at Lancaster West
Estate?
A. On a day-to-day basis, probably. That's probably
correct, yeah.
Q. On a day-to-day basis, can we look at what your role
involved.

```

\section*{A. Yes.}
Q. Siobhan Rumble was responsible for the income team for the whole of the TMO. Was that something that you were also responsible for?
A. No. There was a separate team leader to deal with income recovery at the point that -- I think six weeks after I joined the restructure took place, and the income element for Lancaster West was taken and absorbed into the main income management team.
Q. You say six weeks after you joined --
A. Yeah.
Q. - there was a restructure; is that correct?
A. Approximately six weeks, yeah. There was a restructure pretty soon after 1 joined, which I think took effect in August 2016. So I joined on 3 May 2016, and then the restructure took place -- so allowing for consultation with staff, I think it went live in early August 2016.
Q. Did that restructure include removing your responsibility for the estate services assistants?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. So does it follow then that from May to August you were responsible for managing the --
A. They were caretakers at the time, I think they were called, but yes, they were estate service supervisors, so that would have been Robert Regan, Paul Steadman and
the handyman, Seamus Dunlea.
Q. Can we look at your second witness statement, paragraph 2 \{TMO00842401/1\}. You set out there a list of your responsibilities. Can we just clarify some of these responsibilities.

That list itself, was that obtained from a job description or can you recall the source from which you --
A. It may have been. It may have been. I recall when compiling the statement to say -- to refer to the job description, so it may have been.
Q. At (a) you refer to managing the neighbourhood management provision. Could you give us a little more detail on what exactly you meant by that?
A. Yeah, so neighbourhood management would include things like -- so tenancy management, dealing with successions, mutual exchanges, overseeing all of that kind of landlord and tenant work. Also looking after antisocial behaviour and the management of antisocial behaviour complaints. A level of resident engagement. Yeah, and managing the on-site office there. So, yeah, landlord and tenant stuff mainly.
Q. At (b) you refer to delivering housing and management services. Is that different, then, to (a) or does it cover the same --
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A. No, the same, the same.
Q. Could you look at (e), please:
"To take the lead in identifying new initiatives and policies that improve service delivery for local residents."

Can you help us with that, could you give us an example of an initiative or policy?
A. I'm trying to think if there was one that I developed when I was there, but really part of the role would be to look to continuously improve the service that you were delivering. So if something happened during the course of your management there where you felt that something could be developed or something new needed to be initiated, or if there was an area of policy that didn't appear to work or that needed to be changed because something in the locality had changed, then certainly that would be feeding that back up and trying to develop new processes.

So that's really -- that's the kind of stretched part of the role, I would say, in that it didn't happen all that often and doesn't, in my experience, in housing management, but it's there if an opportunity presents itself
Q. If we could scroll down to (f) \(\{T M O 00842401 / 2\}\), please, you say:
"To develop local knowledge of the communities and neighbourhoods in which the TMO operates."
A. Yeah.
Q. Practically speaking, what did that mean? What did that involve?
A. Well, I can only say kind of how I approached that, which was to try and get an understanding of the community that I was working with and understand some of the complexities around that, and to engage with residents and customers as much as possible.

Unfortunately I was only with the TMO just under a year before the fire occurred, so that would very much be something that you would gain throughout the span of your tenure there, and unfortunately I didn't have a huge amount of time to be able to get as much of that knowledge as I would have liked.
Q. At (i), if you could look at (i), you talk about liaison with other external agencies.
A. Yeah.
Q. Would that have included the Fire Brigade, the LFB?
A. Potentially, yes, although liaison with the Fire Brigade would generally have been dealt with by Janice Wray. I think that would probably come more into play when liaising and speaking to our local police teams. That's usually what -- that's how I would remember that
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particular area.
Q. With the aim of addressing what?
A. Antisocial behaviour, generally, and just having an understanding about the issues that were occurring out on the wider estates, remembering that at this stage I wasn't just responsible for Lancaster West Estate, I obviously had estates on Silchester and Henry Dickens, so my remit was broader than just Lancaster West.
Q. In terms of fire safety risks, and given that you were the most senior person on the estate, on Lancaster West, would you have been responsible for, if you became aware of any specific fire safety risks, escalating those to others in the TMO?
A. Not primarily. All the other members of staff -- it doesn't necessarily follow that because I was on site, I would be the person responsible. So the other members of the staff that were there that had their own line managers, they would have routes to escalate any queries and concerns and would be managing those staff accordingly. So because I was the most senior on site doesn't necessarily mean I am the overall responsible person.
Q. You mentioned a moment ago that your role covered Silchester and Henry Dickens estates.
A. Correct.
```

Q. When did your role expand to cover those estates?
A. During the August time, early August time.
Q. This is August 2016?
A. Yes.
Q. The restructure?
A. Yes, that's correct, so }--\mathrm{ and that also included
management for the travellers' site and for the
temporary accommodation hostel remit as well. So it was
wider than just Lancaster West.
Q. Did you consider that you were stretched thinly across
the areas you had to cover?
A. I think having - - I didn't consider that at the time
because obviously I was fairly new into the role, so
it's very difficult to gauge how much work that would
have encompassed at that point. So at the time of the
restructure, I didn't foresee that being a difficulty .
Q. What about now?
A. With the benefit of hindsight, I think if you speak to any housing manager, they're always going to say that they feel that they could have, you know, had extra resource. That's true of any role that l've been in. I have to say that at the time I felt that we were adequately resourced from a housing management perspective.
Q. I asked you a little earlier about training prior to
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joining the TMO. Now, when you were with TMO, did you receive any training on fire safety?
A. I don't recall that I did. I don't recall that. I don't think I did.
Q. In your first witness statement, if we can go back to that, at paragraph 20 \{TMO00000894/4\}, just look, please, at the first sentence there. You say:
"While I had some awareness of the fire safety measures in Grenfell Tower, I have no knowledge of whether they were compliant with relevant building regulations ..."

```

\section*{A. Yeah.}
```

Q. What fire safety measures were you aware of at Grenfell Tower?
A. I was aware that there was a smoke vent system. I hadn't been involved necessarily on the training for that, although the ESAs were, as far as I'm aware, so I was aware that there was a -- that system in place. Not - I can't remember if I was aware of anything else.
Q. Did you ever consider during the time that you worked there whether you should have been aware of the fire safety measures in place?
A. I felt at the time that the staff that were there, that were responsible for managing that, had worked there for a considerable period of time. There was no reason for

```

\section*{A. Yeah.}
Q. I think you called them caretakers until the restructure ; is that correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. So again in your first witness statement at paragraph 10 \{TMO00000894/2\}, please, you say:
"I recall that for the first few weeks I worked at the TMO, the two Estate Service Assistants reported to me. However following a restructuring Paul and Robert began reporting instead to the Estates Services Team Leader, Louise Nezandonyi ... "
A. Yes.
Q. So post-restructure, did you cease to have any supervisor responsible for the estate services assistants?
A. Effectively, yes, although I would try and keep abreast of what was going on, but effectively the line management responsibility was with Louise 125

\section*{post-restructure.}
Q. Was she based on the Lancaster West Estate?
A. No, she wasn't, she was based at the hub, but she would visit the office regularly. We had a hot desking arrangement there, so she was able to come down and speak with her team if she needed to.
Q. Can you help us with how regularly she would have done that?
A. Off the top of my head ... I wouldn't like to put a timing on that. All I can say was regularly.
Q. Right.

Were you more senior than the ESAs?
A. I was more senior than the ESAs, but I was on a peer group with Louise, so we were the same grade, myself and Louise.
Q. In the office at Lancaster West --
A. Yeah.
Q. - - would they have come to you as the more senior person in the TMO with any issues or queries that they were experiencing in their day-to-day work?
A. Possibly, possibly. That is definitely possible, yeah.
Q. Now, in your third witness statement at paragraph 36, if we could just go to that, please, \{TMO00871021/7\}, what you do there is quote from Mr Steadman's witness statement where he says:
So at the
another team leader colleague, I have to make the
assumption that that was working, and that everybody was
doing what they needed to do. It wasn't my area of
responsibility at that time.
Q. We touched upon the estate services assistants before. estate. What kind of things would you have wanted to know about?
A. Yeah, so obviously I would be the one attending most of the Lancaster West Residents' Association meetings, so really it would be around whether we'd had fly-tipping issues, whether, you know, we'd had -- whether there were concerns about anybody sleeping rough anywhere, so we had garage blocks underneath the finger blocks and occasionally we had rough sleepers in there. Yeah, it could be about anything, really, any concerns on the general estate. So, yeah, that type of thing.
Q. Any fire safety concerns?
A. Not that I could recall. It's possible, but I can't recall anything specific. But in any event, that would have needed to have been picked up with Louise as I would expect through his formal one-to-one process with her. I wouldn't have expected fire safety concerns
to be raised in an ad hoc catch-up session with me.
I wouldn't be the appropriate person.
Q. Given that you can't recall --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- if he had raised such a concern, what would you have done with it?
A. What I would have done with it would have raised it with the necessary people, so it would either have gone -I'd have either spoken to his line manager about it or I'd have spoken to Janice about it. That's what I would have done.
Q. Did Paul Steadman or Robert Regan ever raise concern with regard to the amount of work that they had to do in the time with which they had to do it?
A. I'm trying to think back on that one. There's nothing specific that rings a bell. I mean, I think other than the kind of normal situation that you -- I say normal situation, but in my experience of social housing, there are times where everybody feels really pushed and stretched, but nothing more significant than that, in terms of the normal run of day-to-day things. I certainly didn't get the impression that they were under significant pressure that would warrant me having to speak to Louise and raise concerns about the -- their workload.
Q. Were you aware if they had certain time limits for carrying out pieces of work?
A. No, I wasn't aware of time limits on pieces of work.
Q. Could we look at a document, please. The reference is \{TMO10047147/7\}. Can you look at the paragraph towards the end of that box, in the right-hand column, which says, "Currently Paul"; do you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. "Currently Paul does not do estate inspections like the other ESAs but from the end of November he will be accompanying Nicky and I on the walkabout with the RA. This is so that Paul can explain what jobs he has raised or raise any jobs that the RA bring to his attention.
The walkabout will be happening every three weeks on a Thursday."

The RA, could you help us with that?
A. The Residents' Association.
Q. Is the Nicky he refers to --
A. That would be me.
Q. That's you?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you know what was meant by the comment he does not do estate inspections like the other ESAs?
A. I think that's a legacy issue. So in my predecessor's time, in Siobhan's time, the service was run slightly
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[


differently and not in the same way that the ESAs would manage on the other estates. So part of the thought process, my understanding was that they would join the wider pool of estate service assistants so that those processes could be standardised, because -- yeah, that's what I -- that's what my understanding of that meant.
Q. Did you start accompanying him on walkabouts with the Residents' Association?
A. I started the walkabouts initially, fortnightly, and then I had a member of the -- a new housing officer join, Millicent Williams, who joined, I believe, middle of August to the end of August, and then that's something that I eventually handed over to Millicent to manage, and my understanding is that she and Paul would carry those out with the Residents' Association. So it went from two weeks to then eventually three-weekly.
Q. Can you remember when the change came between two weeks and three-weekly?
A. It went to three-weekly at the Residents' Association's request, because I think they were having difficulties in having enough residents wanting to meet, and so -because they would organise a bit of a rota for people to attend and to carry those inspections out. So I think it went at their request to three-weekly, but I can't remember when. It will be in
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Residents' Association minutes maybe somewhere.
Q. Can I ask you some questions about inspection checklists now.
A. Yeah.
Q. So paragraph 27 of your first witness statement, please, \{TMO00000894/6\}. You refer there to Excel spreadsheets which contained the results of weekly and monthly health and safety checks.

Can we look at your exhibit reference NB2 as an example. So that's \{TMO10016213\}.

Do you recognise that?
A. Yes.
Q. Would these have been generated from the information that was inputted on the PDAs, the devices used by ESAs?
A. I assume so. I wasn't managing them at that point, so I wouldn't have been getting this information on a - - if at all, on a regular basis. So I would assume that would be the outcome from the PDA devices.
Q. Could we just click on sheet 2, please, operator. You see the information contained within the second sheet in the spreadsheet?
A. Yes.
Q. So these are the list of questions across the top row. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Now, this spreadsheet, would you have ever seen this spreadsheet or something like it before?
A. I can't recall seeing this spreadsheet before. If I did, I may have seen it very early on in terms of when I was looking after or managing the ESAs, but subsequent to that, I'm not sure that I would have seen this regularly, if at all.
Q. Would it -- sorry.
A. Sorry.
Q. Would it have been sent to you in any way?
A. It's possible, but given that Louise was the line manager or there was a team leader for that, I don't -that -- the person in that role would have been looking at that information rather than myself. It may have been sent to me as a courtesy.
Q. Right.
A. But I don't recall seeing it, or having seen it, you know, giving it my full attention.
Q. So if there was an issue, for example, with one of the inspections that this checklist highlighted, that wouldn't necessarily have been obvious to you or something that you would have dealt with?
A. Not necessarily, no, because, as I said, there would be -- there is a team leader for that area of work and they would be responsible for picking that up.
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\footnotetext{
Q. I see.

During the time period that you did supervise the estate services assistants, caretakers or handymen, did you ever hear of any issue with self - closing device on doors, specifically with those being removed?
A. No.
Q. Or any significant issues with those door-closers?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. I now want to ask you some questions about interactions you had with Janice Wray.
A. Yeah.
Q. Are you familiar with Janice Wray - -
A. Yes, I am, yeah.
Q. You didn't have regular meetings with her; is that right?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any meetings with her at all?
A. I don't think there was anything in the calendar specifically on a kind of -- on a moving forward basis. We would catch up if there was something -- you know, if we happened to be in the same place and we needed to have a catch - up, but I don't think there was anything diarised formally.
Q. So, again, would it have been on an ad hoc basis that you would have had --
}
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Whenever an issue arose that --
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Did you ever attend the health and safety committee meetings in the TMO?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. Would you have received the minutes from those meetings?
A. I don't believe that I would have done. I wasn't a participant, so therefore I don't believe that I would have been sent the minutes, but I don't recall seeing any minutes.
Q. Can you help us with how you were kept abreast of any health and safety issues that had arisen, either on the Lancaster West Estate or across TMO stock? How would you have been kept abreast of those issues?
A. Well, we did have managers' meetings, so if anything was raised then it would have been raised as an issue at those management meetings. So present at those would have been myself, the team leader responsible for the ESAs, the other two neighbourhood team leaders, a variety of my peers would have been at that meeting, the two heads of service, and they were usually chaired by Teresa Brown.
Q. Who were the two heads of service?
A. That would be Kiran Singh, who was my line manager, and

\section*{135}
then the housing -- head of housing I think was Maria,
I'm afraid I can't remember her surname, and she managed the south area.
Q. So if there were health and safety issues or fire safety issues, they would have been articulated and passed to you through the managers' meetings?
A. I would have assumed so, yes.
Q. Any other ways in which they were passed to you?
A. It's possible that things could have come directly, so if, you know, if it wasn't -- if a meeting wasn't due to take place, we could have been emailed about them separately, yeah.
Q. Can I ask you about fire risk assessments.
A. Yes.
Q. In your first witness statement at paragraph 23, that's \{TMO00000894/5\}:
"I was not involved in the procurement of these Fire Risk Assessments, nor was I involved in reviewing
findings. I do recall that a list of actions would arise from these assessments however it was not my responsibility to ensure that the actions were completed. This was managed by Louise Nezandonyi, who would liaise with Janice Wray directly."

Were you ever provided with the fire risk
assessments or the action plans that were produced by
A. I can't recall if I was in receipt of the action plans from Mr Stokes. I do recall receiving a risk assessment form with some actions on, but I don't know if that was in relation to any work of Carl Stokes.
Q. Who provided that --
A. That came to \(--I\) think that came to me via Janice Wray.
Q. Did you ever ask to see the fire risk assessments for any of the properties you were responsible for?
A. No, I don't recall that I did.
Q. Does it follow you would never have read any of them?
A. It does follow that I wouldn't have read them.
Q. Were you made aware at any stage of the risks that had been highlighted in them or any steps that ought to be taken with respect to them?
A. I think there were probably elements that I would have been aware of and certainly on the issues that Janice would have raised directly, but the wider scope of the risk assessments, maybe not. It's very difficult for me to recall.
Q. Those elements that may have been raised with you directly, can you help us with what they were?
A. Yeah, I think there may have been things in evidence already of a risk assessment that had my name attributed to them for fire safety actions or risk assessment
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actions.
Q. What kind of actions were they, from recollection?
A. From my recollection, I think they were things to do with -- there was something to do with a stairwell, maybe, maybe a door, one of the fire doors, things like that, and that had my name against them. But again, that was a legacy issue in terms of the role had already passed over to Louise. So, with hindsight, what I should have done was just get the name switched to reflect that Louise was responsible for those, but we were a small team and I was just trying to be helpful, I think, in making sure that, you know, a name was against it at the time. But it was on the transfer period, so yeah.
Q. Given that you were the most senior person from the TMO on the ground, as it were, at Lancaster West, should you have known about the outcomes of the fire risk assessments or the risks that had been flagged up to the TMO for those properties?
A. Well, again, I go back to my point and say that I might have been the most senior person geographically there, however everybody else also had someone of a similar position to myself that they were reporting to. The fact that I was physically located there didn't necessarily mean that I should have any more knowledge
of Lancaster West than I did of Silchester or Henry Dickens.
Q. You mentioned about the actions that arise from a fire risk assessment, and I think what you said is that you weren't responsible for closing them down or for making sure they were completed?
A. Yeah.
Q. That fell following the restructure to Louise Nezandonyi.
A. Yes.
Q. Why were you still aware of them, if the responsibility had passed to Louise Nezandonyi?
A. Because generally speaking I was copied in to a lot of information on Lancaster West generally, and sent a lot of information. It didn't necessarily follow that I was the person responsible for completing everything or dealing with everything, but because I worked on site down there, a lot of information was forwarded to me and I was copied in to a lot, and I think culturally as well, I think people perceived that I was Siobhan's replacement, and certainly during Siobhan Rumble's tenure she was responsible for more of the Lancaster West responsibilities than had happened with my post, given that the restructure had meant that a lot of the things that Siobhan was responsible for, I was no
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longer responsible for. So there was a bit of crossover there.
Q. Did you ever speak to Ms Nezandonyi to make sure that the actions that had been raised in a fire risk assessment had been carried out?
A. I can't recall specifically whether that happened. I'm afraid -- yeah, I'm afraid I can't recall that. With hindsight I would have done that differently and I would have made sure that there had been a more thorough handover for sure. But, yeah, I can't recall at the moment having a specific conversation with her about that.
Q. What about the ESAs, with Paul Steadman and

Robert Regan, would you have ever have had a conversation with them about making sure that actions had been carried out?
A. I'm sure that I would have done. I can't recall specifically the times and occasions when I did, but I'm sure I would have done. Paul more than Rob, because Rob had assumed a slightly different role at that stage. He was covering different estates whereas Paul was more of a fixture on Lancaster West, so it would have been with Paul, and I'm sure I probably did have a conversation, but I just cannot recall when that took place or what the content of that conversation would have been.
```

Q. Just going back a moment to the time you were
supervising the ESAs and the time you weren't, did you
ever have any concerns about whether they were carrying
out their inspections or their roles generally properly?
A. No, no concerns. I think, had I had concerns, I would
have raised them with Louise directly. Louise did come
down and visit her team. Martin Barr did come down and
visit Paul before he left the organisation as well. So
I was - - I had some confidence that that was taking
place. So, yeah, I don't recall any concerns with their
workmanship, put it that way.
Q. I'd like to ask you some questions now about vulnerable
residents on the Lancaster West Estate and
Grenfell Tower in particular.
During your time as neighbourhood team leader, did
you have access to a comprehensive list of vulnerable
residents on the Lancaster West Estate?
A. If I -- I don't recall having ever seen a list of
vulnerable people. I expect it would have existed, most
organisations do, and there would have been a database
or vulnerabilities flagged on a system electronically,
but I don't recall viewing one specifically.
Q. So that would apply to a list or would it also apply to
the electronic system? You don't recall ever viewing
it?

```
A. Well, I think in terms of the electronic system, we had a CRM system, so we would tend to go into cases one by one, rather than view everything in one go, or I certainly did, and so, you know, it may have been possible to identify someone's vulnerability going into a single case basis. I can't recall whether I was able to see a full list of vulnerabilities. I don't recall seeing one in my time there.
Q. You mentioned CRM, I think?
A. Yes.
Q. What about Capita, were you aware of the Capita system and whether it recorded information about vulnerabilities ?
A. Capita, I didn't use. I used CRM. But I think Capita may have been the database system that sat beneath CRM. So CRM took the data out of Capita and then displayed it . I don't -- but I didn't use Capita myself.
Q. Would you have ever inputted or updated records to show if a resident had a particular vulnerability or disability?
A. I don't believe I would have done. I don't think anybody showed me how to do that. I wouldn't necessarily in the course of my role do that. Housing officers would normally do that piece of work. If I needed it to have been done, I would have asked one of
A. So I had three in my team, so I had Millicent Williams, Janice Jones and Susan Anim-Boadu. So they were my three housing officers that were based in the Latimer office. Millicent covered Lancaster West specifically She took over from Janice Jones who, after the restructure and Siobhan's departure, wanted a change of scene, so she moved on to the Silchester Estate, and Susan Anim-Boadu looked after the Henry Dickens Estate
Q. To your knowledge, was there any system in place for the TMO to know which residents would have difficulty evacuating in the event of a fire ?
A. No system that I'm aware of, that I can recall.
Q. Can we look at what Siobhan Rumble said about this issue of a list. Her first witness statement at paragraph 37, please. The reference is \(\{\) TMO00000891/7\}. Second sentence of that, please, Ms Bartholomew. You see it says:
"I am also aware that there was a spreadsheet recording the information of vulnerable residents."
A. Yes.

\section*{143}
Q. If we can then turn to your third witness statement at paragraph 29, \{TMO00871021/6\}, you referred to what Ms Rumble said there, and you say you don't recall being told about any such list, you don't recall any such list held at the TMO.

Would you have been told about any list or anything of that nature when you did your handover, when you arrived at TMO?
A. Well, that's the difficulty. My understanding is that my predecessor left in February and I joined in May, so there was that gap there. It was filled with an interim person, who -- Daniel Fielder, so effectively my handover would have been via Daniel as opposed to what Siobhan would have given.

I don't recall seeing a list. There were some handover notes left, but I don't recall there being a list of vulnerable people contained within that paper copy. In any event, I wouldn't expect to have a paper copy of vulnerable tenants. I would expect there to be an electronic list on a database, to be properly updated. I wouldn't expect to have anything in paper.
Q. In terms of the updating of that information electronically, you mentioned your housing officers would do that; is that correct?
A. Yes, I believe so.
```

Q. Was it just them who would do that or was anybody else
involved in that process?
A. I actually don't know. I don't know if they would be
the only people to have access to that. Certainly
I didn't, because I actually can't recall whether I was
able to do it or not. So I don't know if they were the
only people that were able to update that system.
Q. David Noble, would he have --
A. David would have been an example of someone that would
have looked after that system, so I would assume that he
would be able to go in and look at that data. I would
assume Siobhan Bowman may have had access to that system
as well.
Q. Can I ask you about tenancy audit questionnaires,
please.
A. Yes.
Q. In your third witness statement, you discuss tenancy
audits at paragraph 4, if you could go to that, please,
it 's {TMO00871021/1}. Paragraph 4 you say that the
tenancy audit programme was ongoing.
Was the purpose of these audits to make sure that
the information held by TMO on residents on CRM was up
to date?
A. I would say so, yeah.
Q. Can we look at an example of a tenancy audit the only people to have access to that. Certainly I didn't, because I actually can't recall whether I was able to do it or not. So I don't know if they were the only people that were able to update that system.
Q. David Noble, would he have --
A. David would have been an example of someone that would have looked after that system, so I would assume that he would be able to go in and look at that data. I would assume Siobhan Bowman may have had access to that system as well.
Q. Can I ask you about tenancy audit questionnaires, please.
A. Yes.
Q. In your third witness statement, you discuss tenancy audits at paragraph 4, if you could go to that, please, it 's $\{$ TMO00871021/1\}. Paragraph 4 you say that the tenancy audit programme was ongoing.
Was the purpose of these audits to make sure that the information held by TMO on residents on CRM was up to date?
A. I would say so, yeah.
Q. Can we look at an example of a tenancy audit
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    questionnaire, please. It's at \(\{I W S 00001778 / 2\}\), please.
    Do you recognise that?
A. I recognise it as a TMO document. I didn't -- I don't
        recall carrying out any questionnaires myself. So it's
        not paperwork that I would have used on a day-to-day
        basis, but I recognise it as a TMO document.
Q. Do you recognise it? What type of TMO document do you
        recognise it as?
A. Yeah, I recognise that that would -- that was part of
        the tenancy audit paperwork.
Q. Could we go to page 10 of this document
    \{IWS00001778/10\}, please.
            Do you see in that box there, "14. About your
        needs", and 15 is "Disability"?
A. Yes, I see that, thank you.
Q. Do you recall seeing that aspect of the form before?
A. As I said, I did not fill out these forms myself, my
        housing officers would have been doing that, so I'm not
        familiar with these forms on a day-to-day basis.
        I would recognise that as something that would be in the
        form, but I didn't do the audits myself, so I can't say
        that ...
Q. Do you know the purpose for which TMO were collecting
        this information contained in box 15 ?
A. I don't know specifically the purpose, but I would
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questionnaire, please. It's at \{IWS00001778/2\}, please. Do you recognise that?
A. I recognise it as a TMO document. I didn't -- I don't recall carrying out any questionnaires myself. So it's not paperwork that I would have used on a day-to-day basis, but I recognise it as a TMO document.
Q. Do you recognise it? What type of TMO document do you recognise it as?
A. Yeah, I recognise that that would -- that was part of the tenancy audit paperwork.
Q. Could we go to page 10 of this document \{IWS00001778/10\}, please.

Do you see in that box there, "14. About your needs", and 15 is "Disability "?
A. Yes, I see that, thank you.
Q. Do you recall seeing that aspect of the form before?
A. As I said, I did not fill out these forms myself, my housing officers would have been doing that, so I'm not familiar with these forms on a day-to-day basis. I would recognise that as something that would be in the form, but I didn't do the audits myself, so I can't say that ...
Q. Do you know the purpose for which TMO were collecting this information contained in box 15 ?
A. I don't know specifically the purpose, but I would
assume -- my working assumption would be that it was to be more informed about the nature of people's needs within the properties and to update the vulnerability accordingly.
Q. Would that include needs in the event of an emergency in terms of evacuation, or at all ?
A. It may eventually point to that, I could see how that could occur. It doesn't specifically say that, though, in that form. It doesn't specifically outline whether somebody had a specific need in terms of an evacuation, and I think that would be a different question.
Q. These questionnaires, the information that's contained or that's gleaned from them, who would have inputted that onto TMO systems?
A. My understanding would be it would be the housing officers, so they would go out and collect that information and then input it and then it would be scanned on to the W2 system, I think. But given -I didn't do them myself, unfortunately, so I can't vouch for the accuracy of that, but that's my working assumption.
Q. You have said in your witness statement, I think your third witness statement at paragraph 27 , if we could go to that, please, \(\{\) TMO00871021/5\}, you mention about the CRM system and --
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\section*{A. Yes.}
Q. - - information contained on it, and you say here there is a notes or comments section to record information.

Was that something that you could input information into or was it just something that flashed up whenever you were on a particular record?
A. It's so difficult to remember. I actually can't answer that question. I don't know. I cannot recollect that.
Q. Were you aware of or would you have known how to obtain information on people who had vulnerabilities or disabilities, say, within Grenfell Tower? Would you have known how to do that?
A. I think what I'd have done is I'd have asked somebody like David Noble to produce that list for me. That's what I would have done if I'd asked for that information.
Q. And did you have any way of knowing whether the information produced by David Noble was up to date or accurate?
A. No.
Q. Whenever you accessed CRM or whenever you considered those with mobility issues or disabilities or vulnerabilities in Grenfell Tower, did you ever consider what they would do if they needed to evacuate in the event of a fire?
```

A. I did, but the advice was that it was a stay-put policy
and we were working on the assumption that any fire
would have been compartmentalised and therefore full
evacuation of the building may not be necessary.
Also, there were two lifts that were all floor
lifts.So in other tower blocks that were on the
surrounding estates, they're alternate floor lifts, but
Grenfell had two lifts that serviced all floors. So
whilst it was a stay-put policy, I wouldn't have
expected to have dealt with an evacuation.
Q. On the lift point --
A. Yes.
Q. - - were you told that the lift was to be used in the
event of an emergency or is that something that you were
aware of and therefore assumed that it would be used?
A. No, no. I mean, my -- at the time I wasn't particularly
concerned with fire per se. It was if, for example,
there had been an issue when one of the lifts had
failed, we still had another lift that was available
Not specific to fire, because in a fire you probably
wouldn't want to use the lifts anyway. So my view was
it was a stay-put policy and, therefore, you know, you
would not be looking to evacuate an entire building in
the way that we subsequently -- that happened.
Q. Did you ever consider, with the stay-put policy, if

```
    a fire occurred in someone's flat and that person had
    a disability which prevented them from leaving easily,
    what should happen in that scenario?
A. No, because I considered that -- my view would have been on that that there was a health and safety -- that that would have been covered as part of the health and safety risk assessment. The policy that was in place should have factored that in. It wasn't necessarily something for me to consider. The organisation would have already considered that and put its policy in place.
Q. Did you know that the organisation had done that, or do you assume that that's what they --
A. I would have assumed that, and that's based on, you know, experience of working in other authorities and other housing providers. There is a general assumption that those things will be in place.
Q. You also refer to tenancy information sheets in your third witness statement. Can I ask you to look at what I hope is an example of one at \{TMOH00018968\}.
A. Yes.
Q. Is this a tenancy information sheet as far as you can recall or are aware?
A. I don't recall seeing the paperwork, but it says "Tenancy Information" at the top, so I would assume so.
Q. Would you have seen these documents while you were in
post as neighbourhood team leader, do you think? Would you have ever had to work with them on a regular basis?
A. The housing officers more than myself. I may have seen some. I can't recall at the moment whether I would or not, but yeah, the housing officers would have been dealing with these documents far more routinely than I ever would.
Q. If we can scroll to the bottom of that first page, please, there is a question:
"Does the tenant or anyone in the household have additional support needs? Please specify and give details of agency and contacts in place."

Were you aware of the purpose of that question?
A. I was aware of the - I'm aware of the purpose of it. Effectively this could be -- this form could be used at the point that we're signing a new -- a person signing their tenancy for the first time. This will usually be the first time that our officers will have been meeting the new incoming tenant. We would get a certain amount of information from RBKC as they were responsible for doing the nomination for that customer, so we'd have all the background. This would be a further opportunity to collect information at the point of sign-up and would be determined on what the tenant or the incoming prospective tenant would choose to share.

\section*{151}
Q. Would it ever, as far as you're aware, have been used to formulate plans for assistance in an emergency, such as a fire?
A. I'm not aware that it would have been; however, it does follow that that information could have been used for that purpose, yeah.
Q. Can I ask you about introductory tenancy agreements.
A. Yeah.
Q. You refer to these in your third witness statement. Can I ask you to look at an example, please,
\(\{\) TMOH00019941/6\}, 1.13, if you could look at that, please, Ms Bartholomew.

Do you recognise this tenancy agreement? Would you have been involved in these in any way?
A. I didn't carry out sign-ups -- what we call sign-ups, signing of new tenancy agreements, I didn't carry those out routinely. Again, that's housing officers. I think I did ask to be trained up on how to do them at some point because we were a small housing offices and people had to be out and about, so it was just in case there was nobody around them one day that I could do them. So I think they were looking to train me up and I did probably fill out one or two of these in my own tenure there. So, yeah, I do recognise this, I think, yeah.
Q. If you look at the black box at the bottom, just above
```

it there is a paragraph which says:
"If you have ticked any of the boxes above, please
give more details below. This will enable the TMO to
decide if you need additional help to manage your
tenancy."
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know what the purpose of that --
A. My understanding --
Q. -- paragraph was?
A. Sorry. My understanding of that would have been on occasion we would need to refer some of our customers on for additional support, welfare support, things like that, to support them in their tenancy moving forward. So that is what my understanding of that box would have been for, to see if there was an ongoing referral necessary for a particular customer if they were having difficulties in a particular area.
Q. Would it have consideration of needs in the event of an emergency, do you think?
A. I don't think so, and the reason why I say that is it was help to manage their tenancy. So from my perspective as a housing manager, I would be thinking along the terms of welfare benefits, advice and support with financial planning, I would be looking at mental health support potentially, things that would sustain

```
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the tenancy and maintain that contractual relationship and for the customer not to lose their home, bearing in mind this is a probationary tenancy, so it's really important to sustain it .
Q. Could that agreement have been used to obtain information that would have informed the TMO about needs in the event of an emergency?
A. Potentially it could have been, yeah.
Q. Weave seen three examples now, the audits, the information questionnaires and then the tenancy agreements themselves, which ask for information about vulnerabilities; do you agree?
A. Yes.
Q. There were then those various ways in collecting that information, but it wasn't a comprehensive system; is that correct? It wouldn't have addressed people who had existing tenancies or had been in the property for a long time; is that fair?
A. Yes, the audit should have covered people that had been in their tenancies for a longer period of time.
Q. And that would depend on whether the particular property had been subject to a tenancy audit; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you tell us how often the audits took place?
A. I'm afraid I can't recall that.
```

Q. Could you -- sorry, I think I overspoke.
A. That's fine.
Q. Can you recall or can you help us with how often any one
property would have been subject to a tenancy audit?
A. I actually can't remember the frequency, to be honest.
There was a -- they had a number that they needed to
achieve in any year, but I can't recall the frequency
that they were completing them. I'm really sorry,
I can't assist any further with that.
MR GADD: Mr Chairman, I've come to the end of that topic
and I would like to move on to another one, but I wonder
whether this is an appropriate moment to break.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It probably is, isn't it? Yes.
We always have a break during the afternoon,
Ms Bartholomew, and this seems like a good moment to
take it.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So we will stop now. We'll resume
at 3.30, please, and please don't talk to anyone about
your evidence while you're out of the room.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right? Thank you very much.
(Pause)
Right, 3.30, then, please. Thank you.
( 3.15 pm )
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evidence of any resident ... who suffers from sensory
impairments that would prevent them ..."
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Gadd, I'm sorry to interrupt you,
are you reading from the same document that we're
looking at? When you read it the first time, I sensed
that the words were slightly different from what I was
reading.
MR GADD: May I read verbatim from the risk assessment,
then? I'm sorry.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's all right, thank you.
MR GADD: The document:
"At the time of the risk assessment there was no
evidence of any resident within the premises who suffers
from sensory impairment that would prevent them from
hearing a shouted warning of fire."
Was that correct as far as you understood the
position in Grenfell Tower whenever you joined it in
May 2016?
A. I wouldn't have been able to have made a conclusion on
that. That would have meant that I'd have had to have
known every individual tenant, every individual
household member, to make that assessment. I wouldn't
have been aware of that.
Q. The next paragraph is:
"TMO have introduced a comprehensive programme to
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A. Yes.
Q. And that's in response to the question:
    "It is considered that the building is provided with
    reasonable arrangements for means of escape for disabled
    people?"
        Were you aware of what those means of escape were?
A. No, in terms of I knew that there was a -- there was the
    emergency exit stairwell, which was available, but
    anything in addition to that, no.
Q. No one ever came to you and said, "These are the ways in
    which disabled people will escape from Grenfell Tower"?
A. Not that I can recall, I'm afraid, no.
Q. If we look into the comments box beneath that, Mr Stokes
    writes:
            "At the time of the risk assessment there was no
        evidence of any resident within the premises who suffers
        from sensory impairment [to such level] that would
        prevent them from hearing a shouted warning of fire [or
        a loud knocking on their entrance door to warn them]."
            Given your knowledge of residents in Grenfell Tower
        at the time, was that correct, as far as you were aware,
        that there were no such residents?
A. Sorry, can you repeat that for me?
Q. Mr Stokes says:
            "At the time of the risk assessment there is no
A. Yes
```
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that information.
    Specifically addressing a point of physical mobility
    restriction, would you have known of any residents in
    the tower who suffered a physical restriction in
    mobility that might have meant that a PEEP was
    appropriate for them?
A. At the time of the fire there was one resident that
    I was aware of, because -- by virtue of the fact that
    the customer had a disability scooter, a mobility
    scooter, and from memory I think she was housed in the
    Hidden Homes, which were the new properties that were
    developed in the tower that had been built with
    disability in mind, so the doors were wider and there
    were various adjustments made within the property. So
    I think that particular customer I was aware of, but
    I couldn't say that I was aware of anybody else,
    unfortunately.
Q. We may come back to the customer you refer to, but can
    I ask you to look at a document which is the fire safety
    strategy, that's at {TMO00830598}. Do you recognise
    that document?
    (Pause)
A. I'm afraid I can't recollect reading that document.
Q. You don't recall ever seeing it?
A. It's possible, but I can't recollect at this time,
```
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I'm afraid.
Q. Did you know that such a document existed, that there
was a fire safety strategy?
A. I would have assumed something like that would have been
in place. That's been my experience in most of the
organisations, if not all of them, that I've worked for,
that there was usually a health and safety fire strategy
in place. So it would have been my assumption that the
document was there.
Q. Can I ask you to look at one of Janice Wray's witness
statements to the Inquiry. That's at $\{$ TMO00847305/35\}.
Can I ask you to look at paragraphs 114 to 115 .
Paragraph 114:
"114. I have been asked to provide more information
on the TMO's intention to produce [PEEPS] ... for
vulnerable and disabled residents. I have also been
asked to set out the extent of my knowledge and
involvement in this plan.
"115. PEEPs were generally targeted at workplace
and occupational settings and not residential dwellings.
Additionally, the Health and Safety team were not
routinely advised of the location of vulnerable
residents or those with disabilities. If vulnerable or
disabled residents raised concerns with my Estate or
Neighbourhood colleagues, we would have visited that
resident and/or asked the fire risk assessor to visit and/or sought an LFB Home Fire Safety Visit."

Were you aware that you could make a referral to the health and safety team for a PEEP to be prepared?
A. Not specifically for a PEEP, but if I -- if there were health and safety concerns, then it may have been raised in a different way and a PEEP may have resulted out of that conversation. But not specifically to $--I$ wasn't ever aware of a situation where I'd specifically say,
"We need a PEEP for this customer or this customer".
Q. Can I ask you to look next at the supporting residents policy and procedure, that's at \{TMO00880481\}. Could you look at that document.

Do you recognise it? Have you seen it before?
A. I don't believe I have.
Q. Were you aware of whether such a policy existed? (Pause)
A. Again, I would have to assume that a policy would be in place, but I don't know. The evidence that I see in front of me, this is draft, so I don't know if it was actually in place at the time or whether it was still a draft document.
Q. One more document on this topic, the supporting residents procedure, which is at $\{T M O 00880482\}$, if we could look at that, please. Do you recognise this
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procedure document?
A. I may have seen it. I can't actually recall, I'm afraid.
Q. Do you have any recollection of whether this procedure was implemented or in force at the time you worked at the TMO?
A. I'm not aware of that.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Can I just ask, I notice at the foot of the page it says "draft 10"; were you aware either that it was going through drafts, did anyone tell you that?
A. I'm afraid not, sir, I'm not ...

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: No, no, that's all right.
A. I'm not aware.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So it follows that you don't know whether it was ever finalised and put into effect?
A. Correct.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
MR GADD: You mentioned a moment ago a customer you were aware of who had issues within Grenfell Tower. Can we look at that. You go into some detail at paragraph 32 of your third witness statement. Could we look at that, please, $\{$ TMO00871021/6\}. Could you just read that to yourself, please.
(Pause)
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A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall, was the lady's name
    Mariko Toyoshima-Lewis?
A. Yes, that rings a bell, yeah.
Q. That's flat 9 at Grenfell Tower?
A. I don't know the door number, I'm afraid.
Q. Were you aware that she was a wheelchair user and
    registered as disabled?
A. I wasn't fully aware of that; however, her use of
    a mobility scooter would suggest that.
Q. In her Phase 2 witness statement to the Inquiry, at
    paragraph 63, she gave some evidence about this. If we
    could look at that, please, the reference is
    {IWS00001725/21}. If we could zoom in on paragraph 63,
    please, what she says is:
            "One of the issues I did raise was regarding what
        would happen in terms of me escaping if there was
        a fire. I asked 'Rob' and the Neighbourhood Officer
        what would happen if there was a fire in relation to me
        escaping. I also asked the people working in the
        Latimer Road office, what would happen if there was
        a fire as I am in a wheelchair."
            Move down to paragraph 67 on the same page. She
        says:
            "The response that I received in relation to what
```
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would happen if there was a fire and I am in
a wheelchair was from Rob and the neighbourhood officer was verbal where I was told that I am on the list for disabled people in the tower."

Could we also look at paragraph 78, please, in that document on page 29 \{IWS00001725/29\}:
"I asked the Estate Inspector of the Tower about how I would escape in the event of a fire. I cannot remember his name. He came and talked to me for three hours explaining about how the building was built and designed to contain a fire. He told me that there was very thick concrete ( 80 cm ) around the flat ensuring that the flat was completely safe in the event of a fire. He told me that because of this protection, I did not have to leave the flat in the event of a fire as it was safe to remain in the flat if the fire had not started in my flat."

The reference there to Rob, could you help us with who Rob might be?
A. Possibly Robert Regan.
Q. Were you aware of the issues that Ms Toyoshima-Lewis had raised in respect of her escape in the event of a fire?
A. Not specifically about her escape, although she was in a property that had been allocated by RBKC. So we didn't do the allocation of that property, the TMO
didn't do the allocation to that property. And at that
time the stay-put policy was in place, so ...
Q. Was there any consideration of referring

Ms Toyoshima-Lewis for a personal emergency evacuation plan?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Does that mean that there may have been consideration of it or you don't think there was at all?
A. I don't think it could have been, because had consideration been given, then it would have been done. So I can only assume that it wasn't considered.
Q. In terms of consideration of that issue, her evacuation in the event of a fire, who should have dealt with that or who would normally be expected to deal with that in the neighbourhood or through the neighbourhood office? Would that have been your role?
A. I think it's something that the housing officer would have been able to deal with, with the resident, and seek the appropriate advice. It wouldn't necessarily have been for me to do that. It would have taken somebody, I assume, with some health and safety and fire evacuation experience that had been trained to be able to develop that evacuation plan, so it wouldn't necessarily have been within my skillset to do.
Q. Can we look at an email chain from October 2016, at
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\{TMO10045793/2\}, please.
So what Ms Wray is informing you of -- you saw the email was to you -- the fire risk assessor at Grenfell Tower, and if you look halfway through the first paragraph, it says:
"However, the assessor has advised that there was a mobility scooter parked in the communal lobby outside flat 9 and this was being charged through the letterbox of the flat at the time of his visit. Paul has never made me aware of this - were you aware? Did the resident seek permission to have a scooter in this area and had we informed them of the ban on charging in the communal areas."

If we could scroll up to see your response, please. You say in response to Janice Wray \{TMO10045793/1\}:
"I am at Grenfell tomorrow so will deal with the scooter issue myself whilst I am there - will update you on Friday."

Do you remember in fact going to speak with
Ms Toyoshima-Lewis at Grenfell Tower?
A. I do remember speaking to the customer. I can't remember if it was at this juncture, but I did spend some time with this particular lady in her flat discussing it. She had various issues, some to do with the -- I think there was an issue with the telephone
for that particular customer, bearing in mind it was a stay-put policy. So, yeah.
Q. Janice Wray's email was because of a fire safety concern; is that correct?
A. My understanding was that it's because the scooter -the way the scooter was outside, and from this email, it appears because of the electric supply running from the property, out through the letterbox and in to the scooter that was parked outside the front door of the property.
Q. As a consequence of that fire safety concern, you didn't think about an issue of evacuation in a fire, nor did anyone ask you to consider that with this particular resident; is that correct?
A. I can't speak for anybody else, but I didn't think about a safe means of escape in those terms because I was working on a stay-put policy.
Q. And no one else asked you to consider that?
A. I don't know. I can't recall anybody specifically asking me to look at that.
Q. Do you know if this issue was resolved with --
A. I think as I pointed in my statement, I said it was a live issue at the time of the fire, so my housing officer was still trying to work with social services to secure the customer with a smaller scooter that would
line and some other concerns that she had. So I can't
issue or with all of the issues together, but I know I did visit this lady.
Q. One visit or more than one?
A. I can't actually remember. Definitely one, I can't remember if it was more than one.
Q. And on the one occasion, or if it was more than one or another occasion, did she raise with you this issue about evacuation in the event of a fire?
A. I actually can't recall that. Yeah, I can't recall whether she did.
Q. Is the evidence then that she may have done but you can't recall whether she did or not?
A. It's possible, it's certainly possible, but

I literally - I can't recall, I'm afraid.
Q. Can you recall, whether or not she raised it with you, considering yourself what she would do in the event of a fire?
A. My $--I$ think the way that the concern was raised was more to do with the location of the scooter, and so our work or the work of the housing officer was predominantly around trying to have the scooter safely housed within the property and not on the outside, and was less to do with looking at a safe means of escape
Q. Paragraph 36 of your first witness statement, which is at $\{T M O 00000894 / 7\}$, if we could pull that up, please, thank you. If we could zoom in on paragraph 36: "Because I joined the TMO just after the

## 171

refurbishment project was completed, a conscious decision was made within the organisation that I would not become involved in any complaints relating to that project."

Was that decision made before or after your recruitment to the TMO?
A. I can't fix precisely when, but I got very much a view when I started that the organisation was keen to have a bit of a - almost a bit of a fresh start in terms of the works were now completed and we wanted to move on to having a more effective communication and constructive communication with residents.
Q. Does that -- sorry. Had you finished?
A. Yeah, that's fine.
Q. Does that mean that you were aware that the communication between residents of Grenfell and the TMO had been ineffective up to that point?
A. Ineffective in terms of that I was aware that there had been difficulties. Now, whether that -- you know, and for many reasons. I'd reviewed some of the -- before joining the organisation, I had the opportunity to read some of the things online, some of the blogs. I was aware coming into the post that there had been some issues, and very much saw it as an opportunity to start afresh.
Q. Can I ask you to look at, on the issue of a tenants' handbook, a document, the reference for which is \{IWS00001343\}.

If we look at the bottom of that page, it's an email from Shah Ahmed on 6 October 2016 to Millicent Williams, who I think you said was one of your housing officers.
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. You're copied in to that, and he asks:
"Could you kindly send me the Tenant handbook at [your] earliest convenience?"

If we could scroll up to Ms Williams' response, she says:
"Good morning Mr Shah
"Thank you for your email.
"Unfortunately I am unable to provide you with a copy of the Tenant's Handbook at this time [as] the manual is currently under review. It is hoped that the tenant's Handbook will be ready for distribution early next year (2017)."

Can you look at I think an undated version of the handbook, $\{$ TMO10041915\}. Perhaps we could scroll down to the next page, please.

If it assists, we can scroll through the document, but having seen those first two pages, is it a document that you recognise?
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## A. I believe so.

Q. You do recognise this?
A. I believe so, yeah.
Q. Do you know if this handbook was finalised in 2017?
A. I'm afraid I don't know whether it was finalised.
Q. Do you know if it was ever provided to residents?
A. I can't say that, because I wouldn't be the person issuing it to residents, so I can't answer that question, I'm afraid.
Q. Who would have issued it to residents?
A. I'm assuming if it was a tenants' handbook that that would have been issued as part of -- at the tenancy sign - up stage, and so any officers doing sign-ups, tenancy sign-ups, that may have been part of the pack of information that new tenants were given.
Q. So who would those officers have been? Is that housing officers?
A. Housing officers, so Millicent, Janice, Susan and, you know, all the other officers that worked within the TMO, the housing officers.
Q. Was there an officer called Daniel Lewis?
A. Daniel Lewis was our administration officer who worked across all the teams. So, yeah, he wasn't a housing officer per se, he was part of our wider admin team.
Q. Do you know if he would have been involved in providing
tenants' handbooks to residents?
A. It's possible, given that he was doing the administration.
Q. Can I ask you next to look at your second witness statement, paragraph --
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I'm sorry to interrupt you.
Can you help me with something else? I think
Shah Ahmed's request was made in about October, I didn't
quite get the date.
A. Yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And it was hoped that the new version of the handbook would be available early the following year.

What did you give any tenant who was signed up during that period? Were there stocks of the old one?
A. It's possible that there were.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Then he could have had that, couldn't he?
A. He could have done. However, I'm not sure -- this may have been a tenants' handbook, and I think Shah was a leaseholder, so that may have been different information.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, he may have been interested to read it.
A. He may indeed. But, yeah, I don't know.
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SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Do you actually know whether there were existing stocks or whether there weren't?
A. I'm afraid I can't tell you, I don't know.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, thank you very much.
Yes, Mr Gadd, sorry.
MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
Second witness statement, if we may, paragraph 14,
\{TMO00842401/5\}. You say here that you recall
Seamus Dunlea suggesting floor signage might need to be replaced after gas pipe work was completed because the work obscured the numbers. That's correct, is it?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware of any temporary numbering that had been put in place at Grenfell Tower?
A. No, not that I can recall .
Q. Can you remember when you and Mr Dunlea discussed this issue of replacement of floor signage?
A. I can't remember specifically when we discussed it. It was a - there was an occasion where it was discussed across the office, so just Seamus saying to me, "The pipes are potentially covering the numbers, we need to get them replaced", so I think I probably said something in response to, "Okay, fine, we'll get that resolved", again, after the works were complete.
Q. Did you consider whether it presented a fire safety

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { questions for you at that stage. All right? } \\
& \text { THE WITNESS: Thank you. }
\end{aligned}
$$

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. Please don't talk to anyone about your evidence while you're out of the room.
THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thanks very much.
(Pause)
4.20, then, please. Thank you.
(4.05 pm)

## (A short break)

(4.20 pm)

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, Ms Bartholomew, ready to carry on?

THE WITNESS: Yes, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We will see whether there are any more questions for you.

Yes, Mr Gadd.
MR GADD: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
I asked you some questions about the collation of information about vulnerable residents within Grenfell Tower, and I think you informed the Inquiry that you wouldn't know the detail of that information. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you have known how to access that information collectively at all?
A. I think what I would have done is I'd have spoken to David Noble and asked for a list that way.
I wouldn't - - I don't recollect knowing how to collate that kind of information myself.
Q. Does it follow, then, that in the event of an emergency where that collection of information was relevant, you wouldn't have been able to do that, you would have had to have asked David Noble to do that; is that correct?
A. Yes, and also I'd have needed access to the system to be able to do it, so I wouldn't have had -- we didn't have laptops or anything at the time of the fire, or I certainly didn't, so it's not something I could have
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## done remotely myself.

Q. You couldn't have said or been able to assess how that information would have impacted upon their ability to evacuate those particular residents; is that correct? You couldn't have addressed that issue of, in the event of an emergency, how such residents would be able to evacuate?
A. Addressed in what way, sorry?
Q. You wouldn't have been able to provide that information and assess what such people would be able to do in the event of an emergency; is that correct?
A. Not in respect of every resident, no.
Q. Can I ask you about logging complaints?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if a resident attended the office in Lancaster West and they wanted to make a complaint, what was the system for logging such complaints where they attended in person?
A. I think it would depend on who they saw and what the nature of the complaint was. So we had -- at the office, there was a customer services officer on the reception desk that would deal with any customers coming into the office routinely, taking down details and passing that on to the relevant people, certainly if that was in relation to repairs, because customer
services assistants or customer service advisers would be able to log repairs from the office there and then. So from that respect they would deal with that.

I also had housing officers on a duty system, so if it wasn't that kind of query or complaint, they would be able to see a duty housing officer who could hopefully pick up those details and interview the customer and see what the situation was and pick that up and rectify that. So there's a couple of different ways that it could have been dealt with.
Q. Would the complaints have been sent to the complaints team if they were lodged in that way?
A. It depends if the customer was making a formal complaint. There's two different -- it's almost two different things. So the ability for customers to raise formal complaints was available, and my understanding is that that information was available on the TMO's website, I believe, about how to make a formal complaint via Catherine Dack's team, the three-stage formal complaint process.

The things that would come via our office would be things that we would try and resolve quickly that wouldn't necessitate -- wouldn't need a formal complaint process if we could fix it quickly, if it was a simple issue that could just be resolved quickly, to the
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customer's satisfaction. That's what we were aiming to achieve.
Q. What about complaints made by telephone to the office at Lancaster West, how would those have been logged and responded to?
A. I think with the CRM system officers were able to take notes of conversations that they were having with residents and put that on CRM, and raise concerns or queries via the CRM system and send that to the relevant department that needed to deal with it. So that was available as well, if phone calls were received.
Q. Is it possible that residents either phoning in or attending at the Lancaster West office may have made a complaint which was not logged or passed to the complaints team? Is that possible?
A. Yeah, certainly possible.
Q. Could you say how likely that was to happen?
A. Impossible to say, really, there are so -- you know, there are various different people involved and it was an estate office, so there were people, you know, in and out all the time. So very difficult to say what or how many formal complaints wouldn't have been logged. I wouldn't have that information.
Q. Can I ask you about smoke alarm tests and checks.

Would you have been involved in smoke alarm tests or
checks at any stage?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. If a resident came and said, "I'd like my smoke alarm tested and I can't do it myself", did that type of incident like that ever occur?
A. I couldn't tell you, I'm afraid. I couldn't tell you if that had happened. I mean, I would assume that someone would come into the office, speak to the customer service adviser and say that if they were coming into the office and then, you know, that would have been dealt with. But I'm not aware of any cases of that nature.
Q. You yourself, you can't recall addressing such an issue or resolving such an issue?
A. Not off the top of my head, no, I'm afraid I can't.
Q. Are there any other points or is there any other evidence you think that the panel would be assisted by knowing that you would like to give?
A. No, not that I can think of. Thank you. Obviously what I would -- this being an opportunity to just formally say how incredibly sorry I am to all the bereaved and everybody that suffered.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
MR GADD: I've no further questions, Mr Chairman.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, Ms Bartholomew, it only
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remains for me to thank you very much on behalf of the panel as a whole for coming in to give your evidence today. It's been really helpful to hear from you, and it 's a very valuable exercise. So thank you very much indeed, and you're now free to go.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(The witness withdrew)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, Mr Gadd, that presumably is a convenient point to conclude for the day.
MR GADD: I hope so, Mr Chairman.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We shall embark on another witness tomorrow.
MR GADD: Mr Millett, yes, will be taking the witness tomorrow.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And that will be at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

So, 10 o'clock tomorrow, then, please. Thank you.
MR GADD: Mr Chairman.
(4.30 pm)
(The hearing adjourned until 10 am on Tuesday, 27 April 2021)
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