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(10.00 am)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to
    today's hearing. Today we're going to continue hearing
    evidence from Mr Ashton of Exova.
        So would you like to ask Mr Ashton to join us,
        please.
            MR TERRENCE ASHTON (continued)
THE WITNESS: Good morning.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, Mr Ashton. Are you
    happy to carry on?
THE WITNESS: I am indeed, yes, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much.
        Yes, Ms Grange.
    Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY (continued)
MS GRANGE:Thank you.
    Mr Ashton, I have a number of questions that I'm
    going to deal with at the beginning now which arise from
    matters covered yesterday, or potentially with some of
    your colleagues when they have been giving evidence, and
    then I'mgoing to turn to the topic I flagged yesterday,
    which is the September 2014 emails about the cladding.
    So we will do these corrections and questions first .
            First of all, a correction. Yesterday, while we
        were discussing the role of Artelia or Appleyards and
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    the role they played on the project, and whether they performed roles other than that of QS, I referred to them mistakenly as performing the role of project administrator as well. That was at page 19 of the transcript \{Day17/19\}. In fact, I should have said that they were employer's agent, not project administrator. Does that make more sense?
A. It does indeed, yes.
Q. I apologise, that was my slip of the tongue.

I asked you some questions yesterday, just on another topic, about inclusive design, and do you remember we looked at some of the early sections of Approved Document B, which provide that fire safety measures incorporated within a building will need to take account of the needs of all people including those with disabilities ? Do you remember we looked at those provisions?
A. I do indeed, I remember that.
Q. Just on that topic, is it right that you were on the BSI, the British Standards Institute, committee which drafted part 8 of BS 5588-8:1999, which was headed:
"Fire precautions in the design, construction and use of buildings - Part 8: Code of practice for means of escape for disabled people."

Were you on that committee?
A. I was on the code drafting committee responsible for several parts of BS 5588; in fact, I was the chairman for a number of years. But part 8 was dealt with by a subgroup of the same committee.
Q. Was that FSH14?
A. FSH14 was the overseeing committee, if I can call it that.
Q. I see, yes.
A. FSH14.1 was a subcommittee of that main committee.
Q. I see. So you were involved in relation to that British Standard?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. Let's bring it up so we can just see it for a moment. It's \{BSIO00000018\}. So it's:
"Fire precautions in the design, construction and use of buildings - Part 8: Code of practice for means of escape for disabled people."

My question really is: in the light of your work on that committee, should you not have had in mind considerations for designing means of escape for the disabled when you worked on the Grenfell fire strategies, given what was in Approved Document B at the time?
A. Well, I think we went into it in some detail yesterday, but the Building Regulations, or at least the approved
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documents, do not require the same level of provision for disabled people in residential buildings as they do in commercial buildings.
Q. Yes.
A. Now, why they chose to do that, I don't know. In an ideal world, you would have a block of apartments or flats -- they're all called apartments nowadays -- where there were provisions for disabled people. I mean, they do make provision for what they call accessible flats, so there are people with disabilities in residential blocks. But, as I say, to go back to the core business, in an ideal world there would be a means of getting those disabled people out of that block. Normally it would be done by using the lifts .
Q. Yes.
A. But there would have to be a management regime attached to that to ensure that that would work. Now, that isn't always present in apartment buildings.
Q. Yes.
A. And that's presumably why, and I can't say for certain, the Government -- the responsible Government department didn't say that you had to make provision for disabled people to escape.
Q. Were you aware, though, that there were changes in 2006 to Approved Document B which brought in those inclusive
design provisions that we looked at yesterday?
A. Oh, yes, I'm aware that it is covered in Approved Document B as well as in the British Standard that you've got displayed at the moment.
Q. Yes.
A. But the fact remains that you do not have to make provision for means of escape for disabled people in residential buildings. I'm not saying that's right.
Q. Yes.
A. But that's what it is at the moment.
Q. But is it right -- and I think this is what you said yesterday -- that, in the light of that, it simply wasn't considered in the context of the fire strategies for the Grenfell project?
A. Correct.
Q. Yes.

Just moving on to another topic, yesterday, in response to questions about Ms Cooney's observations about the overall refurbishment plans -- and, do you remember, we looked at her email, whether they're making a "crap situation worse" in terms of fire safety -I asked you whether you had warned the TMO about this, and the answer you gave -- this is at \{Day17/9:4-12\} -you said:
"I think when I had the first meeting with the TMO, 5
which was essentially a design team meeting which they attended, I did make the point fairly forcefully that the proposals as drawn up by Studio E were not acceptable in terms of getting approval under the Building Regulations, and that therefore we needed to do some serious work to get to a situation where we could actually go forward to Kensington and Chelsea with a -confident that a scheme would be approved."

That's what you said yesterday.
A. Yes, I remember saying that, yes.
Q. You couldn't give a precise date for that meeting, but you said it was the very first design team meeting that had the full design team there, including the TMO.

Now, the first meeting that you attended with the TMO and the rest of the design team appears to be the project meeting number 8 held on 6 September 2012. I just want to pull up the minutes for that. This is \{ART00006770\}.

So we looked at these notes yesterday. We can see that you were physically present at this meeting, because you're four lines up on the "present" list.
A. Right.
Q. Do you think that it was at this meeting that you made the comments that you referred to, these forceful comments?
A. Possibly.
Q. I see.
A. I know I did say at one meeting that we had some hard
work to do to get the scheme into an approvable
situation --
Q. Yes. Yes.
A. -- or condition.
Q. Because the point I want to put to you is there doesn't
seem to be anything in the minutes or the notes from
this meeting that record that. What we have on page 2
\{ART00006770/2\}, if we can go to this -- and, again, we
looked at this yesterday -- under"Fire", do you see
that there?
A. Yes.
Q. We've got this note that:
"Exova need to understand the existing situation and
whether LFB do test the system twice a year, and what
was behind the proposed upgrade works to the smoke
exhaust/fire. The statutory position on the design
needs to be established as it is not possible for
Building Control to insist on enhancements."
Then:
"Draft fire strategy needs detail interrogation and
a meeting was arranged with [Studio E] early next week
to review."
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Do you see that there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. And the action for that is noted to be Studio E and Exova.

So the question I want to put to you is whether you did actually say that in a meeting with the TMO present, because that seems to be being disputed.
A. In my experience, minutes don't always reflect exactly what was said at meetings, but I do recall saying, to more than just an audience comprising Studio E, that there were approval risks based on the current proposals. I even referred to the need possibly to provide sprinklers to the non-residential portions, and so on.

Now, if I haven't got the date of the meeting right or the precise meeting right, I apologise, but I did say that.
Q. Okay. Yes.

To what extent were you seeking to engage with the TMO on that issue and talking directly to the TMO about it as distinct from Studio E?
A. I wasn't really thinking about the TMO specifically when I made those comments. I just made the comments to whoever was assembled at that meeting.
Q. Yes.
A. This was before we did the first design note
Q. Yes.
A. So it was in advance of that. Now, that may give some idea as to actually when that meeting took place.
Q. Yes.

Would you agree that you were, day to day, dealing with Studio E as part of the design team and not the TMO in respect of the preparation of the fire safety strategies?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Yes.

So just moving on to another topic, this is in relation to the existing fire safety strategy, you said yesterday that you thought it was a misunderstanding between you and between Clare Barker and Cate Cooney on the other hand about who was actually going to finalise the draft existing fire strategy; you remember saying that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Given that this work remained outstanding for such a long period of time, from August 2012 until the end of Exova's involvement in the Grenfell project, I want to put to you: can that really have been a misunderstanding? Why was that not picked up in that length of time?
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A. I don't know, to be honest. I mean, I assumed, as I said yesterday, that Clare was going to continue to deal with that until it was completed, but I did take from the recommendations of that draft report the issues that we needed to address with the refurbishment scheme.
Q. Do you think it was that you simply forgot to come back and address that, or in fact did you actually think about it but consider finalising that draft report not to be a significant priority?
A. In the greater scheme of things, finishing that report off wasn't the top priority. I mean, we've got three strands here: we've got the risk assessment, which is carried out or should be carried out periodically --
Q. Yes.
A. -- which will highlight things that have gone wrong or need to be put right; we've got work going on with the refurbishment, which was my main focus; and we have the existing fire safety strategy drawn up, which I took to be just a record of what was there, and I only took out of that draft the things that we needed to concentrate on going forward.
Q. So can we take it from that answer that you were aware and conscious that it was a draft that hadn't been finalised, but just didn't think that that was a priority that needed to be come back to?
A. If I'm honest, I didn't think it was that important, given that there were these other strands to the building.
Q. Were you aware that the existing fire safety strategy was meant to be a baseline on which the refurbishment strategy built?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever, in the next four years after 2012, investigate what had happened to the draft existing fire strategy?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Okay.

So moving on to another topic, you said yesterday on a number of occasions that your time was stretched because you were handling often a large number of projects.

Can you recall, to the best of your ability , approximately how many projects would you have been working on at any one time, say during 2012, when you were first working on the fire strategies?
A. Well, it could be six to ten, I guess, but they would all be at different stages of development, and I don't think that I want to give the impression that there wasn't enough time to deal with this project, because there was.
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Q. Okay.
A. I made enough time to do that.
Q. Yes.

Now, another point arises from Ms Cooney's evidence.
She was asked about why she hadn't referred to diagram 52 of Approved Document B in relation to the fire main outlets being in the lobbies. So you know at Grenfell Tower, the riser --
A. Indeed.
Q. -- for the fire main outlets are in the lobbies, and she was asked a question:
"Why did you not include any discussion or assessment within your draft existing fire strategy report about the impact on operation of firefighting of the fact that the main riser outlets were in the lobbies and not in the stair as required by diagram 52?"
A. Right.
Q. The answer she gave was:
"The outlets being in the lobby -- and I'm fairly sure on this -- were a requirement of section 20 of the London Building Acts at the time. Terry is probably your man to clarify this for you."

Is what she said.
A. Right.
Q. So I just want to ask you: in your view, is it correct
that it was a requirement of section 20 of the London Building Acts that the fire main outlets should be in the lobbies as opposed to in the stair?
A. That's totally correct.
Q. Would you agree that the existing fire safety strategy should have addressed the impact on firefighting of not having the fire main outlet in the stair as required by the current design guidance?
A. No, it comes back to what I said at some point yesterday, that this was an existing building and it would not be reasonable, just because a more recent code of practice suggested some other way of dealing with things, that we should modify the building in the way that you're suggesting.
Q. And you don't think that that's something that could have been highlighted or should have been highlighted in the existing strategy, and then addressed and explain why that was nevertheless not a difficulty in this building?
A. I don't think it should have been mentioned in her strategy, but I would like to say that this idea that the fire main outlet should be in the stair, there wasn't unanimity amongst this in the fire community, if I can use that word.
Q. Yes.
A. Because what it meant was, in operational terms, that if a fireman was fighting a fire in a flat, the door to the stair would be permanently open.
Q. Right, yes.
A. And a lot of people in the BSI, for example, didn't feel that that was a good idea.
Q. Yes.
A. So to change that, given that it would be an unreasonable thing to ask for in an existing situation, didn't make a lot of sense technically.
Q. Yes, I see.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I think the thrust of the question -- and it applies, I think, to other things as well -- is whether the fire safety strategy ought to identify changes in requirements since the date of construction of the building; in other words, to point out: "Well, it was supposed to be like this, but it's now supposed to be like that", and to highlight the distinction.
A. Yeah, we could have put in a general narrative, and perhaps we should have done, saying, "This building was built in 1971 to a code of practice that was drawn up in 1950", or wherever, "It must be recognised that the arrangements there don't meet current standards". And taking a lesson from that, I think if we came to do
a similar development or partial redevelopment, we would put that in as an upfront statement.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.
MS GRANGE: Yes, thank you.
Staying with Ms Cooney for a minute, can we go to \{EXO00000388\}. This is an email we looked at yesterday from Ms Cooney to you on 10 September 2012, and she says in the very beginning:
"As promised, my thoughts on the possible solution to Grenfell Tower: General fire line mark up attached to clarify ideas below."

Then she has set out various ideas under different headings. We looked a lot yesterday at -- if we can scroll down to the end of this email, this is the one where she talks about, in the third from bottom paragraph, some fairly long protected entrance halls, we talked about that, and where she says in the next paragraph:
"The existing ventilation system is questionable and the overall scheme theoretically makes the existing conditions worse ..."

## Et cetera.

Just in terms of this email and how it came about, did Ms Cooney send you her thoughts on the possible solutions to Grenfell Tower because you asked her to do
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so?
A. No, the opposite. I think she went further than I thought she would. But, I mean, all information is useful in pulling together a fire strategy for a building, so it wasn't unwelcome in that sense, but I didn't ask for it .
Q. The follow-up question is: if she was sending you thoughts on the refurbishment fire strategy, did that not prompt you to think, "Well, I need her thoughts on how to finalise the existing fire safety strategy"?
A. No, it didn't lead me to think that.
Q. Did you ever ask Ms Cooney any questions about the draft existing fire safety strategy?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever discuss it with her at all?
A. No, I didn't. I mean, I think that she enlarged on the concerns that she had about the three issues that we've talked about in this document.
Q. Yes.
A. So I had a summary of what her views were about the building in one page.
Q. So does that explain why you didn't feel the need to discuss it with her?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Yes.

On another topic, I take it that you are familiar with Article 13 of the RRO 2005, which relates to the obligation on the responsible person to ensure that the premises are equipped with appropriate firefighting equipment, fire detectors and alarms?
A. I am aware of that, yes.
Q. I want to ask: what information did you seek from the responsible person -- ie records, past compliance notes -- in order to complete the outline fire safety strategy?
A. Well, in -- generally speaking, fire appliances for use by the occupants are not provided in residential buildings, because you can't train residents of flats to tackle a fire, and indeed it might be dangerous for them to do so. So, broadly speaking, there are no fire extinguishers in apartment buildings.
Q. I appreciate that, but there would be some equipment within the building which would be there for the purpose of firefighting, wouldn't there? The main, the dry rising main.
A. Yeah, but those would be for use by the fire service. Now, in terms of the other parts of the building, I would have expected that there would be portable fire extinguishers for use by the occupants.
Q. But my question is: did you seek any information at any
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stage from the responsible person in terms of records relevant to Article 13 of the RRO?
A. No, because it wouldn't have had any impact on the
fire strategy report that I was working on.
Q. Did you ever have any communication with the responsible person?
A. No.
Q. Moving on, yesterday we discussed the email you received from Janice Wray, or you were forwarded an email from
Janice Wray which, if you remember, had referred to the smoke control system not operating properly in a previous fire in the building in 2010; do you remember that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. I asked you why that hadn't caused you to update your fire strategy to note that there had been a previous fire.
A. You mean the existing building fire strategy?
Q. No, sorry, the refurbishment strategy.
A. Well, I think you might ask the question: if there was a fire in 2010 and there was a criticism made about the smoke extract system, something would have been done about it by the responsible person then. Now, in terms of mentioning it in the fire strategy that I drew up, no, we made a clear statement in there that we were
going to improve it.
Q. I see.

Were you aware, did anyone ever make you aware, that during the fire in 2010, the AOV system sent smoke from the 6th and then later the 9th floor to upper floor lobbies, to the 15 th and 18 th floor, during that fire?
A. No. I had seen no documentation about that fire .
Q. Did you ever ask --
A. Other than the fact that there was an email which said that there was a fire.
Q. Did you ever ask for any documentation relating to that fire?
A. It wasn't really relevant to what I was doing.
Q. Maybe I should have put to you that: well, it would certainly be relevant to the existing fire safety strategy, wouldn't it?
A. Yes, but I wasn't dealing with the existing fire safety strategy .
Q. I see.
A. I mean, if you have a fire incident in a building like that and there are things that you mentioned like smoke spread from floor to floor via the automatic opening vents, then you would have expected the fire authority to have followed that up with the building owner or responsible person, but that doesn't seem to have taken
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## place.

Q. No, but that wasn't something that you thought to outline in your fire safety strategy, to make sure that it had been followed up, given there were residents in that building at the time and were going to be for several years before the system was refurbished?
A. I didn't know that it had happened.
Q. No. Well, you knew that there had been a fire in 2010. I think we established that yesterday.
A. Yes.
Q. You were sent that email. But is it right that you never requested any further details of what had happened in that fire or how serious --
A. No, because it wasn't my responsibility to do that. That would have been a matter between the fire authority and the responsible person.
Q. Had you known that, had you known that the malfunctioning of that system had been sending smoke from lower floors to upper floors, would that have rendered the stay-put strategy untenable and meant that mitigation ought to have been put in place in terms of evacuation?
A. We couldn't have -- I don't -- well, in the first place, I didn't know about it; in the second place, I don't think you can alter a stay-put strategy just like that,
because you need to do a number of things to make sure that that can function. For example, you would need to put in a fire alarm system to ensure that people would respond and make their escape.
Q. I appreciate there might be steps that would follow from that if it was considered that actually the stay-put strategy wasn't tenable anymore, but wasn't it your responsibility to be flagging up that someone ought to be thinking about that?
A. No, I don't believe it was. I believe that should have happened at the time, not two or three years later.
Q. Okay.

Just one final topic before we then pick up where we left off yesterday.

We looked at a document, I just want to bring it up, \{EXO00000693\}, which was an email of 18 September 2013. So if we scroll down within this document, I think it's on page 5 of this \{EXO00000693/5\}.

I showed this to you yesterday and I asked you whether the reference in blue and underlined meant that you were using a file -share link to send documents back to Studio E.

It's been quite properly pointed out overnight that actually there is another version of this email. If we can look at that. That's \{EXO00000390\}. If we look at

## 21

the top of that, this is exactly the same email, it's another Exova reference, and I think I may have actually taken you to this later yesterday, but what we didn't pick up was that in the line attachments at the top, it looks like what you were sending back was actually three pdfs: "Grenfell GL.pdf", "Grenfell Mezz.pdf". Do you see that there?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. So it does in fact appear that you were sending documents back attached to the email as pdfs rather than using a file -share link on that occasion.
A. I wouldn't know how to use a file -share link even now. I mean, the standard way that I dealt with these was to print the drawings, annotate them, scan them and then send them back as pdfs.
Q. Yes. Thank you.
A. That might seem fairly simple, but it's fairly foolproof.
Q. No, no, I understand, yes.

Okay, so let's pick up, then, and we're moving forward in the chronology to September 2014, and I want to look at an exchange of emails which you had on that date concerning the external cladding at the tower.

Can we go to \{SEA00011705\}. If we can start with the top email on this page, this is Mr Crawford of

Studio E to you, copying in two Rydon personnel there,
Simon Lawrence and Simon O'Connor. Do you see that there?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. "Subject ... Grenfell Tower Cavity Fire Barriers."
A. Yeah.
Q. He says:

## "Hi Terry

"I am working on the Grenfell Tower regeneration project from the Studio E end. The following RFI has come in relating to horizontal fire breaks within the cladding areas.
"Can you comment on the RFI attached and whether you believe this interpretation in relation to stack effect is correct?
"Regards
"Neil."
Do you see that there?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Is it right that RFI stands for request for information?
A. It does.
Q. That's how you understood it?
A. Yeah.
Q. So if we can go to that request for information, this appears at \{HAR00003616\}. If we blow up the top half of
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this document, we can see at the top, it is to
Simon Lawrence of Rydon from Daniel Anketell-Jones of
Harley. It's dated 17 September 2014, and then we see lower down the query:
"Please may you confirm the required extent of the horizontal firebreaks within the cladding areas?"
A. Right.
Q. Can you see there, there is a suggested solution:
"We believe that they will be required at every floor level on the vertical columns, but not in the area of cladding between windows. This is because there is no 'chimney' effect here, and therefore the cladding will not add to the spread of fire ."

Do you see that?
A. (Witness nods).
Q. So that's the RFI that you have been forwarded by Mr Crawford.
A. Yeah.
Q. Then if we can go to your reply, this is at \{RYD00018154\}. I want to start on page 2 \{RYD00018154/2\} of this email string with your initial reply. So if we can look in the second half of that page, this is an email you sent back at 11.33 on 18 September, and you reply:
"Neil

$$
22
$$

"I've never seen details of what you're doing to the external walls. Do you have any
cross sections/elevations?"
"Kind regards.
"Terry."
Do you see that there?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Now, is it right that, up until this point, you had given no substantive consideration whatsoever to the cladding or the impact of the cladding on external fire spread?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you explain how it came about that, despite preparing three issues of the fire strategy, you still didn't have the details of what they were doing with the external walls until this point?
A. Well, I think we went through this in some detail yesterday. I mean, they never sent me anything asking me to comment on it.
Q. When you got this request from Mr Crawford to look at this RFI, did this not ring alarm bells for you, given what you had written in your previous fire strategies about the B 4 requirement being satisfied by the proposals?
A. It didn't ring alarm bells because I had never seen any
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details of what we were proposing, and that's what I said in my response.
Q. Did you look back at what you had written in your
fire strategies? I mean, this is September 2014, so it 's nearly -- it's not quite a year, but from your third issue, which was November 2013, it's quite a few months.
A. No, I didn't refer back. I mean, I think it's worth pointing out that, September 2014, my belief was that we were not really a fully paid-up member of the design team, because Rydon were appointed in March, and we were never approached by Rydon to work for them.
Q. I see.
A. And we did talk yesterday about why it was that we saw fit to respond to these emails, and we did it because we normally do that if it's limited in extent.
Q. Yes. And I think --
A. Even though we consider ourselves not to be working on the project.
Q. I think what we established is what we don't see in these emails is you saying to Mr Crawford, "Well, why are you asking me? We're not engaged anymore. If you want our advice" --
A. Yeah, well, I did hint at that yesterday, I did say that we would have been entitled to say, "We are no longer
employed on this project, why are you asking me those questions?", but I didn't see fit to do that.
Q. Yes.
A. That wasn't entirely because we felt generous towards them, but, you know, if you refuse to help people when they ask you questions, it might be seen that you're not being very professional.
Q. Yes.

Now, in fact, your reply, "I've never seen details of what you're doing to the external walls", it may be that you had not seen them, but as we established yesterday, you had in fact been sent details.
A. Not direct.
Q. Well, there was the stage --
A. We were sent a link to the stage $C$ report.
Q. Yes, and you had attended meetings in which cladding had been discussed, including zinc rainscreen cladding.
A. No. No, I don't remember -- as I said earlier, I don't remember cladding ever being discussed at meetings that I attended.
Q. Now, Neil Crawford replies to you on 18 September, the same day, at 12.18 . Can we go to that. I've got a different reference for that. Let's go to the different reference. I think I'm going to follow my notes here: \{EXO00000709\}. This is Mr Crawford's
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response at 12.18. He says:

## "Hi Terry

"Please see attached our sections and the initial drawings set we have from Harleys. The initial drawings from Harleys are fairly limited but they attempt to establish the basic approach."

Can you see there -- yes, the reason I have gone to this email is that you can see there are various attachments clearly that are sent with that email. Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. One of those is a drawing called "1279 SEA (06) 120", the first one. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if we can look at what you say at paragraph 5.17 of your witness statement, this is at \{EXO00001621/15\}, in that last sentence when you are dealing with this email, you say:
"These were large scale drawings which showed zinc outer cladding but did not specify the materials to be used for insulation."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. I just want to look at that drawing. If we can go to it -- and we will need the native version -- this is
\{EX000000710\}. If we can, what I want to do is look at the labels on the left -hand side of those sections. Perhaps we can look at the top of the page, and zoom in. They're quite small, Mr Ashton, but -- that's better, thank you.

So can you see that we get various labels here, and we can see that at the top there it says "H92 Zinc composite rainscreen panel and framing system to cills ", can you read that?
A. I can, yes.
Q. If we keep going down, we should see one labelled H92/776.

Yes, there, three labels up from the bottom, there's H92/776, "Thermal insulation". Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Did you understand when you got these drawings what these little labels in circles were referring to?
A. Well, I assume that they were various components of the cladding system.
Q. Yes. So, I mean, had you seen similar references, like H92, in other projects, or P10?
A. No, no, it didn't mean anything to be honest.
Q. So you didn't understand that that related to the employer's requirements in the NBS specification for the project?
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A. No. No. And may I say, I didn't look at these drawings in any great detail; I just noted that the outer material seemed to be zinc, and that the insulation wasn't defined at that stage.
Q. I see, so you noted that much.
A. Oh, yes.
Q. Why didn't you look at the drawings in any great detail?
A. Because, as I said earlier, we were no longer part of the design team, we hadn't been employed by Rydon, and so I wasn't spending a lot of time on this .
Q. Did you ever make that clear to Studio E?
A. No.
Q. No, you didn't ever say, "By the way, I'm not spending much time on this, you need to understand that"?
A. No, I didn't make that clear to them, no. But, as an overall impression, we have a building which is going to be clad with zinc, with some aluminium elements, such as window flashings, and there was some insulation, which I would expect to see, but it wasn't specified as whatever it was, it was just insulation.
Q. But you didn't think to ask for more details?
A. No. I think it comes back to the fact that I wasn't employed by Rydon, and therefore I didn't feel that I was obliged to spend a lot of time on this .
Q. Yes. Just to be clear -- I think I know what your
answer is going to be, but I want to just check with you -- did you ever see any employer's requirements or the NBS specification at any stage on the Grenfell project?
A. No. I mean, that's an interesting question because employer's requirements are normally provided at the beginning of a development, not towards the end, because if you're drawing up a fire strategy for a building, you need to know what the employer's requirements are, and I never saw them on this job.
Q. Did you ever ask to see the employer's requirements?
A. No. And had I done so at the time that I produced the first report, they wouldn't have been available, it would appear.
Q. Just to be clear, when you looked at these drawings sent to you, was this the first time that you had looked at Studio E's design and specification for the cladding system?
A. Well, I was given to understand these were Harley drawings, not Studio E drawings.
Q. I see, yes.
A. And it was the first time, yes.
Q. Can we then turn to your reply to the email you were sent then by Mr Crawford. \{EXO00000708\}. It's on the same day, and if we can zoom in to the top box, and this
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is at 15.32. You say:
"Neil
"If the insulation in the cavities behind the rainscreen cladding is combustible you will need to provide cavity barrier as shown on your drawing (number 1279 (06) 120) ..."

That's the one we were just looking at.
A. Indeed.
Q. "... in order to prevent fire from spreading from one flat to the one above even if there isn't a continuous cavity from the top to the bottom of the building.
"Kind regards
"Terry."
Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Now, I just want to take this response in stages.

First of all, what do you mean by, "If the insulation in the cavities behind the rainscreen is combustible"?
A. Well, as I said yesterday, there were systems around which employed combustible insulation, but which had been validated for use by test to BS 8414 and therefore satisfied BR 135. So -- and there must be a number of buildings in the country which still have combustible cladding which is endorsed in that way by test evidence.
Q. You have said there, "If the insulation in the cavities is combustible"; did you think to ask for the specification for the insulation to check that point?
A. No. No, I didn't.
Q. Why not?
A. I wanted to deal with this in a light way because

I wasn't working on the project full-time.
Q. I see.

What was the reaction to fire performance requirement for insulation in Approved Document B for buildings over 18 metres at this time?
A. Well, if you were going the linear route, as Studio E described it, which is a term I don't understand, you would have to use materials of limited combustibility. However, if you were using a tested system, you wouldn't have to do that.
Q. So under paragraph 12.7 of the ADB , the insulation should be of limited combustibility in a building greater than 18 metres.
A. Yes.
Q. What did you understand the term "limited combustibility" to mean at the time?
A. Well, it's a firm -- sorry, it's a term that's defined in Approved Document B, and broadly speaking it's -historically it was introduced so that plasterboard
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wasn't deemed to be a combustible material, bearing in mind that plasterboard has a non-combustible core but is faced both sides with paper or cardboard. So it was an artificial definition produced by the DoE at the time. Now --
Q. And --
A. Sorry, please go on.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: No, you finish your answer.
A. Well, I pretty well have. Yes, I have, thank you.

MS GRANGE: Is it right that that definition was by reference to certain fire testing?
A. It included materials which had been tested to various parts of the British Standard, yes, indeed.
Q. Yes.

Now, if you were aware that, under paragraph 12.7, the insulation should be of limited combustibility, then why were you asking whether the insulation was combustible?
A. I wasn't asking; I was saying if it was combustible, you would need to provide cavity barriers.
Q. Can you explain why you didn't immediately draw Mr Crawford's attention to the fact that the insulation must be of limited combustibility if following ADB paragraph 12.7?
A. I didn't know which route they were taking.
Q. Why didn't you ask?
A. Because, as I said earlier, I wasn't -- didn't feel obliged to do a lot of work on this given that we were not part of the design team.
Q. Would you agree, looking at this now, this email, that it appears to suggest that combustible insulation is permissible as long as there are cavity barriers?
A. It could be interpreted that way, yes, I agree.
Q. Is that how you meant the email to be read?
A. Yes, I think so. I mean, I didn't know what insulation they were using. I didn't know whether they were going compliance with ADB or whether they were going to use a system which had been tested.
Q. But given you didn't know, it wasn't the correct advice to give, was it, to say or to suggest that if the insulation is combustible, it's permissible as long as there are cavity barriers?
A. I could have worded it better, I concede that.
Q. Do you agree that, as at 18 September, you had not been provided with any information suggesting that the proposed cladding system that Studio E or Harley were proposing to use had been tested to BS 8414 or otherwise shown to meet the performance criteria in BR 135 ?
A. I hadn't been given any information at all about the cladding, or the insulation for that matter.
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Q. Did it not occur to you at this point to advise Studio E about the risks of using combustible insulation in a cladding façade?
A. I didn't feel that that was my job at this stage of the project.
Q. I mean, I just want you to think about the warning that is in Approved Document B at 12.5 that the use of combustible materials in the cladding system may present a risk to health and safety. Did you not think, with reference to that very clear warning, that you ought to be giving that warning to the design team on this project?
A. No, I think if -- I think it comes back to what I was saying yesterday, which is that because of the very onerous requirements of the thermal regulations, designers are forced to use more thermally efficient insulation, and at that time there were -- there was a lot of work going on, making highly efficient plastic-type materials compliant in order to minimise the amount of insulation provided on the external walls of buildings.

If you were restricted to using mineral wool, which is effectively the only alternative, the thickness of your external wall would be quite significant. That's why there was a lot of work going on at seeing if other
materials that had better thermal properties than mineral wool could be used, and they were having it tested on a regular basis.
Q. Do you agree, looking at this now, that you ought to have ensured that the design team was fully and properly advised as to the risks of using combustible insulation in the system and the requirements or the guidance in Approved Document B, in particular at 12.5 and 12.7?
A. No, I think that the designers should have been aware themselves of the need to comply with the Building Regulations and the guidance documents that they -- are published in support of those regulations.

If this issue had come up at a time when I was a fully paid-up member of the design team, then all of these things would have been discussed in much more detail.
Q. Yes.
A. I'm being asked to comment on things when we have effectively left the design team, and only in little bites of information, not the full picture.
Q. Did you appreciate at that time that that was quite a risky thing to be doing, to be advising piecemeal without full details on something as important as an external wall, given the effect it could have on compartmentation?
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A. Arguably it's a risky thing for the architect to do as well.
Q. But I'm asking you whether you appreciated at the time --
A. Asking me something -- a question which is not supported by a sufficient level of detail.
Q. Just going back to the answer that you have given there, you have recognised that combustible insulation would permit the spread of flame upwards from one flat to another. Do you see that there?
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. Can you explain why you have suggested that the need for cavity barriers depends on there being combustible insulation?
A. I'm not quite sure that I'm saying that. Cavity barriers are required irrespective of the combustibility or otherwise of the insulation. The regulations are quite clear: you have to provide cavity barriers at the junction of all compartment walls and compartment floors with the external walls.
Q. Yes, quite, but can you see, reading this now, where you said:
"If the insulation in the cavities behind the rainscreen is combustible [if] you will need to provide cavity barrier as shown on your drawing ..."

Do you see that? Can you see that it seems to make it contingent, the cavity barriers, on there being combustible insulation?
A. If it's read that way, then it wasn't meant to read that way, and I concede that it could have been more clearly worded.
Q. Yes.

It's right, isn't it, that Approved Document B recommended that cavity barriers were provided around the windows and also at the head of the cladding system regardless of whether the insulation was combustible?
A. That was the requirement or recommendation in the approved document, yes, I agree.
Q. So even if the insulation was of limited combustibility, isn't it right that cavity barriers were still required to be provided if following that guidance?
A. If you followed that guidance to the letter, yes, that's correct.
Q. At this time, were you aware of paragraph 12.8 of Approved Document B, which required cavity barriers to be installed in accordance with section 9 of Approved Document B?
A. Yes, I was aware of that.
Q. And were you aware that to comply with section 9 and, in particular, diagram 33, cavity barriers are required
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around all openings in the external walls, ie around all window openings, at the head and top of the external wall and at the junction of compartment walls and floors?
A. Yes. Yes, I was aware.
Q. Those cavity barriers are all required, just to be clear, irrespective of the reaction to fire performance of the insulation; do you agree?
A. I do agree.
Q. Given that, why do you not recommend cavity barriers at the window openings or at the top of the external walls?
A. That wasn't the question I was being asked, I don't think.
Q. Can we just go back to the drawing that you looked at. You appear to have looked at it, because in the email you say "you will need to provide cavity barrier as shown on your drawing", so it does appear that you looked at this drawing at the time.
A. Very briefly, yes.
Q. Can we go back to that drawing, the native version, \{EX000000710\}. I want to zoom in on that top section again as much as we can.

Now, the point I want to put to you is that the horizontal cavity barriers in this drawing are not placed around the window frames but only in between the
windows. So in this section, for example, there's nothing shown at cill level, is there? Can we see that at the bottom of the page? There is no cavity barrier --
A. Maybe the drawing needs to go up a bit so I can see the bottom. There is a cavity barrier which is in the same horizontal plane as the floor.
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.
Q. But can you see the window frame above that? There is no cavity barrier, there is no label for a cavity barrier, at the cill of the window, at the bottom of the window.
A. I can see that now, yes, but as I said to you earlier , I didn't look at this drawing in any great detail.
Q. So when you were advising that they would need to provide the cavity barriers as shown in this drawing, were you just talking about the cavity barrier you can see and you didn't think about whether or not other cavity barriers ought to be there as well?
A. No, that's right.
Q. Again, can you explain why you advised in that way?
A. I can't really add to what I said earlier, which is that I didn't give these drawings much attention, I just wanted to know in broad terms what they were doing.
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I wasn't asking for full constructional details in order for me to do hours and hours of work which I was not entitled to be paid for.
Q. Were you aware of the importance of cavity barriers around the windows --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in terms of preventing fire spread from the compartment into the cavity and then into the system?
A. Yes, we did have a little bit of a discussion about this yesterday. You definitely need cavity barriers at the junction of walls and compartment floors. There is some debate about the efficacy of cavity barriers around window openings where you have effectively got cavity barriers on all four sides.

However, I concede that that is not what the approved document says.
Q. No, diagram 33 is very clear, isn't it?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Why didn't you give detailed advice to Mr Crawford as to the required location of cavity barriers in accordance with the requirements of Approved Document B?
A. I'm sorry if this is going to sound repetitive : we weren't really charged with helping them in this way. We weren't part -- we weren't employed by Rydon.
Q. Does it follow that you didn't think it was part of your
role, when you were responding to this email, to be stating that the drawings did not comply with Approved Document B because they didn't have cavity barriers at the window openings?
A. No, I didn't see that to be my function at all .
Q. And these drawings don't show cavity barriers at the top of the external wall either. If we zoom out, we see the top, on the right-hand side of this drawing -- we were looking at the left.
A. Right.
Q. And there is no cavity barrier at the top of the building; do you see that?
A. There's not one that's labelled, but there's one, looking at it now which could be --
Q. There's one at the top of that window, but I'm talking higher up. Shouldn't there have been one higher up at the very head of the cladding system?
A. I can't answer that now. I mean, if I had been asked to look at these in detail some time earlier in the design procedure, then I would have gone over them with a fine-tooth comb.
Q. Okay.

Later that same day, so staying with 18 September 2014, Neil Crawford sent you another email. Can we go to that at \{SEA00011724\}, and I want to look
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at the top of page 1 .
So just looking at that very first email at the top, so this is now at 4.07 in the afternoon, and then he says:
"Terry
"Is this interpretation correct (see below)?
"Regards
"Neil."
Then if we can look at the email directly below, it 's from Daniel Anketell-Jones to Mr Crawford, copying in Rydon and Kevin Lamb as well.
A. Right.
Q. "Subject ... Grenfell Tower Cavity Fire barriers ."
"Neil
"Thank you for your response.
"The insulation is class 0 ... Therefore after reading the correspondence below; I believe that the fire barrier in these locations, will not be necessary.
"Can you confirm that this is acceptable?"
So this is a debate that's going on within the design team about whether --
A. Right.
Q. -- a further fire barrier is necessary, and he has said there the insulation is class 0 ; do you see that there?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Now, we can also see from the top email, when Neil Crawford emails you forwarding this on, he attaches a "Rainscreen cladding product datasheet aug14.pdf". Do you see that there?
A. I see there is an attachment, yes.
Q. I want to just go to that attachment. This is at \{RYD00018155\}. This is, if we zoom in to the top half of this, the Celotex RS5000. In the very top right-hand corner, there is actually a date, which I can't now see on the screen. Yes, "Issue 1, August 2014"; do you see that there?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. So this is the Celotex RS5000 datasheet for a premium rainscreen cladding board, and it says there it is:
"... our premium performance PIR solution for use in rainscreen cladding systems."

I will come back and ask you some questions about this datasheet, but before I do, I want to follow through what happened with the emails before I ask you a number of questions.

I want to go to your response to Mr Crawford's email where he asks for advice on Mr Anketell-Jones' interpretation. If we can go to that at \{EXOO0001430\}, this is 16.21 , so a little bit later in the afternoon, you respond to Mr Crawford:
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"Neil
"A material which has a Class 0 rating is not necessarily non-combustible although the reverse is invariably true. Some Class 0 products will burn when exposed to a fully developed fire. In any case, you need to prevent fire spread from [one] flat to the flat above as I stated in my earlier email. What isn't clear from the information to hand is whether or not there is a continuous cavity from top to bottom in any part of the cladding (apart from around the column casings) irrespective of the type of insulation?
"Kind regards
"Terry."
A. Right.
Q. Do you see that? Now, again, I want to ask you a number of questions about this exchange.

First of all, do you recall reading the datasheet for the insulation which Mr Crawford had forwarded to you?
A. No, I didn't open the attachment.
Q. Do you know --
A. Why would I? I mean, I didn't see the need to open the attachment.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, I was just dealing with an exchange of emails
about whether a class 0 material is -- means you don't need to have cavity barriers.
Q. Wouldn't it be important to open the attachment, look at the datasheet, so you can see exactly what type of insulation it is?
A. This is down to communication. I think I assumed that if I needed to look at it, Neil would have said, "Please see the attached and the datasheet attached". He didn't. He just asked me a question about whether, you know, you needed cavity barriers because of the fire performance of the material.
Q. Well, he has asked you about whether Mr Anketell-Jones' interpretation is correct. He says the insulation is class 0 , and they have forwarded to you the datasheet so you have got the information on the insulation. Wasn't it patently clear that you needed to open that attachment and then respond?
A. No, it wasn't clear to me that that was what I needed to do.
Q. Were you familiar with the Celotex RS5000 product at this time? So this is September 2014. It was actually launched in August 2014, as per the datasheet. So it was only launched a month before, but were you aware of the Celotex RS5000 product?
A. I was aware that there was a product called Celotex.
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I've not actually investigated or not had cause to investigate it for any particular application.
Q. How long had you been aware? Because we know there had been another product called FR5000, which in fact is the same product but they then marketed it differently. How long had you been aware of the Celotex insulation product?
A. It's difficult to put a time on it.
Q. Did you know what type of insulation it was?
A. Well, I knew it was PIR foam, which is polyisocyanurate or polyurethane foam.
Q. Did you know --
A. It doesn't mean -- these foam products had been around for a long while. As I referred to yesterday, they were used in insulation to fast food factories and the like.
Q. Did you know its reaction to fire performance?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Were you aware that there might be an issue about how a PIR insulation would perform in an external cladding system?
A. Yes. Yes, of course I was aware of that, but I wasn't aware they were using it here.
Q. Now, in your first witness statement you said at paragraph 5.20 \{EXO00001621/16\} that you do not remember seeing the datasheet.
A. That's right, because I didn't open the attachment.
Q. So you just didn't open the attachment?
A. No.
Q. That's what I just wanted to clarify .
A. Yeah.
Q. So you didn't take any information away from that datasheet at all?
A. No.
Q. Can you explain to us, with reference to your email and discussion of class 0 , how class 0 is relevant to insulation products in an external rainscreen system?
A. It isn't really relevant. I mean, if you're looking at Approved Document B, what it says -- and I summarise it -- is that insulation must be of limited combustibility and the external wall finished outer surface must be class 0 .
Q. If it isn't really relevant, why didn't you respond saying exactly that, saying, "I'm sorry, class 0 is not relevant to an insulation product and whether it should be on an external wall"? It wouldn't be relevant whether you were following Approved Document B or the full fire test route, would it?
A. I didn't know at that time what insulation they were using. In fact, I didn't know until after the fire had taken place. But they were saying, " If we've got
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a material that is class 0 , we don't need cavity
barriers", in effect, and I'm saying "Oh, yes, you do".
Q. I see, so you just took it at face value that it was a material with class 0 and you responded to that narrow question?
A. Yes, I dealt with it in a narrow way, for the reasons I've given earlier. At this stage of the development of the building, I was not really fully engaged. I was not really engaged at all.
Q. Again, my question is the same as before: why didn't you immediately refer to paragraph 12.7 of ADB and explain that the insulation needed to be of limited combustibility if following that guidance?
A. Well, I think I've already answered that question. We weren't --
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Ashton -- sorry, carry on.
A. We weren't part of the design team. I mean, what are the obligations on somebody who has stopped working on a project to carry on as if nothing had happened?
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, Mr Ashton, that rather feeds into what I wanted to ask you.
A. Okay.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Which is this: if you had regarded yourself as still part of the design team, would you have responded in a different way?
A. Yes, I would have probably spent more time looking at the drawings and literally looking at it in much more detail.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And the attachment, would you have opened the attachment?
A. I might have done but, you know, I wasn't part of the design team and that was the way I felt my status was with regard to the project.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, I understand that.
If you're asked a question on an ad hoc basis, so you're not part of the design team but for commercial reasons you are willing to respond to questions, is there any reason why you shouldn't be expected to respond in a fully professional manner?
A. No. No, there isn't a reason why we shouldn't do that.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So you would expect to do that?
A. I would expect to do that, yes, that's fair comment.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Would there be any difference between responding in a professional manner to an ad hoc question and responding in a professional manner as part of the design team?
A. Well, I think that's a difficult question to answer, because if you're not part of the design team, you're not really obligated to give them any answer at all, which is something I said yesterday, I think. With the
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wisdom of hindsight, maybe I should have said to Studio E, "Look, I'm no longer part of the design team, please stop sending me technical queries".
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I do understand that, and I can see the force of what you say, that you could have responded by saying, "It's not part of my responsibility to answer these questions". But once you do agree to answer the questions, I'm just wondering whether there is any real difference between one's professional obligations as a member of the design team and one's professional obligations in answering questions on an ad hoc basis.
A. Probably not. Put in those terms, probably not.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Okay. Thank you very much. Yes, Ms Grange.
MS GRANGE: Yes, just a couple of follow-up questions on that.

Had you been part of the design team, would you have advised that the insulation needed to be of limited combustibility, do you think?
A. Or tested, yes, indeed.
Q. That's a very simple, easy thing for you to advise, isn't it? It didn't require detailed research.
A. No.
Q. You knew that, did you, at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. So it wasn't something that was going to take you a lot of extra time, was it, to go and research?
A. Not necessarily research, just tell them that it needed to be of limited combustibility or justified by test data. That's a sentence which I could have added, I agree.
Q. Is it right that at this time you're still recording your time and assuming you're going to be billing for the work? Is that correct?
A. Not necessarily anticipating billing, but certainly recording my time, that's part of -- you know, you have to record what you spend your time on, on a timesheet. Everybody does that.
Q. I think what Exova do -- we will look at this later -is they still have some headroom in their stage $D / E$ fee, so it just gets added to that in the end, and you never reach the limit of that stage D/E fee. Was that your understanding?
A. I think that's correct, yes.
Q. Did you ever at any stage on the project give any consideration as to whether or not Celotex RS5000 was a suitable insulation product to be used on the tower?
A. No, because I didn't know it was being used.
Q. Did it occur to you to -- forget whether you opened the
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Celotex datasheet -- quickly look up the product, research it yourself, or even approach Celotex directly and find out what type of insulation it was?
A. I'm sorry, as I just said, I didn't know they were using Celotex on the building.
Q. Do you agree that if a product is of limited combustibility, it will typically be marketed as such? So take Rockwool, for example. Do you agree that normally they' ll expressly say in the marketing material, "This is of limited combustibility"?
A. Oh, yes, and I would expect them to say a bit more than that, "It's suitable for use in high-rise buildings", and so on, and what tests it had been tested under, and so on. It would be quite a fairly comprehensive description. Because if you try and market a material as being of limited combustibility, people wouldn't understand it.
Q. Yes.

In your second statement at paragraph 2.3
\{EXO00001775/2\} you say that had it been suggested that the insulation was Celotex, you would have raised doubts about that, and you said something similar yesterday in oral evidence \{Day17/96:1\}, you said:
" If I had been told that they were using Celotex, I would have said that that is not acceptable without
test evidence that it is suitable for use on that building."

I'm suggesting to you now that effectively you were told that they were using Celotex; you were sent the datasheet.
A. No. I mean, I think this is in the same sort of category as sending me a link to a stage C report but not asking me to look at it and comment on it.
Q. Now, in your reply, just looking at it, you say:
"A material which has a class 0 rating is not necessarily non-combustible ..."

Can you help us -- I know you touched on this yesterday -- precisely what your understanding is of the meaning of class 0 ?
A. I couldn't give you the precise definition in Approved Document B but, as I said earlier this morning, it was an artificial term composed by the DoE to ensure that plasterboard was not put at a commercial disadvantage because it had cardboard facings. That's the background to it. So it's a sort of artificial definition, if you like.

I mean, I'm not aware of any materials of limited combustibility other than non-combustible materials. You know, mineral wool. It is probably the only material you can use with confidence in the sort of
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situation that we're talking about, unless you happen to have had your system tested and validated for use on high-rise buildings.
Q. When you state there in the second line:
"Some Class 0 products will burn when exposed to a fully developed fire."

Which class 0 products were you meaning to refer to there?
A. I couldn't be specific . I mean, some will. If they're mineral wool, they will have a class 0 rating but it won't burn.
Q. You weren't aware at the time, were you, whether Celotex RS5000 was non-combustible or whether it was, in your words, a product which will burn when exposed to a fully developed fire?
A. I think I knew that Celotex was isocyanurate foam, which is not a non-combustible material.
Q. Just moving on within this email, there is a lot of detail in here, why do you ask whether there is a continuous cavity apart from around the column casings? Did you believe that such a cavity within the column casings would have been permissible?
A. I was just asking whether there was one or not.
Q. And you weren't curious to see the full details of the drawing so you could see more information about the
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A. Where you need them.
Q. Yes.
A. I mean, it's very difficult to give a two or three-page answer to every -- what I regarded as fairly minor technical questions.
Q. Did you ever think about approaching other experts in

Exova to help you when advising on these topics?
A. I didn't think I needed to.
Q. I mean, this goes into my next question, which is: did you feel that you were appropriately qualified and had the right expertise to be advising on these issues?
A. Do you mean the totality of the issues that they raised or just this particular one?
Q. This particular string, so back to the RFI and then being asked about the insulation is class 0 and cavity barriers; did you feel that you were appropriately qualified to give the right advice about these questions?
A. Yes, I did feel suitably qualified.
Q. Going back to your answer earlier, you said, "If I had been asked the specific question: is it okay to use Celotex RS5000, then I might have answered in a different way".

Were you qualified and experienced to advise on the use of Celotex RS5000? If you had been asked to advise
on that specific product, would you have thought you were able to or would you have referred it to other experts within Exova?
A. No, I think I would have been able to do it on my own.
Q. Now, you're asking a question at the end. You're saying:
"What isn't clear from the information to hand is whether or not there is a continuous cavity from top to bottom in any part of the cladding ... irrespective of the type of insulation?"

Can you recall, we can't find any evidence of this, but did Mr Crawford or Mr Anketell-Jones ever get back to you regarding the extent of the external wall cavity as you requested?
A. No, I don't think they came back at all .
Q. And you didn't think to chase for a response?
A. No, the last statement in there was intended to be helpful: are there continuous cavities?
Q. And you didn't think that you needed to clarify the position you had posed in this email before letting this trail go cold?
A. No.

MS GRANGE: Mr Chairman, I think that's an appropriate moment, actually. There is a related topic coming, but I would rather do that --
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SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It's probably best to break now, isn't it?
MS GRANGE: Yes, it would be.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Ashton, we will have another break now.
THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We will come back at 11.35 , so if you would like to go with the usher, that would be good. Please remember not to talk to anyone about your evidence while you're out of the room. I have to keep telling you that just in case you forget.
THE WITNESS: It's all right, I won't forget. Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I'm sure you won't. Thank you very much.

## (Pause)

Right, 11.35, please.
MS GRANGE: Thank you.
(11.17 am)
(A short break)
(11.35 am)

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, Mr Ashton, ready to carry on?
THE WITNESS: I am, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. Yes, Ms Grange.
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Q. And you --
A. -- you can draw from not being said, don't, you know --
Q. And you carried on --
A. -- just carry on.
Q. -- receiving requests for advice?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I just look at your fee proposal for a moment. We will come back to this later, EXO00000474. I beg your pardon, sorry, that's not the fee proposal. Sorry, it's --
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I'm sorry, before you go on, can I ask you to clarify . You just said to Ms Grange -- I'm looking at the transcript -- she put it to you you didn't get any kind of indication that they didn't, I think she meant want you to continue.
A. Correct.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: You said, "No, no, obviously, that's the obvious inference you can draw from not being", and then there was some overspeaking.
A. Sorry, did I not make it clear?

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, that's what I want you just to clarify.
A. If there had been no communication at all from the client, then it would have been reasonable to assume that they were happy for me to advise on an as-and-when
basis.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Okay, thank you. Yes.
MS GRANGE: Sorry, I've got the reference now,
\{TMO10003885\}, so this is the fee proposal that we looked at of 9 May where you set out your work for the TMO, and we know that that was accepted, and you were told to proceed on that basis.

Can we just look at page 5 \{TMO10003885/5\} within that. There is a section there headed "Changes to client or invoice details", and it says there:
"If, during the project, you inform us of changes to the client or invoicing information, we would be happy to make those changes. However, if there are changes to the client company ... we would need to carry out a credit check ..."

Et cetera.
A. Right.
Q. You were never informed, were you, that there had been any change to the client at any stage?
A. No, no.
Q. So you understood your client throughout to be the TMO; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Even when you were providing the ad hoc advice you were providing in 2014 and 2015?
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A. Yes, well, I think I assumed that КСТМО were still the client.
Q. Yes. Once you knew that you were being asked for ad hoc advice, in, say, September 2014, that we were looking at this morning, did you think to go back to the TMO and raise your status, your contractual status, with them?
A. No.
Q. Just on another point, we looked at that drawing that you were sent. Can we go back to that. This is at \{EXO00000710\}. This is the drawing you were sent by Mr Crawford, and I want to go again to the top left -hand section and zoom in on that.
A. Right.
Q. If you see the labels towards the bottom of that, there is a label with a little circle "H92/125", and it says "PPC aluminium composite rainscreen panel and framing system"; do you see that?
A. I see that now, yes.
Q. There is a line and a label and you can see it's referring to the outer panel of the rainscreen system, as distinct from the insulation that's sitting behind it . Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. So it's referring there to a composite, aluminium composite, do you see that, "TBC"?
A. I also see "TBC" after that, yes.
Q. Yes. Yesterday you said in evidence -- I think this is around pages 76 and 77 \{Day17/76\} -- that you weren't familiar with composite metal panels. So when you looked at this drawing, did it occur to you that that was something you ought to clarify and check? If you weren't familiar with the aluminium composite, was that not a trigger to find out more about that?
A. It might have been, but "TBC" means to be confirmed.
Q. Yes.
A. It might have been an alternative material, ultimately, but, as I said earlier, I didn't look at these drawings in a huge amount of detail.
Q. So picking it back up in 2014, in the light of the advice we've just looked at that you gave, were you aware of the Building Control Alliance Technical Guidance Note 18: Use of Combustible Cladding Materials on Residential Buildings, issue 0 , that had been published in June 2014? Were you aware of that publication?
A. No, I wasn't.
Q. Can we just bring that up so you can see it. It's at \{CELO0003615\}. This is the Building Control Alliance note.

So do I take it you didn't read this at the time of
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working on the Grenfell project?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Have you ever read this piece of guidance?
A. No, I haven't.
Q. So you're not aware of the warnings that are contained within it about the use of combustible materials on residential buildings and the different routes to compliance that it's recommending when dealing with that?
A. No, but looking at it, it's sort of pretty similar guidance as to what is contained in other publications. I'm not quite sure why the BCA decided that they needed to reinforce that because, as I say, just looking at it, I can't really see anything in there that adds any information to what was already in the marketplace. Q. I see.

So just looking at it in a bit more detail, under "Key Issues", if we can zoom in on the bottom of that page, it says there, in the third paragraph:
"A Surface Spread of Flame Classification does not infer any resistance to combustibility, it is solely a measure of the spread of a flame across the surface."

Then in the first bullet it says:
"Thermosetting insulants (rigid polyurethane foam boards) do not meet the limited combustibility
requirements of AD B2 Table A7 and so should not be accepted as meeting AD B2 paragraph 12.7. However, if they are included as part of a cladding system being tested to BR135 \& BS8414, the complete assembly may ultimately prove to be acceptable."

Do you see that?
A. I do, yes. That's more or less what I was saying earlier, without referring to rigid polyurethane foam boards. I mean, any system can be justified by test to be suitable for use.
Q. Did you have any understanding around this time of the limited conditions in which Celotex RS5000 could be used within an external cladding system?
A. Not specifically, but I was aware that Celotex was not a non-combustible material.
Q. I see.

The datasheet can be found -- let's have a look at it again -- \{RYD00018155\}, if we can blow that up. I want to look in particular, actually, at page 3 \{RYD00018155/3\} and the top of page 3. So it says there:
"Celotex RS5000 is a premium performance solution and is the first PIR board to successfully meet the performance criteria set out in BR 135 for rainscreen cladding systems."

67
Then it says there:
"The system tested was as follows ..."
And it explains what the system was. Can you see that it involved 12 millimetre fibre cement panels; do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Were you aware at any time when you were working on the Grenfell project that if you're using Celotex RS5000, it would have to be within the parameters of this system that was tested?
A. No, I think, as a general comment, if you have had a particular construction tested to BS 8414 and you then want to use -- vary that specification slightly, at the time you were able to go and get an assessment from the test house that conducted the test.
Q. Yes, a desktop assessment.
A. And say, "Look, this is slightly different, we're using
a different facing material, we're not using fibre cement panels, we might be using" -- I don't know -"sheet steel, can you assess whether that will still perform in the same way as the tested system?"
Q. Can I go back to the email you wrote to Mr Crawford, this is \{EXOO0001430\}.

Did you think at this time to ask Mr Crawford what type of rainscreen cladding panel was proposed at this
time?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Given it was clear from these email exchanges that there
was some confusion within the design team, did you think
that it might be helpful to suggest a meeting to discuss
these issues?
A. Yes, but equally I would -- if -- it could have come
from the other side. If there was some doubt as to
whether or not what they were doing was acceptable then
it would be open to them to have called for a meeting.
Q. Did you think about whether or not you ought to advise
Mr Crawford that the fire strategy report that you had
written in November 2013 , a third issue, should be
revised given that the B4 compliance was to be confirmed
by an analysis in a future issue of this report?
A. No, I didn't think to tell him at that point.
Q. Can you explain why?
A. No, I can't, really .
Q. Now, in his oral evidence, Mr Crawford said a number of
things about discussions that he had with you at this
time, and I want to take you to some of what he said, so
that you have the chance to respond to that.
A. Okay.
Q. You have addressed this in your second statement, but
I want to ask you some more questions about what
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Mr Crawford said.
Can we go to the transcript at \{Day9/176:23\}. This is right at the bottom, I just want to read this. So he says:
"I think when I spoke with Exova, it must have been 17 or 18 September ..."

And he is talking about 2014 here.
A. Right.
Q. So the exact dates we were just talking about:
"... to confirm what ... confirm the compliance of the Celotex insulation and the proposed cavity barrier strategy, my understanding from the conversation with Exova is the ... that what was being proposed was compliant. I'm not sure if I entirely understood on which method they were using or which basis they assumed it to be compliant. I think I probably assumed a linear route. But I think, having said that, Exova have a massive -- they've a massive wealth of knowledge in terms of similar projects and they may have ... may have had the confidence to say what they said based on desktop studies, previous projects, similar projects, similar build-ups."

Do you see that there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. So he is saying that he spoke with you around 17 or

18 September to confirm the compliance of the Celotex insulation.

Now, I just want to ask you first : do you recall speaking with Mr Crawford on the telephone at the time that these email exchanges were being sent and exchanged?
A. No, I don't recall any conversation with Neil Crawford.
Q. So you didn't have any conversations with him around this time?
A. No.
Q. Or in the days thereafter?
A. No. It's interesting he says "conversation with Exova"; he doesn't name me as the person that he spoke to.
Q. It's pretty clear from his evidence that he is talking about you, Mr Ashton.
A. Well, I didn't have this conversation with him.
Q. So did you ever confirm the compliance of the Celotex insulation in conversations with him at this time?
A. No, definitely not.
Q. Did you ever have a conversation with him in which you were talking about the Celotex RS5000 insulation?
A. No.
Q. Can we look at another extract from his oral evidence --

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Sorry to interrupt, Ms Grange.
If Mr Crawford is right, it would be quite
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an important conversation, wouldn't it?
A. It would indeed, yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I'm just wondering: was it your practice to keep notes of a conversation of that kind, if it had taken place?
A. No, I wouldn't have kept notes, but, given that it is an important subject, I would have expected him to confirm by email that I had agreed that these materials were acceptable. To rely on a telephone conversation or an alleged telephone conversation is not very reliable.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, thank you.
Sorry, Ms Grange.
MS GRANGE: Thank you, yes.
Can we look at another extract from the transcript. This is \{Day10/58:1\} down to \{Day10/59:1\}. So the question is:
"So just so I've got your evidence clear on this, it 's the class 0 fire performance throughout the entire product which to you meant that it was safe to use on buildings above 18 metres as an insulation product?" Do you see that there?
A. Yes, I do, yes.
Q. The answer that Mr Crawford gives:
"Answer: No, no, it's the entire presentation material. I then sought to check that interpretation
with Exova, which I did, and which I understood from what was fairly emphatic confirmation from Exova that it was applicable and that it could be used.
"Question: Let's look --
"Answer: Their understanding of how it was and how it could be used may have been different from mine. They may have had -- they work on hundreds of buildings. They may have had knowledge of BR 135 testing,
for example, that led them to believe that it was applicable in this particular build-up.
"Question: But you don't know that, do you?
"Answer: No, but what I know is from the conversations I had with Exova, they were emphatic -fairly emphatic about the fact that it was appropriate to use, and that's what they suggested to me. I mean, that was my understanding from the conversations I had with them. I asked them to put it in writing, they put it in writing, the contacts with the cavity barriers. On reflection, it is a tacit approval in writing, but from the conversations I had with them, I understood that it was appropriate to use."

Now, in the light of that, did you at any stage on the project discuss with Mr Crawford whether the insulation was compliant and appropriate to use?
A. No, I didn't.
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Q. Did you provide emphatic confirmation to him that it was appropriate for the project?
A. No, I didn't. And it says in there that they -- that we wrote to them confirming this, and we did not.
Q. Yes, I think it was clear from follow-up questions that Mr Crawford was talking about the emails we've just been discussing, and then there's some further emails in 2015. He wasn't referring to any other written correspondence?
A. Yes, but nothing in the emails that I exchanged with him could be described as emphatic about anything.
Q. Yes. You don't recall ever putting in writing that the insulation categorically was appropriate to use?
A. No, and I wouldn't have done that anyway.
Q. Were you ever asked by Studio E about BS 8414 system testing or BR 135 classification?
A. Not specifically, no.
Q. I now want to ask you about whether you had any discussions around, again, 17/18 September 2014 with Mr Crawford about the ACM, the aluminium composite material panels. Can we look at what Mr Crawford said about this on \{Day10/91:16\}.
A. Right.
Q. To \{Day 10/92:11\}.

So the question is put:
"Question: Why didn't you say to Mr Ashton, 'I should just tell you that the bits where it says zinc aren't right anymore, it's aluminium composite'?
"Answer: But I think I did. There was a follow-up -- I ... zinc CM and ACM in performance terms, as I understood it, were the same, and then -- so he worked on the assumption, I think, of the zinc CM, performance of which I think had been the same as the ACM. Then at the end of the conversation I think I did confirm with him that it was -- my understanding was that we were running with ACM.
"Question: When was that conversation, please?
"Answer: At the same time.
"Question: At the same time as?
"Answer: 17th/18th conversation.
"Question: That you referred to on Thursday where you told us that he had said that the Celotex was compliant, the same conversation as that; is that what you are saying?
"Answer: I think it was, yes, I think it was.
"Question: Really?
"Answer: I mean, maybe I've got conversations mixed up."

Do you see all that?
A. I do.
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Q. Again, I want to give you the chance to respond to this: did Mr Crawford confirm that aluminium composite material was to be used? You have pointed out on the drawing it was TBC, but did he ever confirm that to you on the telephone?
A. No, he didn't.
Q. Do you ever recall at any time discussing the use of aluminium composite material panels with Mr Crawford?
A. Never. I mean, I think in my witness statement I said that I didn't know that ACM was being used until after I read about the fire in the press.
Q. Did you ever specifically discuss the use of Reynobond 55 PE rainscreen panels with Mr Crawford?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. I just want to look at what Mr Crawford said later in the day, \{Day10/94:1-22\}. The question:
"Question: Well, we're going to look at the rest of the email chain shortly, but just so I understand your answer, you're saying, are you, that you had a telephone conversation with Mr Ashton on 17 or 18 September in which he told you that Celotex RS5000 and Reynobond PE 55 aluminium composite material rainscreen --
"Answer: ACM.
"Question: -- ACM --
"Answer: Yeah.
"Question: -- were compliant; is that your evidence? I don't want to put words in your mouth, I'm trying to summarise what I think you've been telling me, and if I'm wrong, please say.
"Answer: My understanding is that in discussing the fire strategy -- the cavity barrier strategy in relation to the wall build-up, he understood what the build-up was, we had sent him the insulation detail -- the insulation data sheet, and he understood what the cavity barrier strategy was and he understood what the cladding panel build-up was, and I asked him to confirm that in writing.
"Question: And you say that he did confirm it in writing, but only tacitly?
"Answer: He confirmed in writing that he thought that it was appropriate, but on reflection it's more of a tacit approval than an explicit one."

Did you ever confirm in conversations with
Mr Crawford that you understood what the wall build-up was?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Did you have a conversation about the suitability of the cavity barrier strategy at any time?
A. No. No.
Q. Did you ever say to him that your advice was based on
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desktop studies or previous projects?
A. No.
Q. He goes on to say -- I think I can just summarise this bit -- that his understanding of the route to compliance on the cladding system was from conversations he had with you around 18 September.

Again, do you recall any conversations about the route to compliance for the cladding system?
A. No, I don't recall any discussion about that.
Q. Did you tell Mr Crawford around this time that you would be completing the outline fire safety strategy?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Mr Crawford said that he remembered you eluding to the fact that he would have to complete the report or something of that nature; do you recall ever having a conversation about having to complete the outline fire safety strategy?
A. No, I'm assuming we're talking about one telephone conversation here, which I -- you know, didn't take place as far as I was concerned.
Q. Yes.
A. Seems to exchange a lot of information in one telephone conversation.
Q. Conversely, did you ever tell him that you were so sure that what was being constructed was acceptable that
there was no need for a further report?
A. Definitely not.
Q. Did you ever tell him that there was no risk of external fire spread?
A. No.
Q. Okay.

Just sticking then with 2014 and moving on to a slightly different topic, can we go to \{SEA00012189\}. Now, these are some exchanges that you had in late 2014 with Mr Crawford about observations that RBKC Building Control had made on the means of escape arrangements for the refurbishment. If you look at the top email there, Mr Crawford is saying that he has received some mark-ups from Building Control on the fire strategy. He is due to meet them on Monday and wondered if you had any views on their comments.
A. Right.
Q. Then in the second and third lines, he says this:
"On the Academy project we had the situation where Tony Pearson managed to argue some of their comments away. If you had any observations particularly where you think there comments may be excessive I would be grateful to know as I can take these with me to the meeting on Monday.
"Regards
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## "Neil."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Was it your understanding that Tony Pearson had argued some Building Control comments away on the KALC project, the Academy and Leisure Centre project?
A. No, I think I took Neil Crawford's word for it that Tony Pearson had managed to do that. I didn't discuss it with Tony Pearson because the academy building was Tony Pearson's job.
Q. Did you know what topics he had managed to argue away?
A. No.
Q. Do you know the detail of what they were talking about?
A. No. I think my inference from this was, "Tony Pearson has managed to persuade Building Control to accept a number of modifications, do you think you could do the same?"
Q. Yes.
A. That's how I read it .
Q. Yes, and what was your reaction to that? Did you think that --
A. Well, I didn't know what he wanted relaxations of, at the time of reading that.
Q. Did you think that it might be part of your role on the Grenfell project at this time to argue Building Control
comments away, to go into debate with them?
A. Very definitely . I mean, we had quite lengthy discussions with Kensington and Chelsea Building Control.
Q. Do you agree, though, that best practice would have been to engage in an open and transparent way with Building Control and not seek to get around issues that they're raising?
A. I'm not actually sure what Tony Pearson managed to argue away. I mean, our objective is not to go the -- take the line of least resistance on projects; it's to provide a safe building. Now, without seeing the context of what Tony Pearson and Kensington and Chelsea discussed, I couldn't comment further. It may have been totally unrelated to the sort of questions that we had.
Q. Okay.

So we're now going to go forward in the chronology and look at some emails that were exchanged in March 2015 between you and the design team on the project.
A. Right.
Q. Before we get to those, by March 2015 had you heard or read about a fire which had occurred in the Lacrosse Building in Melbourne, Australia, in which a rainscreen façade incorporating ACM panels had rapidly
spread up the entire external façade to the top of a 21 -storey building?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that specific job or building.
Q. It was a fire that occurred in Melbourne.
A. Yeah. I mean, fires do occur, but I don't follow them all.
Q. No.

Do you remember ever hearing or reading about that specific fire, the Lacrosse fire in Melbourne?
A. No, I don't.
Q. It's not one you are aware of even to this day?
A. No.
Q. No.
A. No.
Q. Turning to the advice which was sought from you on 3 March 2015 from Neil Crawford again, \{EXO00001315\}. If we can blow up that top email. So he says:
"Hi Terry
"Just a quick question relating to Grenfell Tower. As part of the re-clad we are we have (sic) added fire breaks around the apartments as per the email below. Can you comment on the level of protection $(90+30)$ as to whether this is suitable. My only query might be that we have different levels of party wall at the lower levels - see attached fire plan with some 60 some 120
walls.
"Regards
"Neil."
Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Do you remember receiving this email?
A. Yes, I think I do, yes.
Q. Did you ever respond to this email?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. We can't find a response to this email.
A. No, it's possible that this was one that I identified in my first witness statement as one that I obviously received because it was on our system, but I may not have seen it, and had I seen it, I would have responded. I mean --
Q. I see, yes.
A. -- looking at the project as a whole, I'm pretty sure that I answered every single query that was put to me. Whether it was the right way to do it or not is another issue. But I don't remember responding to this, and, as I understand it, I didn't.
Q. No.
A. Which must indicate to me that I hadn't read it.
Q. Okay. Yes, you talked about your witness statement. If we just look at that, paragraph 5.25 of your first
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witness statement, \{EXO00001621/17\}, if we can go to this.
A. Right.
Q. You say there, this is in reference to this email:
"I do not have any recollection of seeing this email or the attached 'Specification Note', or of sending any reply to it. I understand that in reviewing Exova's documents no response to this email has been found. It is very possible that I did not reply to it and if that is the case then I probably did not see this email."

So that remains your evidence; is that right?
A. Yeah, that's in its essence what I just said, yeah.
Q. Did you have any kind of system or procedure within the office for checking or picking up on any requests that hadn't been answered, or would you just leave it to the person sending the email to send another one saying "You haven't responded"?
A. No, there isn't a system for checking on whether all emails received have been answered, but from time to time, if I or one of my colleagues fails to respond to an email, we generally get a reminder, "May I please have a response to my email dated so-and-so, which is attached", and I didn't get that in this case.
Q. If we can go and look down on this page at paragraph $5.27(B)$ of your statement --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- you say -- let's pick it up at 5.27:
"I would not have needed to look at the details of the attachments to provide this answer. Having now reviewed the email and the attachments I note that, at the back of the pack, there is reference to 'Glazing-P1-Panels' in the Specification Note ... which provides some information on the panels and describes the cladding as aluminium composite panels."
Then you say at (B):
"In relation to that email and its attachments, I note ....
"(B) The Specification Note mentions that the cladding would be a 'Reynobond Rainscreen Cassette'. Reynobond is a brand name and there are various types of Reynobond product, some which include insulation of limited combustibility and others which do not. The information provided in the Specification Note does not indicate which type of Reynobond system it was intended to use."
Do you see that there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. I just wanted to ask you some questions there about what you say about the Reynobond product.
What do you mean when you say here that there are 85
some Reynobond products -- it's the third line there of (B) -- "some of which include insulation of limited combustibility and others which do not"? What do you mean by that?
A. I think -- I'm not particularly familiar with Reynobond, but I think I must have looked at some technical datasheet for them subsequently. Bear in mind that this particular email was tabled at a meeting with our legal advisers and, as I've explained already, I hadn't seen it before and therefore didn't reply to it.
Q. Yes.
A. But I can't say hand on heart now that Reynobond is a product which could be used in any circumstances without a test.
Q. No. The phrase you have used there about the product, "some of which include insulation of limited combustibility ", do you mean include it within the panel itself?
A. Yes, indeed, yeah.
Q. I see. Inside the composite panel?
A. Yes, we have a sandwich of I think it's aluminium with a filling of one particular material or another. But, I mean, this is only my understanding; I'm not saying categorically here that that is the case.
Q. Yes. I just wanted to check whether you're mixing up
the Reynobond ACM there with the insulation, but
I think, is it right, what you are saying is that sometimes inside the panel you have insulation material of limited combustibility?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes, I understand now, thank you.
A. Indeed.
Q. You also say in your witness statement at (C) below that that had you seen these specification notes giving the specification details of the cladding, so had you looked at the attachments to this email, you would have drawn Studio E's attention to the fact that the use of styrofoam in the glazing panels would not have been acceptable to Building Control because styrofoam is combustible. Do you see that there?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Can you explain the basis on which you would have given that advice?
A. Had I become aware of the totality of this specification then I would have told them it wasn't acceptable. Styrofoam was obviously a combustible material, in which case, you know, there are no arguments about its fire performance. As I've said in (B), it's possible that Reynobond has different fillers which may be acceptable.
Q. Yes. I'm trying to concentrate for the moment on the
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glazing P1 panels as having a 25-millimetre styrofoam core.

Do you agree that the reason you would have given that advice to say, well, it just can't be used, is because of 12.7 of Approved Document B that provides that any insulation product, filler material, et cetera, used in the external wall construction should be of limited combustibility?
A. Yes, I do agree with that, yeah.
Q. You would have said the styrofoam panels were classified as an insulation product?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Yes.

Had you been asked -- I appreciate your position is you weren't ever asked to advise on it -- whether Reynobond aluminium composite material with a PE core used with Celotex RS5000 insulation was compliant, what would you have said in terms of compliance with the Building Regulations?
A. Well, I would have said, "On the face of it, it doesn't comply, but I will make some enquiries as to the fire properties of what is proposed".
Q. Let's break that down and think about the aluminium composite material panel on the exterior for a moment.
A. Okay.

| Q. Can you be more specific as to on what basis you have said it wouldn't comply? | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| A. Sorry, you want me to deal with it component by component? | 3 |
| Q. I'm now asking you -- | 5 |
| A. I didn't know enough about Reynobond to say one way or the other. | 6 |
| Q. I see. | 8 |
| Do you know whether you would have been looking at paragraph 12.6 of Approved Document B and diagram 40, or would you have been thinking more about 12.7 and the requirement for limited combustibility? | 10 11 12 |
| A. Well, I would have been looking at the fire properties of the material in their totality . | 13 |
| Q. I see. | 15 |
| A. Because, as I said yesterday, class 0 materials -- | 16 |
| Approved Document B does allow the external covering of | 17 |
| buildings to be a class 0 fire performance. That | 18 |
| doesn't tell the whole story. And with a material like | 19 |
| this, you would have to look at it a bit more carefully | 20 |
| to see whether or not in fact it was a suitable | 21 |
| material. | 22 |
| Q. Yes. I see. | 23 |
| A. And for that, I might rely on our testing colleagues in | 24 |
| Warrington. | 25 |
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Q. Okay.

Now, we know that on 27 March 2015, Mr Crawford then sends an email to Mr John Hoban, copying you in. Let's look at that. This is at $\{E X 000001434\}$. And I want to pick this up on page 4 \{EXO00001434/4\}, in the second email down on page 4, from Neil Crawford to you. So there we see at 10.53 Mr Crawford states:
"There has been a lot of conversation on site about the cavity fire barrier requirements to be fitted between the existing concrete external wall panels and the new external rain screen aluminium cassettes.
"Can you please see the proposal by the cladding contractor below and confirm if this is acceptable to you."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. So that's from Mr Crawford to Mr Hoban, copying you in, and also copying in Paul Hanson of RBKC Building Control. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Can we just note while we're looking at this that it says:
"There has been a lot of conversation on site about ..."

And then in the second line it says:
"... to be fitted between the existing concrete external wall panels and the new external rain screen aluminium cassettes."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah, I do.
Q. So you would have been aware, looking at that email, that at that stage, at least, they were using rainscreen aluminium cassettes; do you see that?

Then the proposal is from Ricky Kay at Siderise below that. If we can look at that email below. Ricky Kay states :
"Apologies for the delay ...
"Please find below extract from the Approved Document B of the Building Regulations."

Then if we can go on to the next page \{EXO00001434/5\}, he says:
"Here you can see that it clearly states that 30 minutes fire integrity and 15 minutes insulation is all that is required from a cavity fire barrier. This is reference to rainscreen cladding applications where the cavity barrier is deemed to be on the outside of the building. Our RH25-90/30 will offer 90 minutes fire integrity and 30 minutes fire insulation, therefore exceeds minimum requirements."

He says:
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" 120 minute fire rating is generally the industry standard for curtain wall to concrete slab edge firestopping where the firestop is located on the inside of a building and is considered to be a continuation of the floor slab."

Then he says:
"Please get in touch if you need anything else ..."
Do you see that?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Looking at those emails, was this the first interaction that you had had with RBKC Building Control about the cladding system, or the first time you have been looped in to an email about the cladding which also involves RBKC Building Control?
A. I believe it was. You know, I can't say with certainty that I had never seen anything else, but I do remember seeing this, I think.
Q. Did the reference to rainscreen aluminium cassettes in Mr Crawford's email to you which we just looked at raise any concerns with you?
A. It didn't register, if I'm honest. I don't understand the term aluminium cassettes. I mean, when I looked briefly at the original details that Neil Crawford sent me, there were aluminium elements in that, and that didn't cause alarm because aluminium is used for things
like louvres and what have you. But to this day,
I don't understand the term "cassettes ".
Q. Okay. Did it register with you, when you received these emails, that they weren't proposing to use zinc panels anymore, but aluminium panels?
A. No, it didn't register with me that that was the case.
Q. So it follows, does it, that it didn't signal to you that you needed to consider giving some detailed advice with regard to requirement B 4 at this stage?
A. No, I think the main focus here was the cavity barriers again.
Q. Now, we can see that you're then copied in to an email of 30 March 2015 from Mr Hoban. Let's look at that. This is \{EXO00000715/2\}. So if we look at this email, this is from Mr Hoban, 30 March, to a number of people -- Siderise, Harley, Rydon -- and then you're there on the list as well.
A. Right.
Q. So it's actually sent to you, this email.
A. Yes, yes.
Q. At that stage, what John Hoban does is set out his interpretation of diagram 33, and he says that it's his interpretation that the detail between compartment floors was not a cavity barrier but a firestop which needed to be of 120 minutes standard. Do you see that?
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So in the substance of his email he says, two lines down:
"I would advise you that it is my interpretation of diagram 33 of Approved Document B is that the detail between compartment floors and external cladding is not a cavity barrier, therefore it must be fire stopped to at least the standard of the existing compartment floor [120 minutes ]."

Do you see that there?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. You're then sent an email from Neil Crawford at 12.05 on 31 March, if we go to the bottom of page 1 \{EXO00000715/1\} of this string. If we look at the bottom of the page, at $12.05,31$ March, Neil Crawford says to you:
"Hi Terry
"Can you comment on the history of this item- please see correspondence below as it is not clear to me why this item is causing such a difference in interpretation - can't see anything that seems to reference it in the fire strategy.
"Regards.
"Neil."
Do you see that there?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Then I' ll ask you some questions about this, but let's look at your response first.

In response, at the top of page 1 , you say later that day:
"Neil
"This isn't something that would necessarily form part of a fire safety strategy for a building. Therefore, it would not have been dealt with in the fire safety strategy for this buildings. I agree with Ben Kay. I believe that a cavity barrier is all that is required in this application. Even if we were to agree with RBKC, it is difficult to see how a fire-stop would stay in place in the event of a fire where external flaming occurred as this would cause the zinc cladding to fail.
"Kind regards
"Terry."
Do you see that there?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Again, I just want to take this email in stages.

First of all, why was this not something that would necessarily form part of a fire safety strategy for a building?
A. Well, I think that's not correct as written. I'm not quite sure why I wrote that. The provision of cavity
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barriers would normally be part of a fire safety strategy under B3; it would just say that internal voids will be provided with fire cavity barriers and so on.

I think the main thrust of this was to do with whether or not there needed to be a firestop or a cavity barrier at the junction between the cladding and the structural floors. In that sense, I agreed with Mr Kay that quite clearly it was a cavity barrier and not a firestop.
Q. Yes.

So you knew that cavity barriers arose in the context of functional requirements B3 and B4; you knew that?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And you knew that your fire strategy reports for the project had purported to address both of those requirements, hadn't they?
A. Hadn't?
Q. Had. They had dealt with B3 and B4.
A. Oh, yes, but not in great detail, I have to say that.
Q. Isn't advice on cavity barriers something that
a fire strategy consultant would need to address when considering the fire strategy for a building that was to be overclad?
A. Arguably, yes, it would be. I think it was
an unfortunate form of words in the sense that you wouldn't be discussing in the body of a fire strategy whether or not there was a difference between a firestop and a cavity barrier. That's what I meant.
Q. Yes.

Do you think in that first statement, which you have just said was not strictly correct, that what you were really trying to do here was justify your failure to deal with it in the fire strategy reports that you prepared prior to this?
A. No. As I said just now, the central question here was: do we need a firestop or a cavity barrier where the floor is -- at the junction of the floor and the external wall? And that sort of argument would not be part of a fire strategy. I certainly wouldn't have said, "Well, this wouldn't form part of a fire safety strategy" because I had forgotten to deal with it in the report. That wasn't my intention at all.
Q. Can we just look at what you said in your witness statement about this. This is at paragraph 5.29(F) \{EXO00001621/19\}. So you say there:
"I replied that '[t]his isn't something that would necessarily form part of a fire safety strategy '. Looking at this comment now, it reads a little oddly. I think that my comment was probably a narrow one, ie 97
that a detailed commentary on whether Approved Document B required cavity barriers or fire stops in this location was not something which would normally be included in a fire safety strategy. In a broader sense, commenting on the need for cavity barriers within a cladding system (or elsewhere) certainly might form part of a fire safety strategy. I agreed, however, that 'a cavity barrier is all that is required in this application '."

And then you say how your email continued.
A. Yes, I think that's putting in slightly different wording what I've just said to you: that it was -- you wouldn't have an argument in a fire strategy report about whether something was either a cavity barrier or a firestop. You would actually have made it quite clear what was needed, where.
Q. When would commentary on whether ADB required cavity barriers or firestops be included as part of a fire safety strategy?
A. Never.
Q. Never?
A. That's what I'm suggesting. By the time you have written the fire strategy, you will have advised the design team that, "You need cavity barriers here because it's only closing a cavity ", or, "You need firestops
because this junction needs to have the same standard of fire resistance as the floor for which it, you know, forms a junction with the wall with".
Q. I see. But I think you have accepted here and I think you accepted earlier that you have said, in a broader sense, commenting on the need for cavity barriers within a cladding system or elsewhere certainly might form part of a fire safety strategy. You accept that.
A. I do, I do accept that, yes.
Q. And that's not something that you ever did in a fire safety strategy for Grenfell Tower, did you?
A. On this particular occasion, I didn't, no.
Q. Do you accept, thinking back to the fee proposal document, which talks about compartmentation requirements, that it might be thought to be included in the work that you had committed to provide on the Grenfell project?
A. Yes, it could have been. But it would have been a general statement to the effect that you need to provide cavity barriers in ... within cavities .
Q. Yes.
A. So to restrict the spread of unseen -- sorry, the unseen spread of smoke and fire.
Q. Can you help us a little bit more as to precisely why you thought the cavity barrier was all that was required
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rather than a firestop?
A. Because of its location in the building envelope.
Q. Yes.
A. I mean, I believe that John Hoban was wrong in his interpretation. And I think you're probably going to ask me later on anyway, but firestopping is designed to stay in place for the duration of the fire. It's an extension of the structural slab, or an extension of the vertical compartment wall. Cavity barriers are only there to prevent unseen spread of smoke and flames. So they're not structural elements; they are elements to contain fire and smoke.
Q. At this time, did you know what type of cavity barrier was proposed, ie whether it was going to be full fill or open state cavity barrier?
A. No.
Q. Was that not something that you thought about clarifying with the team?
A. Well, that would have been part of the consideration of the complete details of the cladding, which we never did.
Q. Did you have any opinion on the ability of an open state cavity barrier to achieve 30 minutes' integrity and 15 minutes' insulation?
A. Well, they're used quite a lot. I mean, what you have
is you have an intumescent seal which still allows the passage of water which has penetrated the outer layer to drain down and be got rid of at the bottom, and then when there is a fire spread in that cavity, the material intumesces and forms a complete barrier. And it's the only practical way to do it.
Q. But here it's forming a barrier against a metal panel that may warp or deform. Is that something you ever thought about?
A. Well, that's -- well, that's -- we cover that later and I'm sure you're going to ask me about it.
Q. Yes.

Now, you refer to zinc cladding in the email that we just looked at.
A. Yes.
Q. What made you think it was zinc at that stage?
A. I thought from start to finish that they were using zinc.
Q. I think we have just established that you had received an email of 27 March where it's stated to be aluminium, but you just hadn't picked that up from the email; is that right?
A. If you're referring to the email we've just discussed where they were talking about aluminium cassettes, I didn't recognise as cassette as a complete cladding 101
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Q. I see. Yes, let's go back to it \{EXOO00000715/1\} at the top. So that's where you say "would cause the zinc cladding to fail ".

Did you ever appreciate at any time during your involvement with the project that the cladding had been changed from a zinc to an aluminium composite panel?
A. No, and I would have thought that somebody should have corrected me if that wasn't the case.
Q. Yes. Do you recall Mr Crawford ever emailing you or calling you after this to tell you that the cladding was aluminium and not zinc.
A. No, I mean, we discussed this earlier when we were discussing his evidence. He never rang me.
Q. Yes. You refer in that email to Ben Kay in the second line. I think you mean Ricky Kay of Siderise; is that right?
A. Oh, yes, it was -- yes, sorry about that. Yes, Mr Kay I said, I think.
Q. Yes.
A. Ben in the email.
Q. Now, as you have anticipated, I do want to focus on the last lines of that.
A. Right.
Q. By saying that the zinc cladding would fail, did you
mean that the zinc cladding panels would burn, melt and fall off the building and that that's why a firestop would not stay in place in the event of a fire?
A. No. Zinc cladding, as an entity, would not burn. Metal cladding wouldn't necessarily burn. I think the point I was trying to make here was that if you get a severe fire in one compartment or apartment which causes the windows to break, if the windows are in some way connected to the cladding, there would be local failure of the cladding, ie it will fall off the building.
Q. I see.
A. And it might fall off to the extent that fire coming out of the window would bypass the cavity barrier at the window head. And I think probably you're going to ask me about Tony Pearson's -- because Tony Pearson put it rather than better than I did, I think.
Q. Yes. I will ask you about that.

Just picking up on that, that's a rather specific concern, flaming coming out of the window and localised failure. It doesn't seem to bear much relation to what you say here, which is "where external flaming occurred ... this would cause the zinc cladding to fail ". It seems to be a more general point you're making. Could it have been a more general point?
A. No, no, based on experience of fires over a large number
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of years, if you do get failure of glazing, if it's not in a masonry wall, it will take a bit of whatever it's attached to with it when it falls out. That's inevitable.
Q. I see.

If the cladding were to fail, as you have suggested here, wouldn't it follow that the external façade would have failed to resist the spread of fire over the walls in breach of the Building Regulations?
A. No, I think " fail" in this context means structurally. It means bits of it would fall off the building. It doesn't mean that they would catch fire. And zinc, if it's pure zinc, you wouldn't expect fire to spread up it because it's non-combustible.
Q. I see. This maybe goes back to the fact that you weren't aware at this time of composite products, whether zinc composite or aluminium composite products, that might have --
A. No.
Q. -- polymeric --
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
Q. -- in the middle?
A. No.
Q. Does that not perhaps suggest that you weren't the best person to be advising on these issues at the time and
there might have been more appropriate experts within Exova that would have known, for example, about the development in the use of composite panels?
A. As I wasn't aware that those products existed at that time, I'm not sure that I can answer that in any other way than saying, no, I don't believe there was the expertise.

We don't routinely call on our testing colleagues to give judgements on what's proposed on a material -sorry, on a building, unless we were unsure. But at no stage in this development was I aware that they were using a composite material, so there was no need for me to consult our testing colleagues.
Q. Would you agree that the failure of the cladding in the event of a fire in the way you have described in this email would be a major fire safety issue for the project?
A. No. No. When I say it would fail, it wouldn't cause the cladding on the building as a whole to fall off. I mean, I don't want to go back years and years and years, but there was a serious fire in the West End of London where great big sheets of glass were released and flew along the street. That's the sort of thing I'm talking about. Bits of the -- or pieces of the cladding falling, not the whole thing failing.
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Q. I see. But you said to us yesterday that you were aware, for example, of the big tower fires in Dubai.
A. Yeah.
Q. Weren't those really quite stark examples of external fire spread through external rainscreen panels?
A. But they weren't zinc, as far as I know.
Q. I see.

Were you aware at this time that the existing
fire strategy report that had been drafted by Ms Cooney
had justified the stay-put or defend-in-place strategy remaining by reference to an assumed high degree of compartmentation?
A. I think that's a given for any apartment building.

Stay put is because it's highly compartmented.
Q. Did the knowledge that you had here that fire could spread, even if we go with your narrow, you know, fire spreading from the compartment and out and localised spread, did that knowledge that fire could spread that way give you concern about its impact on compartmentation and your knowledge that a stay-put strategy applied?
A. No, I mean, if I had assumed, and I think I did, that the cladding and the insulation would comply with the recommendations of Approved Document B, then that would not have caused me any concern about external fire
spread.
Q. Did the knowledge that you had about this fire spread give you any concern, given the difficulties posed by the interior of Grenfell Tower, namely the ventilation issues you knew about at the time and a narrow single stair? Did that give you any concern?
A. No, my expectation of the internal compartmentation was that it was okay or it should have been following the completion of the works.

In terms of smoke control, my assumption again was that the design of the smoke control would prevent fire spread -- sorry, smoke spread into the stair. That's the functional requirement for a smoke extract system in that location.

Now, if you lose compartmentation -- and I'm not telling you anything you don't already know -- if you lose compartmentation for one reason or another, then a stay-put strategy is a risky one.
Q. Yes, but I'm not talking about the completion of the works, Mr Ashton. I appreciate you knew that the smoke control system would be refurbished. I'm talking about Grenfell Tower as it existed at that point, and you knew that the smoke control system had real problems.
A. Yes, but I didn't know that there were any defects in compartmentation, and I'm not sure there were.
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Q. I see.

Do we take it from the fact that Mr Pearson becomes involved that you did have some concern about advising on this or some concerns about the ramifications of this?
A. No, no, absolutely not.
Q. Can you help us as to how Mr Pearson becomes involved in this?
A. I think he must have been copied in on the email, and he offered his opinion as well.
Q. Yes.
A. I don't believe I asked him to agree with what I was saying, but I may have done.
Q. Yes.
A. We were in the same room together frequently.
Q. Yes.

Did you appreciate at the time that one conclusion to be drawn from your observations about failure of the cladding in the event of fire was that the proposed refurbishment works would have an adverse effect on the building in relation to external fire spread?
A. No, I didn't conclude that at all. If they had put a compliant cladding on that building, then there wouldn't have been a problem, in my view.
Q. I see. So it follows that you didn't appreciate that
the comment you had made in your fire safety reports that the proposed changes will have no adverse effect on the building in relation to external fire spread required immediate retraction because it couldn't be justified?
A. No, I said it would be confirmed by an analysis in the future, to deal with the information that I hadn't been provided with.
Q. I'm going to put it to you that what you should have done is that you should have retracted that comment in the fire safety reports and advised Studio E that they needed full and proper advice about the fire safety risks posed by the overcladding once you started advising in these kind of terms about zinc cladding failing, et cetera?
A. Nothing that I had seen that I commented on gave me any cause for concern, because I didn't know they were using unsuitable materials. As far as I was concerned, they were using zinc cladding, which I took to be non-combustible, and I think that's a reasonable assumption. I didn't know about the insulation, but I assumed that at some point they would tell me what it was, but they never did.
Q. So you didn't think about engaging, for example, with RBKC Building Control in order to discuss with them 109
whether the external wall was compliant with the functional requirements of the Building Regulations?
A. That's not something we would do routinely. We wouldn't ring up the Building Control department and say, "Oh, is what we're proposing for this okay?" It would be more direct than that. We would sit down with them with the details of what was proposed and go through them.
Q. Yes.

Did you consider that the statement you had made in the fire strategy reports, the three issues, that the proposed changes would have no adverse effect on the building in relation to external fire spread, could still be justified?
A. It depends at what time you look at this. If you had asked me if that remark or that statement was valid post the fire, I'd say no, it wasn't.
Q. No, I'm asking you --
A. At the time I wrote it, we didn't know that they were doing.
Q. I'm asking you at the time you wrote this email here, now, in March 2015. Do you think when you were writing it or did you consider whether the statement you had made previously could still be justified?
A. No, I didn't link the two, because I didn't smell a rat. I mean, we're talking about zinc cladding and whether or
not there needed to be cavity barriers or firestops at the junction between the external walls and the floors.
Q. Yes.
A. It was that narrow.
Q. Did it occur to you at this time that there might be a need to identify more clearly the performance requirements for the external wall construction in the locations where these cavity barriers were required?
A. I think I've already said that, in evidence earlier, with the wisdom of hindsight, it might have been helpful to quote what the regulation required, in effect, in the strategy . But we didn't do it .
Q. Yes.
A. We assumed, I think, a degree of knowledge on the part of the reader.
Q. Yes.

Can we have a quick look at a passage in ADB. If we go to \{CLG00000224/86\}, paragraph 9.15 there in the bottom half of that page in the left -hand column, it states there that:
"Cavity barriers should also be fixed so that their performance is unlikely to be made ineffective by ...
"c. failure in a fire of their fixings ... and
"d. failure in a fire of any material or construction which they abut."
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Do you see that?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Then it gives an example about a suspended ceiling over the top of a fire resisting wall.

Did you ever think about that guidance and have regard to that when you were giving this advice about cavity barriers?
A. No, I think the reality is that if what I said had occurred, you would get -- the cavity barrier would not have been an effective barrier against fire and smoke. With sort of collapse of the external covering of the building adjacent to that, it would almost become redundant, and I think that's pretty much in line with what Tony Pearson said in his response, which was only to me, as it happens.
Q. Given what you have said about the risk of flaming exiting a compartment and spreading into the cladding, did you ever consider advising Studio E or Rydon of the need for cavity barriers around windows to prevent a breach of the compartment into the external cladding?
A. Not specifically, but I have said earlier today that there is some debate as to whether or not cavity barriers around window openings are strictly necessary where you have got cavity barriers at the junction of the compartment walls and floors. It is a matter that
could be debated. I accept that the approved document says they should be provided, but I'm saying that it's -- it is a matter for debate.
Q. If you had advised on that issue, would you have been advising that they were required around the windows?
A. If I had been looking at the details in totality, then yes, I would have said this is what is required.
Q. You talk about a debate in the industry. Were you aware that there was a debate in the industry at this time as to the correct interpretation of diagram 33, in particular whether in a rainscreen cladding system there should be a cavity barrier or whether there should have been a firestop which was the same fire resistance as the compartment lines as the cladding passed over?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
Q. Ms Beryl Menzies, the Inquiry's Building Control expert, indicated that if she had been the Building Control officer at Grenfell, she would have required a 120-minute firestop at compartment lines to extend right through the compartmentation out into the rainscreen system.
A. So she supported John Hoban, in effect.
Q. That's what she said, yes.
A. Well, that's, you know, an interpretation again, I would suggest.

113
Q. Did you ever think about whether the substantive requirements of B3 and B4 together might mean that compartmentation should be maintained and that this meant dividing the rainscreen cavity with a 120 -minute firestop in the way that John Hoban and Ms Menzies indicated?
A. No, because they, to my mind, go further than what the approved document says. If you look at where cavity barriers need to be provided, it's behind rainscreen cladding.
Q. Yes.
A. It doesn't say you must have firestops behind rainscreen cladding.
Q. Yes.

Now, moving on to that email from Dr Tony Pearson that we just talked about. Just two minutes after you sent your email to Mr Crawford on 31 March 2015, you received an email from Dr Pearson on this same point.
A. Yes.
Q. Can we go to that, \{EXO00001347\}. This is just an internal email, if you like, between you and Mr Pearson that he sends to you. He says:
"We note that the barrier against fire spread between floors is provided through the connection of the structural floors to the existing external walls. The
existing external walls are expected to provide sufficient fire resistance to prevent fire from entering the cavities at or near floor or ceiling level.
"We would not rule out that fire could enter the cavity if there is flaming through the windows. However, if significant flames are ejected from the windows, this would lead to failure of the cladding system, with the external surface falling away and exposing the cavity, eliminating the potential for unseen fire spread. A standard cavity barrier should be sufficient to prevent fire spread between floors while there remains a cavity.
"In view of the above, we do not feel that there should be a need for a 2-hour rated fire break in the cavities along the lines of the compartment floors or walls."

Do you see that?
A. I do, yes, and I said earlier that I thought he expressed it better than I did.
Q. Yes. You say --
A. He is saying the same thing, isn't he, effectively ?
Q. Let's just explore this . So you say, first of all, in your witness statement at paragraph 5.32 \{EXO00001621/20\} that you don't recall receiving the emails from Dr Pearson at the time.
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Isn't it likely that you forwarded Mr Crawford's email of 31 March to him and asked for his view on how to answer Mr Crawford's query?
A. I think that's the most likely scenario and I think that he responded to me too late ; in other words, after I had responded to Mr Crawford.
Q. Yes.

Now, Dr Pearson has said in his witness statement that the likely reason he became involved in commenting was that all emails containing technical information had to be approved by at least two people. He says that at paragraph 4.5 of his witness statement.

Now, we have covered this already, but would you agree -- I think you agreed yesterday -- that that was normally the practice with technical advice, even an email, that it would be approved by two people?
A. Yes, that was standard practice.
Q. Now, by responding to Mr Crawford's query at 13.32 before you have received Dr Pearson's email at 13.34, do you agree that, in this instance, you didn't follow that practice?
A. Yes, I didn't follow that practice, but I was fairly confident in what I was saying to Mr Crawford and, as it turned out, Tony Pearson was saying pretty much the same thing.
Q. Did you read Dr Pearson's email at the time?
A. Subsequently, yes, I did, yes.
Q. When you say subsequently, when would that have been?
A. Well, I think I -- when I was having a meeting with my legal advisers.
Q. I see.
A. Our legal advisers, sorry.
Q. Do you have a recollection of reading it at around the time you sent your email or shortly thereafter?
A. I think I may have done, but I can't honestly say one way or the other.
Q. Now --
A. It didn't give me any cause for alarm, because it essentially says what I said in my email.
Q. I want to put it to you that, actually, what Dr Pearson has done is draw more explicit attention to the risks posed by fire to the cladding by explaining in particular that if significant flames are ejected from the windows, this would lead to failure of the cladding system, with the external surface falling away and exposing the cavity. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that, and I did say earlier I thought his response was better than mine, but --
Q. Do you agree it's more explicit about the risks that are posed?
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A. No, I think it's not the risks; I think what he is saying is what would happen in the same way that I was. If you get fire coming out of a window, it will lead to -- it could lead to failure of the cladding system surrounding that window opening.
Q. Did it alarm you that flaming through the windows might lead to failure of the cladding system?
A. No, I'm suggesting that would happen anyway.
Q. Would you agree that if you were reading Dr Pearson's email at the time that you should have appreciated that his comments had significant implications for the fire safety of the refurbishment works?
A. No, no, I think I've answered that question in a different way earlier. Nothing that I had seen to that point gave me any cause to think that there would be external -- extensive external fire spread.
Q. Would you agree that that had significant implications for compliance with the requirements of the Building Regulations and particularly the B4.(1) requirement?
A. No. No. As I say, I was not concerned at what was being proposed at that time, as I understood it. The question was -- and I take you back to that -- the question was: do we need cavity barriers or do we need firestops in this location? And that's all it was
about, really. And I sought to justify why cavity barriers would be adequate.
Q. Yes, I think what I'm suggesting to you is that although it began with that narrow question, in answering that question, something far more serious was exposed by the answers that you're both giving.
A. Sorry, this is -- this happened -- I won't say it happens every day, that would be an exaggeration, but on numerous fires, windows do fail, and if they're in a lightweight construction, they will cause part of that lightweight construction surrounding them to fail . That doesn't imply something far worse, which is the whole of the façade on fire, which is what happened at Grenfell.
Q. Did it occur to you that Dr Pearson's comments here had significant implications for the correctness of the statement in the fire safety reports that the works would have no adverse effect on the building in relation to external fire spread?
A. No, it didn't.
Q. Again, I'm going to ask you -- and I know what your answer will be, but I'm going to nevertheless ask it -can you explain why you didn't seek to update your fire strategy report at this stage?
A. Because I hadn't got sufficient details from the architects to enable me to do that.

119
Q. I see. So was it still in your mind that you might need to do that when you got those details?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. I see.

## (Pause)

Can you explain why you didn't raise with Studio E at any stage that there was the potential for flame spread within the cladding system because the cavity barriers would not be effective once the panels started to heat up and melt?
A. No. Well, to say that to a designer would imply that that always happens, and it doesn't always happen.
Q. Just looking at Dr Pearson's view, it appears to be that fire could enter the cavity if there is flaming through the windows, that cladding will then fail, and therefore there is no unseen fire spread, and no need for a two-hour firebreak.

Would you agree, looking at that now, that it potentially overlooks the point that the cladding materials, including for example the insulation, can still burn and spread flame between flats even once the panels have fallen off?
A. I think -- I don't think that he envisaged combustible materials being used on the face of this building.

I would differ with him in one respect. If the fire
comes out and hits the external surface of the cladding, it could be that that fails first before it gets into the cavity.

The other route, which I'm sure you all know about, is if the fire gets into the cavity behind the cladding. But that's not examined in this analysis of his.
Q. No. That's exactly the point, that it also overlooks that before the cavity actually falls off, there could be some unseen fire spread behind the panels.
A. There could be.
Q. Yes.
A. You can't say that fire will never do what it's predicted to.
Q. But doesn't that potentially present problems for the fire service if they are attempting to put out a fire and you have got unseen fire spread behind the panels?
A. Yeah, that's why we have cavity barriers. One thing that, as I -- I think I've said this several times over the last few days, that that's why we have to be careful with buildings where they can't fight a fire externally.
Q. Did you discuss this further with Dr Pearson at the time or with anybody else within Exova?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. Do you remember what you did with Dr Pearson's email? Did it just stay in your inbox?
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A. Just stayed in my inbox, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. I mean, just to add to that, I mean, if he had said something totally different to what I had said, then I would have had a discussion with him and I might have gone back to Studio E and said, "Oh, my colleague doesn't agree with me, this is what we jointly think ". But reading what Tony has written here, it's saying, as I said, slightly better than I would have done, but more or less saying the same thing: that you will get localised failure of the cladding.
Q. Wasn't Dr Pearson's written advice intended to alert Studio E, Harley, Rydon and Building Control that there was a need to review the fire safety of the whole cladding system due to the risk that fire could enter the cavity if there was flaming through the windows?
A. Well, this was an internal email from him to me. It wasn't addressed to anybody else.
Q. Yes, but, I mean, we will ask Dr Pearson about this, but did you not think about whether what he was doing was giving you some thoughts which actually were important to send on to Studio E, Harley, Rydon and Building Control so that they were fully aware of the risks?
A. I'm not sure that he said anything extra that needed to
be conveyed to Studio E, et cetera. He is saying the same thing as me, essentially . He's saying more what -using more words, but what he is saying is that you will get some local failure of the cladding, which could lead to the fire bypassing the cavity barrier.
Q. Yes.

Now, if we go back to the email of 31 March 2015 at \{SEA00013044\}, and if we look at the top of that page, at that email that he sent to you where he has asked you to comment on the history of this item, we can see in the attachments that he sends a drawing, "1279 SEA (06) 110 - Typical Bay". Do you see that there?
A. Yes, I see the reference, yeah.
Q. Do you recall looking at that drawing at the time?
A. No, I don't believe I did.
Q. Can we just have a look at it. So it's \{SEA00002499\} and we will need the native version.

What I want to look at is that section on the top right, that "Proposed Section - Typical Bay", if we could zoom in as much as possible on that.
A. Right.
Q. Now, this again indicates that there were cavity barriers at the head of the window only. Can you see that there?
A. I can, yes.
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Q. At the head of the window we see it says:
"Ensure horizontal and vertical cavity barriers meet tightly."

Under P10/435.
There is nothing there at the cill of the window.
A. Right.
Q. Does it follow, then, from the fact that you didn't look at the drawing, that that was not something that you noticed at the time or checked at the time?
A. No, that's right.
Q. No.

Now, finally -- I'm just on my last couple of questions on this topic and then we can break for lunch, if that's okay.

Can you recall whether in March/April 2015 you had any telephone conversations with Mr Crawford about the cavity barrier strategy, ie calls not emails?
A. No, I don't believe I had any.
Q. Did Mr Crawford ever raise with you any concern that it was not possible to construct the rainscreen cladding in accordance with the ADB guidance, in particular section 9 of ADB and paragraph 12.8 ?
A. No, I would have remembered a conversation like that.
Q. Did he talk to you about the practical application of cavity barriers and whether it was possible to have them
immediately around the windows, or whether they should be further away but in line with the compartment walls?
A. No.
Q. Did he ever talk to you about the practical application of diagram 33 of ADB within section 9 ?
A. No, he didn't.

MS GRANGE: Okay, thank you.
Mr Chairman, that would be a good moment for a break.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, all right, thank you very much.
We're going to have another break now, Mr Ashton, time for some lunch, so we will resume at 2 o'clock, please, and no talking about your evidence.
THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. Would you like to go with the usher.
(Pause)
MS GRANGE: Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much. Up to speed?
MS GRANGE: Yes, I think we're going to be fine. It slightly depends on whether we are inundated in the lunch break.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Of course, yes.
MS GRANGE: But with any luck, we have covered a lot of
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questions overnight.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very good.
2 o'clock, please.
MS GRANGE: Thank you.
( 1.00 pm )
(The short adjournment)
( 2.00 pm )
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, Mr Ashton?
THE WITNESS: Yes, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very good, thank you very much.
Yes, Ms Grange.
MS GRANGE: Yes, thank you.
I just want to pick up on a few matters arising from
this morning's evidence before moving on with my
remaining topics.
I want to start by discussing zinc.
A. Zinc?
Q. Zinc panels.
A. Right.
Q. You said a number of times that you assumed the panels were zinc and therefore made certain assumptions about the fire behaviour of those panels.

Were you aware at the time that there were zinc composite polymer panels on the market?
A. No, I wasn't.
Q. Indeed, in the NBS specification for this project, one of the alternatives that was put forward was a zinc polymeric composite panel.
A. Right.
Q. Again, was that something you were aware of on this project?
A. No, I -- I never saw the NBS specification. Is that part of the employer's requirements?
Q. It is.
A. No, well, I never saw those. I mean, as I said in my evidence this morning, it's important that the design team see the employer's requirements very early on in the design process. That didn't seem to happen, or at least didn't happen in my case.
Q. Was that ever something you raised with Studio E or your client, the TMO, and said exactly that: "It's important that I see the employer's requirements, please can I see them because this is an important document"?
A. No, I say that -- I'm thinking more in terms of new commercial developments. There may not have been any as far as I was aware for this building.
Q. You thought there might not have been any employer's requirements?
A. No, not necessarily .
Q. For the refurbishment project? I mean, it was a big
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refurbishment.
A. Yeah.
Q. Wouldn't you have expected there to be employer's requirements?
A. Can I put it another way: I don't see the employer's requirements on every project that I work on.
Q. I see.
A. But I normally see some.
Q. Back to the point I'm putting to you: if you had known that there were zinc composite panels on the market, might you have been a bit more questioning about whether the use of zinc panels was appropriate?
A. Yes, I would have done, yes.
Q. If that was right as well, you couldn't simply have assumed from the fact it was zinc as opposed to aluminium that that meant the panels were inert and wouldn't behave --
A. No, no, I think aluminium is an inert material anyway, so it's the same as zinc, but ... so, you know, if somebody said, "We're going to clad the building in zinc or aluminium", that wouldn't have raised any particular concerns.
Q. Would you accept, and we looked at it this morning, that there was an email where you were told it was an aluminium rainscreen cassette system? Would you
accept that a reasonably competent fire engineer would have noticed that the contractor was telling him that the cladding had changed?
A. No, I said earlier, I think, this morning that I didn't read aluminium cassette as being the totality of the cladding on the building. When I looked at the drawings that they did send me, there were aluminium elements in that, but the principal cladding was zinc, as far as I could tell.
Q. I see.
Would you accept that a reasonably competent fire engineer would have investigated for himself or enquired if necessary of the contractor what a cassette was if you didn't know?
A. No, it just didn't strike me as being a significant element of the construction.
Q. And yet you said candidly you didn't actually know what the cassettes meant?
A. No, no. No. But, as I say, the central question was not to do with the cladding but more to do with cavity barriers and firestops and the performance, and all that sort of thing.
Q. Yes.
A. It wasn't specifically to do with the construction of the external walls.
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Q. Just one further proposition on this : would you accept that a reasonably competent fire engineer would have advised that, now that there was further detail about the external wall materials and the design, he should complete the outstanding work under the fire safety strategies and do the proposed future analysis on B4?
A. I think it would be reasonable to assume that I would have asked them for details so that we could discuss the details.
Q. I see. Reasonable for them to assume that that's what you were going to do?
A. No, no, reasonable -- I mean, I could have asked them what it -- you know, "Can we have more details of the cladding?" Although these should have been, you know, made available much earlier in the design process.
Q. Okay. I want to put it to you again: do you accept that a reasonably competent fire engineer would have advised that, now that there was further detail about the external wall materials and the design, he should complete the outstanding work under the outline fire safety strategies and do the promised future analysis under B4?
A. I don't think it's -- yeah, I think that's a reasonable assumption.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, in that case, I think you
could help me by telling me why you didn't do that.
A. Because I was more focused on the specific question in the email, which wasn't actually to do with the external wall construction, it was to do with components of it.
MS GRANGE: I now want to ask you a little bit about knowledge of US developments.

At the time that you were advising Studio E about, for example, cavity barriers in the cladding and other issues in September 2014 and March 2015, were you aware that in June 2014 the Fire Protection Research Foundation, based in Massachusetts, USA, had published a report on fire hazards of exterior wall assemblies containing combustible components?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that publication.
Q. So you haven't ever read it or --
A. No.
Q. -- digested its contents? In which case, I' ll move on.

I now want to ask you some questions about Celotex and desktop study work that was done in relation to the Celotex RS5000.

I want to look at Mr Rek's witness statement. This is at \{SEA00014278/34\}. So Mr Rek, just to put this in context, was one of the witnesses for Studio E that we have heard evidence from already, and he was involved, for example, in putting together the NBS specification.
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That's one of the things he had involvement in.
A. Okay.
Q. He says this at the end of his witness statement:
"After I left [Studio E LLP] I was involved in the design of a high-rise building where Celotex FR5000 was also specified. On that project Exova had produced a desktop study comparing the rainscreen façade cladding with Celotex's tested sample and they had concluded that it complied with BR135."

Do you see that there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. Did you know at the time you were advising on the Grenfell project anything about this desktop study work in relation to -- there it's the FR5000 Celotex product?
A. No. I mean, had I looked into the thing in more detail, I might have asked whether there had been a desktop study. I was aware that desktop studies were being carried out by one of my -- one of the other departments in our organisation, which is what I was saying, you know, in terms of following the opposite to the linear route, you could actually get an assessment or a fire test as a way of satisfying the regulation.
Q. But you weren't aware of this specific desktop study work?
A. No, I weren't, no.
Q. So you can't help us as to the building involved, how tall it was, the detail of it?
A. Yeah. I guess by high-rise he probably meant over 18 metres.
Q. But you can't help us any more --
A. No, I can't.
Q. -- as to the background to all of that?
A. No.
Q. Were you aware, when you were working on the Grenfell
project, that in February and March 2015 there had been direct contact between Celotex and Exova personnel about Celotex products, including RS5000? Were you aware of that?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
Q. Can we look at an example. This is \{CEL00003541\}. This is an email between Celotex -- if we can zoom in on the top one to start with, this is Debbie Berger at Celotex and someone called Frans Paap at Exova, and it's in the context of exchanges about the RS5000 product.

Did you know or have any contact with Frans Paap of Exova?
A. I knew Frans Paap, yes. I didn't have any exchanges with him on Celotex.
Q. Were you aware that he was having exchanges with Celotex --
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A. No.
Q. -- at this time?

If we could also look at \{CEL00003547\}, this is
an appointment for a meeting between Celotex and Exova
on 16 February 2015. It appears to be a meeting:
"Subject: RS5000 Field of Application.
"Location: Celotex, Bretton House Board Room."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. "Hi Andrew and Frans
"Thank you so much for agreeing to see us so quickly. I will organise a lunch for when you arrive." That's from Debbie Berger.
Were you aware of that meeting or meetings?
A. No, I mean, we weren't sort of aware of what was going on in the testing and assessment department on a routine basis.
Q. Just one final email to look at. This is \{CELO0003589\}. If we look at the top again, this is Debbie Berger, 18 March 2015, to Frans Paap, and she is enclosing a copy of her 32-page test report for BS 8414 part 2 using Celotex RS5000, and sending examples of " 4 build-ups which we commonly see presented to us at design stage ". Do you see those?

Again, was that something that was being discussed
within Exova at the time, something you were aware of, these different build-ups for RS5000 that were being considered?
A. No, but if I had become aware that Celotex was being -if I had been aware of the totality of the external walls and that Celotex was being used, I would have carried out some investigations. They would have included enquiring of our testing department whether they had any information on the performance of Celotex and in what given sort of configurations.
Q. Yes.
A. This would be part of the process of determining whether or not they had a certificated approval to assist them.
Q. It would appear from the documents we have that these common build-ups form the subject of a draft desktop study carried out by Exova dated 7 May 2015.
A. Right.
Q. I assume from your answers so far that you didn't have any involvement or knowledge of that?
A. No. I wouldn't expect to.
Q. But if you had been enquiring within your firm about the use of RS5000, you might have found out about this --
A. Oh, yes. Yes, I would.
Q. Now, just on the subject of updating your fire strategy work, I now want to turn to an email that you received
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on 21 December 2015, so later in the project again. Can we go to that. This is at \{MAX00006084/6\}. If we zoom in to the top of that.

So this is from Andy Bridges of RJ Electrics, who is one of the subcontractors on the project --
A. Okay.
Q. -- to you and Tony Pearson, copying in some others at

JS Wright; Steve Blake, that's Rydon; Matt Smith,
Max Fordham; David Hughes, Rydon. Do you see that there?
A. Right.
Q. He's emailing you about installing smoke detection to operate the AOV system in the community rooms.
A. Right.
Q. That's the estates office and the concierge office, were removed in favour of two additional flats at the mezzanine level.

If we look at the second sentence of the first paragraph, he says:
"Hello Terry,
"We are the electrical contractors on this project. I'm not sure if you've been made aware but there have been some fairly major changes to the lower levels since you issued your last Fire Strategy document, Iss 03."

Then he gives -- we don't need to trouble ourselves
about the detail of this -- an explanation of what the changes are. Then if we look down at his questions, he raises three questions:
"How is the omission of the concierge going to affect your current document and thinking?"

I think in the version of this document what we're seeing is answers that you then gave to those questions; is that right?
A. Probably, yes.
Q. So in that first question:
"How is the omission of the concierge going to affect your current document and thinking?"

It would appear that you have then typed into this document:
"The omission of the concierge doesn't materially affect the fire strategy."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Do you remember doing this? Do you remember --
A. I remember it, yes, I remember it coming from an electrical subcontractor.
Q. Yes. Now, given that you're being updated on developments since the third issue of your fire strategy, and he is saying that these are fairly major changes to the lower levels, didn't that put you
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on notice that the fire strategy for the tower was out of date and no longer reflective of the design, and should you have not at least advised Rydon or Studio E or the TMO of the need for an updated report?
A. He described them as major changes. They don't seem to be major to me. Or didn't at the time, I should say.
Q. I see.

Can we look at another exchange. This is with Ms Williams on 19 October 2015. This is \{ART00004926\}. So here, what we're seeing in this is a series of exchanges that you have with Ms Williams entitled "Fire Strategy", and you're providing advice on, I think, fire strategy drawings at this point; is that right? It would appear to be a pdf fire strategy drawing.
A. Well, I'm assuming there was a plan, yes.
Q. For example, the top email:
"Terry
"This plan shows that we had assumed an AOV within the lobby of the boxing club, ie where it is accessible at walkway level (top right drawing).
"Would this suffice? I don't know how you would be able to reach to manually reset one at the top of the stairs here.
"Thanks for your help."

Again, my question is a general question. When you have got this kind of email exchange, and it's entitled "changes to floor layout", didn't that prompt you to at least think about whether or not you ought to be telling someone that the fire strategy that you had done for the building needed to be revisited?
A. Well, the first question related to an AOV which I knew was required in the lobby between the boxing club and the stairs, so that to me didn't make any -- have any impact.
Q. I see. But it didn't occur to you that there would need to be a finalised fire strategy for the building that would, for example, form part of the health and safety file as part of compliance with the CDM Regulations?
A. It didn't occur to me at that point, no.
Q. No. And also an updated fire strategy to deal with regulation 38 information that would be passed on to the responsible person, so there is a link between what's been done under the Building Regulations and then the responsible person's obligations under the RRO, that didn't occur to you either?
A. No, it didn't, no.
Q. No.

I also briefly want to turn to some clerk of works reports review meeting minutes. If we go to
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\{ART00006688\}, this is from a meeting on
12 January 2016. These are COW, we haven't looked at any of these yet, but they're clerk of works reports review meeting minutes, and then it says there has been a meeting at the Rydon site office, and you can see the attendees.

Now, you're not present at this meeting, just to be clear, but if we look on at page 5 \{ART00006688/5\} of this document, and if we blow that up, three lines from the bottom, it says there:
"Fire strategy needs to be updated as per on site discussions."

Then there are initials there, DH, which we think are David Hughes of Rydon.

My question for you is: did David Hughes or anyone else from Rydon, or indeed anyone else involved in the project, contact you in or around this time, so January 2016, to ask for the fire strategy to be updated?
A. No.
Q. Now --
A. Before we leave that, I'm not exactly sure, looking at the list of items here, why we would need to update the fire strategy to --
Q. I see.
A. -- deal with what are snagging defects .
Q. Yes. Well, I mean, we can explore that in due course with the Rydon witness.
A. Okay.
Q. I was just interested to know whether or not you had ever had any contact --
A. Absolutely no contact, no.
Q. -- after this.

Yesterday I put to you that there appeared to be around 90 emails either sent by you or cc'd between April 2014 when Rydon come on board and March 2016.

Now, there appears to be a dispute about this, and your solicitors have emailed overnight and said their calculation is it's closer to 40 emails. There has not been time to double check that, so what I' $m$ going to do is just withdraw that question, but put it to you in a different way.

In light of what we have been looking at today -- so the advice you gave in September 2014, the advice you gave in the spring of 2015, these ongoing queries in late 2015 -- the substantive point is: doesn't this show that you were still regarded as involved in the project, even if you are saying you didn't regard yourself as a full part of the design team?
A. I think that some members of the design team did assume
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that we were still on board, so to speak.
Q. Again, the follow-up question is: did you ever disabuse them of that perception --
A. No.
Q. -- at any stage?
A. No.
Q. Sprinklers, briefly. I just want some brief questions about sprinklers.

I think it's right, isn't it, that your understanding of the existing smoke control system serving the common lobbies pre the refurbishment was that it was not compliant with current guidance and it needed to be refurbished and/or modified. You said that in your design note that we looked at.
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. You also said in that initial design note that as the stairs serving residential accommodation should not serve other, non-residential accommodation, it may be necessary to provide sprinkler or water mist systems to the boxing club or office suite. That was something that was said in your design note.

Now, given the problems you had identified, including the single stair, the width of that stair, and the ventilation deficiency, did you consider or ever consider whether sprinklers would be appropriate
throughout the building?
A. I can answer that in two ways. If you ask me: should existing high-rise blocks of flats be sprinklered retrospectively, my answer to that would be yes. That's not always possible and it's not backed up by any statutory requirement.

With regard to this development, I mentioned sprinklers in the context of the non-residential uses as identifying that it might be -- or I think the word I used was "may" -- may be needed to satisfy Building Control.
Q. Yes.

Did you ever advise anyone that it might be a good idea to consider sprinklers throughout the building?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Can we go to paragraph 4.10 of your first witness statement. This is $\{E X O 00001621 / 10\}$. You say:
"Following the design note, I recall having a discussion with Studio E about some of the issues that had been raised in Ms Cooney's 10 September 2012 email ... including the possibility of sprinklers. This was also a point that had been covered in email exchanges with Studio E following the design note."

Do you see that there?
A. Yes, I do.
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Q. Can you recall who you had that discussion with at Studio E about sprinklers?
A. Well, it was either Bruce Sounes or Adrian Jess. One of the two people. The specific problem was travel distances in one apartment, which exceeded the recommended 9 metres, and my view was that we had to offer something by way of mitigation for that particular extended travel distance, and that could have been by using sprinklers --
Q. Yes.
A. -- or it could have been done by putting in an enhanced fire detection system, which meant a detector in every room.

Now, I have to say that, of the two, to deal with that particular problem, the detection system would be better because it would have detected the fire sooner than a sprinkler would.
Q. Yes.
A. You have to bear in mind that a sprinkler would only operate when there was a very high temperature in the room in which the fire is started. So for the occupants of that flat, the fire detection system was the better option.
Q. I see. So do you think that what you have just been explaining was the subject of your discussion with
A. Yes, I was aware of that, yes. I don't know who told
her or --
Q. You were aware she had said "no sprinklers wanted"?
A. Yes. I don't know whether it was the client or Studio E who told her that.
Q. Yeah, that was my next question.
A. Well --
Q. Did you ever ask her who had told her no sprinklers wanted and where that had come from?
A. Well, I assumed it had come from the client's side. If I had come from the client as distinct from Studio E, it would have carried more weight, if you like, but I think that the general philosophy was that they didn't want sprinklers.
Q. No.
A. And there are obvious benefits in putting in sprinklers, but if the client says, "I don't want to put a partial sprinkler system into this building", then -- and it's not required by the regulations, then it wouldn't happen.
Q. No. Yes.

Now, presumably at the time of the Grenfell project, you were aware that sprinklers were mandatory in new-builds over 30 metres?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Yes.
Do you accept that Grenfell Tower was and could be
properly described as a complex building over 30 metres?
A. Not complex, no. No.
Q. Why would you --
A. It was a block of flats with a little bit of
non-residential accommodation in the lower levels.
Q. Complex in the sense it's an old building, single stair,
fairly narrow stair, smoke ventilation system, natural
system no longer working. Wouldn't that all make it
quite complex from a fire safety perspective?
A. Not complex. I would say it wasn't up to modern-day
standards, and you have to then make a value judgement
as to how you do that. But the vehicle for doing that
is the Regulatory Reform Order. If a risk assessment is
carried out in an existing block of flats -- it needn't
be Grenfell, it could be somewhere else -- and we think
that you ought to provide sprinklers in this building,
then that would be the way in which it would be
sprinklered.
Q. I see, so --
A. Unless you are backed by legislation, as in the case of
Scotland or parts of Scotland, where an Act of
Parliament was put through forcing owners of existing
high-rise residential buildings to put sprinklers in
retrospectively .
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Q. So I think I understand from what you're saying there, and you have said it in relation to other topics, that that's really a separate question for the fire risk assessment and under the RRO.

What I want to put to you is actually when you are doing a fire safety strategy, that's also your concern and your consideration, and that there isn't this hard division between what you're doing for a fire strategy and the fire risk assessment process. Actually, to some extent there is an overlap and you're looking potentially forward at what's going to happen at the next fire risk assessment, and also be asking: is it compliant with the RRO?
A. The absence of sprinklers is not evidence of non-compliance with the RRO. I don't automatically think, in dealing with buildings like this, as first principle, why don't we suggest that the client put sprinklers in.

With the wisdom of hindsight and following this fire, that might be our stance now, but at the time there was no reason to think that putting in sprinklers throughout the building would be a reasonable way to go about things.
Q. What I'm putting to you is a more general point than just sprinklers, but sprinklers are an example, about
this potential overlap in some sense with the fire risk assessment process feeding into the fire strategy and vice versa, you're feeding into that process. So, again, it's not a hermetically sealed two bubbles; to some extent, you both have to be having regard to what the other has done. Does that not make sense?
A. Well, no, I think I didn't get sight of the fire risk assessment for this building because that was really, I guess, to inform my colleagues in Warrington who were doing the existing fire strategy.
Q. And that wasn't a document that you ever thought it would be important for you to see, the current fire risk assessment?
A. No, because I think if they had said in the latest risk assessment, "We consider this building should be provided with a sprinkler system" then Cate would have passed that information on to me.
Q. One final question on this topic: with the benefit of hindsight, do you think you should have strongly advised that sprinklers should have been installed throughout the building?
A. No. You know, you say that, but I had no reason to expect when I was dealing with this building that there was going to be such a catastrophic fire.
Q. Yes, okay.

Now, I have a few other questions on miscellaneous topics before we're just going to come and look overall at the work that Exova did and look back at it at the end.

I want to ask you some questions about the evacuation of residents.

Given that you say you never visited Grenfell Tower, what consideration did you give to the residents who were living in the building?
A. In what sense?
Q. In terms of evacuation strategies .
A. Well, I think I've said in earlier sessions of this that there is no evacuation strategy for blocks of residential flats; it's a stay-put strategy.
Q. Yes. I mean, we have gone over the disabled and we've looked at ADB and those changes. Did you at any point consider any other particularly vulnerable groups -elderly, young children -- and how the fire strategy might affect them? Was there any consideration about the specific community within this building?
A. No. I think in answer to an earlier question you gave me, the only time I would look at an occupant profile of a building is if it were -- I hate to use the expression -- an old persons' home, where it would be completely reasonable to put in sprinklers. But if you
have any other mix of occupancy -- young people, old people, people with disabilities -- it wouldn't cause me to do anything.
Q. Yes.
A. Given that if there is a fire, they don't need to evacuate, unless they happen to be in the flat in which a fire starts.
Q. Yes.

Dr Barker suggested in her evidence that the assumption was that residents could self-evacuate. Was that also your assumption when you were working on the project?
A. That's never explicitly stated in any of the codified guidance, but yeah, I mean, obviously a corollary to that is that the occupants of the fire affected apartment would be expected to self-evacuate.
Q. Yes. So did you ever turn your mind to the fact that some residents might not be able to self-evacuate without assistance?
A. No. That would be true for any apartment block.
Q. The existing building fire strategy report makes two statements about evacuation. It says first that evacuation of flats beyond the dwelling of fire origin would be carried out under the control of the attending fire service if necessary.
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A. Right.
Q. It also states, due to an assumed high degree of compartmentation and therefore low probability of fire spread beyond the dwelling of fire origin, simultaneous evacuation of the building is unlikely to be considered.
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, the existing building fire strategy uses the word "assumed", these are assumed. What investigations did you make to confirm what the degree of compartmentation would be after the refurbishment?
A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that?
Q. Yes. What investigations did you make --
A. The second part, anyway.
Q. -- to confirm what the degree of compartmentation would be after the refurbishment, given that those were the evacuation assumptions?
A. I didn't make any assumptions, and it wasn't part of our agreed scope of works to visit the building after the works to see that a satisfactory degree of compartmentation had been provided.
Q. Yes.
A. Had it been asked for, that would have been in our fee proposal.
Q. Yes.

Now, we discussed today the Celotex RS5000 and we were discussing it a moment ago, and you said you didn't know about the fire performance of that product, but that you were aware that it was not a non-combustible material.

Were you aware that there had been a number of fires worldwide involving both aluminium composite material and foam insulation?
A. I was aware that there were fires in the Middle East involving certainly ACM.
Q. But not necessarily that they had involved foam insulation?
A. No.
Q. No.
A. I think it's -- it might be relevant, it may not, but in the fires in the Middle East, the buildings are sprinklered and the evacuation strategy for them was simultaneous evacuation, so nobody lost their lives in the fires that I was aware of.
Q. Yes.
A. Although there was significant property damage, as you would imagine.
Q. Another question: were you aware of anything to do with the process involved in forming Celotex RS5000, the manufacturing process? Did you have any knowledge of 153
that?
A. No, no, but I know what polyurethane foam is. I mean, it's exfoliated plastic.
Q. Did you know --
A. In sort of layman's terms.
Q. Did you know anything about the blowing agent that was used for the foam?
A. No.
Q. Or the flammability of any such blowing --
A. No, but I was aware from work done by the GLC, it goes back that far, that the composition of a lot of these materials was such that, if they were involved in a fire, they would give rise to toxic fumes and dense smoke, which would hamper mainly firefighting operations.
Q. Yes.

Just a few questions on the smoke ventilation system.

Can we look at an email to Matt Smith that you sent, Matt Smith of Max Fordham. This is at \{EXO00000659\}.
A. Yes.
Q. I want to look at the bottom of page 1. This is an email you sent on 3 October 2013 from you to Matt Smith, Max Fordham, copying in Bruce Sounes and others, including at Max Fordham. You say there:

## "Matt

"We're trying not to have to provide mechanical smoke extract to lobbies you've queried.
"Kind regards
"Terry."
Do you see that there?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. But you have said in evidence that you understood that a mechanical system would be installed to rectify the inadequacy of the existing system; is that correct?
A. That is correct, but I think here I might be referring to other areas of the building which it was not possible for the main extract system to serve, ie the --
Q. Ah, okay.
A. -- non-residential uses on the lowest levels.
Q. I see.
A. All of which were required to have some form of smoke control.
Q. That makes sense.

Do you agree that a mechanical smoke extract system was necessary to rectify the problems with the main existing system?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Yes.

I want to look at another email, this time to
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Duncan Campbell. This is at \{MAX00023204/2\}. So this is you, and I think it's to Duncan Campbell. Is that of Max Fordham?
A. Yes, it would have been.
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.
Q. And you state:

## "Duncan

"I appreciate that you are making an existing (unsatisfactory) system more reliable. However, given RBKC's comments when we met them, they are likely to require that we demonstrate in some way that this system is as good as (or better than) a compliant natural ventilation system. I don't believe that the enhanced system would equate to a depressurisation system meeting the recommendations of BS 12101-6 and I believe we should resist a requirement for this. As a starting point, is it possible to state how many air changes/hour will be achieved on the fire affected floor?"

Do you see that there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. What do you mean by a compliant natural ventilation system in that fourth line?
A. Well, a compliant natural ventilation system was not -we didn't have enough space to put one in. I mean,
a compliant natural ventilation system would be a 3-square-metre chimney located in the central lift lobby. Now, that was not really practicable.
Q. Yes.
A. With automatic opening vents into it, and a vent at the top. That could not be accommodated in the floor plate. So we were forced to go to some form of natural ventilation -- sorry, some form of mechanical ventilation.
Q. Mechanical.
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you explain why you're saying in this email that you believe you should resist a requirement for a depressurisation system meeting the recommendations of that British Standard there?
A. Possibly because a brand new depressurisation system meeting the recommendations of this British Standard might be difficult to achieve in this building.
Q. Can you give any more detail as to why that would be difficult to achieve?
A. It could probably be again for spatial reasons.
Q. Yes.
A. I think it's useful to point out that there are commercial systems on the market which require ducts of very small cross-sectional area which do work and would
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have been suitable here, and I think that's actually what we ended up with, although it was after my involvement in this particular part of the design.
Q. Well, we will be exploring this more in Module 3.
A. Okay.
Q. Can I just go to another exchange. This is an exchange you had with Claire Williams. This is at \{EXO00000618/3\}.

She says at the bottom of that page, if we can look at this -- you are cc'd into an email to Matt Smith. She says:
"Matt
"On site we talked about finding out the original installation information - ie from building regulations, as this would evidence the intended design strategy and any measurements.
"Do you have any access to building regulations information, or have you done this already?"

I think she is trying to establish what the existing system was capable of?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Then if we can go one up, they say:
"We'll look into this. We hold historical
regulatory documents in our library ... There will also be the issue of which regulations applied at the time ..."

Then there is all that.
I think that the general question for you here is: why was the design strategy and measurements of the existing system still uncertain at the time of this email exchange in 2014? Can you help us?
A. Why were they uncertain?
Q. Yes, why are they still struggling to understand the existing system at that time?
A. When I heard what it was, I was struggling to understand what it was, because there were quite clearly defined methods for dealing with smoke extract from common areas of residential buildings, and they were documented in both the LCC -- sorry, London County Council code of practice and the subsequent GLC code of practice.
Q. Yes.
A. What was put in there seemed to me to be somewhat experimental, and I think I've referred to it as such somewhere in the correspondence.
Q. Yes.

Would you agree that the performance of that existing system should have been determined from the outset to inform the design strategy for the new system?
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A. No, not really. I think, as I said quite often, there was an intention to put in a mechanical system because of the difficulties in getting small area natural vents to work in a building of this height.
Q. Yes.

Now, just finally on this topic I want to go to another email, \{EXOO0000344\}.
A. Right.
Q. If we can blow this up, this is 6 January 2015, so this is Matt Smith, Max Fordham, to you -- you are the recipient of this email -- copying in Max Fordham and Artelia :
"Subject: Grenfell Tower - Smoke Extract System.
"Afternoon Terry
"Can you look over and provide comment on the smoke extract proposal put forward by PSB on behalf of JS Wright? It looks acceptable and I believe the principle of it has been verbally accepted by Building Control, but it may be wise to get your view as it falls slightly outside our area of expertise.
"It's fundamentally different to what we specified in that it is now a pressure differential system rather than simple smoke clearance. Details can be found below. If you have any questions then please give me a call."

## Do you see that there?

A. I do, yes.
Q. Do you recall receiving that request for advice on that?
A. Yes, I do recall receiving it .
Q. Can you recall making any comments on it?
A. I said something, I believe, to the effect that PSB are specialists in this area.
Q. Yes.
A. Similar to PSB, another specialist smoke extract company does do bespoke systems for this application, and when we're dealing with that, we say, well, they have their own design backed up by CFD, and so the job of getting it approved is generally handed over to them.
Q. I see, yes.
A. So as long as PSB were able to satisfy RBKC that it would work, then that was fine.
Q. Yes.
A. I mean, I wouldn't seek to argue what they were doing was inadequate because they're the experts in their own system.
Q. I see. So does it follow that you didn't get involved in the design process when the change was made to go to a pressure differential system?
A. No, I didn't. Just to give you another example, where we're dealing with a commercial building with
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firefighting shafts and the building design consultant opts to go for a commercial system, all that we say in our documentation is, "This will be provided by $X$ ", and we have no further involvement in that because they're the experts at doing that.
Q. Yes.

Were you ever given an explanation on the project as to why the system that was finally proposed was not the same as that which had been specified by Max Fordham?
A. No, I wasn't.
Q. Do you know why the design intention for the system was still unclear at the time of this email exchange in 2015?
A. At the time when, sorry?
Q. Why was the design intention for the system still
unclear at the time of this email exchange in 2015?
A. All I can say was it probably hadn't been firmly established that what was being proposed was workable. Q. Yes.

Now, fire doors, just a few quick questions on that.
A. Right.
Q. Is there any reason why the fire safety strategy reports which you produced didn't refer to the location and performance of all the fire doors in the building?
A. No. It was quite deliberate. We were only dealing with
doors to new openings.
Q. I see. So it wasn't part of your work to look at the doors that were already existing in the tower and check that they were compliant with -- well, either compliant with modern requirements and then explain why they didn't have to be, or check whether they complied with the requirements which would have been applicable at the time?
A. No, I would expect that to be -- what's the word? -highlighted as a result of a fire risk assessment if the doors were inadequate. I mean, I know a number of cases with local authority housing where one of the recommendations of a fire risk assessment is that the doors are either replaced or modified to make them compliant.
Q. Yes. But, as we know, you never got a copy of the fire risk assessment, so you wouldn't have known whether any of those doors had been highlighted.
A. No, no.
Q. No.

Is there a reason why no investigation was made by Exova into the performance of the existing flat entrance doors, stair doors or lift shaft doors anywhere in the building to see if it complied with relevant fire safety requirements?
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A. Erm --
Q. That's a different way of putting the same question, I think.
A. It is, really. We wouldn't have looked at the remainder of the building because that wasn't part of the scope of works.
Q. What about the fire doors that were proposed in the refurbishment? Was it any part of your role to check the compliance with fire safety regulations and Building Regulations of the new fire doors that were proposed as part of the refurbishment?
A. No, we had no inspection function as part of our scope of works. I think the reason for that is a fairly obvious one: that we would expect that that work would be done by Building Control anyway.
Q. Yes.

So just moving to another topic -- and we're getting towards the end of my questions, although we're going to have to pause when I finish and just sweep up anything else.
A. Okay.
Q. What I'm going to try to do is finish my questions first and then we break, if that's okay.

So I want to take stock and look back at the work of Exova, and compare the work which you proposed in the
fee proposal and the work that was carried out. It's right, isn't it, that the third version of the outline fire safety strategy was, in the end, the only version of that report that was ever produced?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Do you agree that that third version represented the culmination of Exova's work up to and including RIBA stages $D$ and $E$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, as we discussed earlier, your fee proposal envisaged that a detailed fire strategy would be prepared for RIBA stage D and E, which would be written in line with the requirements of the Building Regulations.

Did you think that the third issue of the outline fire safety strategy satisfied that part of the fee proposal?
A. No, it didn't, because it didn't deal with a number of issues, in particular the B4 issue that we have been discussing for the last few days.
Q. Did you ever look back at the fee proposal and see that what was promised in the detailed fire strategy was a determination of any external fire spread issues that there may be and recommendations of compartmentation and fire protection standards? Did you ever look back and 165
consider whether that work had been completed?
A. No, but I was -- I was aware that we hadn't completed the task.
Q. Can you explain why we see so little change between the three iterations of your fire strategy report, in terms of the level of detail that was provided?
A. Yeah, I think that's because it really only picked up internal changes as a result of Studio E redesigning parts of the lower four floors.
Q. Is it right that nothing commensurate with RIBA stage $F$, or indeed any stage thereafter, was ever produced by Exova?
A. I think that's fair comment, and that is particularly because we weren't novated to Rydon.
Q. Do you accept that each time you were copied in to an email about the external wall design in 2014 and 2015, it represented a missed opportunity to give comprehensive guidance on the Building Regulations and statutory guidance document ADB and what they required?
A. I think it could be interpreted that way, but, as I've said on many occasions over the last few days, the general gist of the enquiries that we got were details rather than, "This is a system that we're thinking of using, what do you think?"
Q. Would you accept that these were missed opportunities
for any CDM-related issues to be addressed as part of a design risk assessment process?
A. We had no involvement with the CFD co-ordinator. I think probably --
Q. Sorry, when you say CFD co-ordinator, do you mean CDM co-ordinator?
A. Sorry, did I -- sorry, Freudian slip . CDM co-ordinator. Had we been employed by Rydon, it's likely that we would have had to provide some information and co-operate with the CDM co-ordinator, because the critical role they perform is mainly when the building is -- when the building is being built, although there are some aspects of the design that they need to consider as well, particularly those architectural issues that could create problems for end users of the building.
Q. I would suggest there were very important aspects of the design process that have to be considered.
A. Is the building safe to use, yes, exactly.
Q. Did you know during your time on the project who the CDM co-ordinator was?
A. No.
Q. So you didn't know that, up until 2015, that was Artelia or Appleyards?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Did it ever occur to you, or did you ever think about,
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that your client, the TMO, would need a more detailed and up-to-date fire strategy when considering Building Control approval?
A. I think I thought it might be necessary, but Building Control didn't ask for a more detailed fire strategy; they appeared to have approved the concepts without that information. We never had any instruction from the client to update it.
Q. But were you ever worried or concerned that Building Control might read your iterations of the fire strategy and see that no issues had been identified and take comfort from that?
A. No, I would assume that they were a competent Building Control authority and if they weren't happy, they would have said so. And that is my experience of dealing with Kensington and Chelsea Building Control, by and large; they really do want to know what's going on.
Q. Exactly. Building Control needed to have an analysis of the B4 performance requirements and how the external wall satisfied those requirements, didn't they?
A. They did.
Q. In your proposed scope of works for RIBA stage F, you said that there would be an updated revision of the fire safety strategy documentation to reflect any agreed changes to the strategy following any related design
development and consultation with the approvals body. Do you want to look at that again?
A. No, that's a standard thing that we would do if necessary.
Q. Can you explain what happened to that updated revision to reflect any agreed changes following any related design development and consultation with the approvals body?
A. I wasn't aware it was necessary. As I said earlier, we didn't get anything back from Kensington and Chelsea which required us to change the fundamentals of our fire strategy.
Q. So you didn't think about the fact that your fee proposal stated that Exova would be providing an updated revision of the fire strategy, that was accepted by the TMO, that was what you had proposed you would do?
A. I think, as I said earlier, the wording in our fee proposals is a standard wording, and it covers all areas of what might happen, or might reasonably cover all eventualities. If at stage $F$ it's necessary to update a report to reflect changes either in the design as brought about by the contractor or any other reason, then we would expect to have to update the report.
Q. There is no evidence of you meeting with RBKC
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Building Control after September 2013. Do you agree that such meetings would have been useful to discuss your fire strategy and necessary revisions to it as the project progressed and before the full plans application in August 2014?
A. We generally find that either the project manager or the lead consultant asks for meetings with Building Control if he or she deems it necessary. It doesn't come from Building Control. They don't say, "We need to meet you, say, once every two months to discuss things ". It's generally we ask them or we -- I say "we", I mean the design team.
Q. I think we saw before that you in fact initiated yourself the first meeting with Building Control. You organised it and --
A. Yeah, that's because I knew how to get hold of them easily.
Q. I see. But that wasn't something that it occurred to you to do thereafter on the project?
A. No, no, I assumed that from there on the lead consultant would arrange these things, because when they go and see Building Control, they don't just talk about fire, they talk about all the other parts of the Building Regulations.
Q. Did you think at the time that it was odd -- this is
while you were still involved in the project -- that a compliance check of the design for the external wall had not been carried out?
A. Design -- sorry?
Q. A compliance check of the design for the external wall. Did it occur to you that it was odd that no compliance check had been carried out?
A. Yes, I think it was very odd that I had no contact with Studio E to discuss it.
Q. And did you ever think about contacting your client, the TMO, and just saying that: "It's really odd that we haven't done this, you should know that"?
A. No, I wouldn't do that, I don't think. I mean, that's not the normal way of how a building design team works. If somebody goes to the project manager and says, "We're not getting sufficient input from Warrington on a particular subject", I would be slightly upset that they hadn't come to me and said, "Look, we need some information from you regarding $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ or Z " rather than going straight to the project manager or client.
Q. Would you accept that it fell below the standards of a reasonably competent fire engineer not to advise the TMO, your client, that there was a need for a compliance check of the design to be done?
A. No.

## Q. Okay.

Now, we know that the outline fire safety strategy issue 3 was expressly incorporated into the design and build contract between the TMO and Rydon?
A. Right.
Q. It formed part of the contract documentation.

Did you know, prior to that, that it was going to be incorporated into the design and build contract?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. So it follows that you didn't know that it would be relied on and used by the main contractor?
A. Well, no, when I say I didn't know, I mean, it would normally be information given to a contractor prior to him tendering for the job.
Q. Were you aware at the time that issue 3 of the outline fire safety strategy was eventually submitted to RBKC Building Control by Studio E on 29 September 2014 as part of the full plans application for Building Control approval? Did you come to know about that at the time?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that, but I would imagine that that would be standard practice for our fire strategy report to be part of the full plans application.
Q. And you were completely comfortable with that, were you, that that was likely to happen, that that issue 3 was --
A. Well, they had to have something to look at. I mean, if
the full plans application had been made without any statement about the fire strategy, then it could have been rejected under the Building Regulations, in my view.
Q. Yes. But was it common, in your experience, for a fire strategy to go in as part of a full plans application which didn't deal with, for example, the B4 requirement when there was to be an overcladding?
A. No.
Q. That wasn't --
A. I think in that sense it would have been nice if the final edition of the fire strategy did contain details of compliance with B4, but it didn't because it hadn't been considered.
Q. Yes.

Can we look at paragraph 3.21 of your witness statement. This is \{EXO00001621/6\}. I just want to read what you say here:
"By the time of Stage F, a contractor has generally been appointed to carry out the project. For large projects this is often on a 'design and build' basis, meaning that the contractor takes on responsibility for the design of the works (including completing any unfinished design work) as well as the construction of the works. What often occurs is that the contractor who
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has been appointed to carry out the project will carry out a 'value engineering' exercise, meaning they look for ways to reduce the cost of the project (for instance through changing materials or approach) while still meeting the client's objectives. Such changes may or may not impact on the fire strategy ."

Then you say it's not a given that you will remain involved in the project at this stage.

I just want to ask you about that value engineering process you refer to there. Did you ever hear about whether there had been a value engineering process on this project?
A. No, but I say it's very common --
Q. Yes.
A. -- for the successful tenderer to do that, to see if there are ways in which the design can be accomplished --
Q. So you didn't ever try -- sorry.
A. -- at a reduced cost.
Q. Yes. So you didn't ever try and find out if such a value engineering exercise had taken place and whether changes had been made which would affect the fire strategy?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Do you agree, looking at it now, that the questions that
were being asked of you by Studio E in both September 2014 and March 2015 about the cladding flowed directly from the lack of any analysis about B3 and B4 in your outline fire strategy reports?
A. No, I think it's a reflection of the fact that they didn't tell us what they wanted to do and sit down and discuss it.
Q. Would you agree that the queries raised by Studio E were basic questions about performance requirements in fire which should have been addressed by Exova in the fire strategy reports?
A. Ideally they should have been, but weren't, for the reasons I've already given.
Q. Would you agree that, in light of your knowledge that the refurbishment works included overcladding with panels which would potentially fail in the event of a fire with external flaming from the compartment, you should have produced a further and final outline fire safety report which took account of up-to-date information about the overcladding?
A. I think that you are placing too much importance on local failure of a cladding because of fire coming out of a window. That's not the same question at all.
Q. Well, that's the explanation you have given for those emails?
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A. Yeah.
Q. You don't think that that should have meant that you should have been producing a further and final version of your fire strategy report?
A. I think I've said on a number of occasions that it would have been nice if we had done a full and final fire safety strategy, but for reasons I have already explained, that didn't happen.
Q. Do you accept that you should have advised the TMO as your client, and indeed Studio E, that there were serious issues which needed to be addressed concerning fire safety of the cladding given its likelihood that it might fail in the event of a fire with external flaming?
A. No, I didn't see the need to say that to them because I had no way of knowing that it might fail in the way that you are describing. I mean, that could happen with any building.
Q. I just want to look, then, at the overall time spent on the project and just ask you a few questions about that.

We have had disclosed to the Inquiry a spreadsheet which shows the time spent on the project by Exova. If we can go to the native version, \{EXO00001353\}. I want to look at the timesheets at the second tab at the bottom.

Have you seen this document before?
A. No, I don't think so.
Q. Now, the Inquiry's expert, Dr Lane, has considered it, and it appears to show that 53 hours are assigned to the primary refurbishment project -- that excludes work on the existing fire strategy -- between September 2012 and April 2015.

Now, we know that there must have been some other time spent before that, before September 2012, because we can see Exova personnel, for example, attending design team meetings before that. Subject to that, I just want to ask you about that time allocation.

Some 51 hours are associated with your work on the refurbishment; does that sound about right, 51 hours?
A. On the refurbishment?
Q. Yes. About 51 hours in total.
A. I didn't have any part in the work to do with the -sorry, I'll start again.

Clearly we've underspent by a significant amount of money. Now, that is a reflection of the lack of discussion on some of the key structural elements of the building, including the cladding.
Q. Yes.
A. So that figure of $£ 3,853$ would have been considerably more if we had had a series of meetings with Studio E to discuss that.
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Q. Yes. We will just come to the figures in a moment. Thinking about just the time at the moment, the spreadsheet has split the time allocation between the stage C work and the stage D/E work. It appears to indicate less than -- well, around four working days, if you do a seven-hour day, on stage $C$, and just less than one week for stage D and E work. Does that sound about right to you?
A. Stage C, yes, probably. I'm surprised at stage D/E.
Q. Yes?
A. I would have expected there to be more time.
Q. I think, as you have anticipated, the cost of the time spent at stage C was indeed the full amount. Exova invoiced and were paid the full amount of $£ 3,300$. But for stage $D$ and $E$, the time spent and invoiced is $£ 3,874$, which is less than the $£ 5,300$ stated in the fee proposal.
A. Yes.
Q. I think you have just explained it, but I just want to give you another chance: can you explain why Exova didn't invoice for the full amount shown in the fee proposal, didn't do the full work that was indicated would be done?
A. Generally, unless we have a fixed fee for each stage, as distinct from an estimate, we would only charge for the
work actually carried out.
Q. Would you agree that less than one week's work on the stage $D / E$ process for a project of this complexity was unacceptable?
A. I think you need to understand what we did at stage C -or are you saying $D$ and $E$ ?
Q. I'm saying $D / E$, because you put those together in your fee proposal.
A. It is much less than I think -- I thought that I spent.
Q. Yes.

Mr Ashton, just the last couple of questions from me and then we will pause and break, if that's okay, to pick up anything else.

Looking back at this and in the light of the last few days of evidence, can you tell us: would you have done anything differently now if you had the chance to do it again?
A. Yes, I think I would have asked more questions of the design team.
Q. Yes.
A. Instead of expecting them to come to me all the time, I may -- should have said, maybe, "What's happening with so-and-so? What about this?" And there wasn't a great element of me ringing them up and saying, "What's happening?" It was me waiting for them to send the
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information to deal with.
MS GRANGE: Okay, thank you.
Mr Chairman, can we take a break?
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. Shall we say 3.30 ? Will that give you enough time?
MS GRANGE: Yes, it should. Can I just look behind me and see?
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.

## (Pause)

MS GRANGE: 3.30 should be fine.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We are going to have a break now, Mr Ashton. Ms Grange thinks she has reached the end of her questions, but sometimes, when they review it, counsel find that there are things they ought to have picked up which they haven't.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So we will break now and resume at 3.30 , if you would, please.

THE WITNESS: Okay, yes, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: If you would like to go with the usher, then, thank you.
(Pause)
Good, 3.30, please.
MS GRANGE: Thank you.
( 3.12 pm )

Q. And you're not aware whether Ms Cooney and Ms Barker ever requested that information?
A. I've no idea one way or the other. I have to say -it 's probably gratuitous, but I'll say it anyway -- my experience is that these documents are not easily obtainable for a building of that age.
Q. I see. So you wouldn't expect to find an up-to-date CDM health and safety file for Grenfell Tower?
A. No, not really .
Q. And that's based on, what, your experience of other projects?
A. Experience, yes. I mean, if you go to a shopping centre that's been built ten years, finding the original fire strategy for that is not easy. I mean, this is why the DoE or their predecessor or their successor decided to put in regulation 38 , to ensure that the as-built information is actually sent to the end user of the building and is maintained.
Q. Yes.
A. So anybody doing a risk assessment would want to satisfy him or herself that they'd still got that information.
Q. In your experience, was regulation 38 complied with in practice, as a generality, on projects?
A. I can't say I've any experience of that.
Q. Okay.
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Just finally a few questions about the evacuation of residents. It was put to you today whether you ever turned your mind to the fact that some residents might not be able to self-evacuate without assistance, and your evidence was that you didn't consider that.

Were you aware that there were at least 22 people with disabilities living in Grenfell Tower above the tenth floor?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
Q. Given you weren't aware of that, would you expect to have been told that information during the time that you were working on the fire strategies for the project?
A. No, not normally. We don't normally get that sort of information. As I say, unless there is a specific client profile, such as they're all people with disability or impaired sight, we would expect there to be a cross-section of society living in these buildings.
Q. Had you been told that information, would you have done anything differently from that which you did do?
A. No.
Q. If you wouldn't have expected to have been told, whose job do you think it was to make the necessary provision for such residents in terms of their evacuation?
A. The building management.
Q. Do you mean the responsible person under the --

Thank you very much.
Q. -- RRO? 2
Mr Chairman, those are all of the questions that we
are going to ask.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, very good, thank you very 7
much.
8
Well, Mr Ashton, that is the end of the questioning. 9
I am sorry we have asked you to come for quite such 10
a long time, but it's been very helpful. We are very 11
grateful to you for coming to give your evidence, and 12
now you're free to go. Thank you very much. 13
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: -- from Dr Pearson. 25
A. Well, the responsible person or the building management. 1 ..... 1

A. They may well have been one and the same person. 3
A. They may well have been one and the same person.

MS GRANGE: I see, okay. ..... 4Mr Chairman, those are all of the questions that we510
a long time, but it's been very helpful. We are very ..... 11
grateful to you for13

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. 14
THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. ..... 14

    (The witness withdrew) 15
    (The witness withdrew) ..... 15

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you, Ms Grange. Is that it 16
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you, Ms Grange. Is that it ..... 16

    for the day? 17
    for the day? ..... 17

MS GRANGE: That's it, thank you, we will have another 18
MS GRANGE: That's it, thank you, we will have another ..... 18

    witness on Monday. 19 witness on Monday ..... 19
    SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Thank you all very much. 20
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Thank you all very much. ..... 20

    That's all for today. We're going to rise now, and we 21
    That's all for today. We're going to rise now, and we ..... 21

    shall resume on Monday morning at 10 o'clock, when we're 22
    shall resume on Monday morning at 10 o'lock, when we're ..... 22

    going to hear -- 23
    going to hear -- ..... 23

MS GRANGE: From Dr Tony Pearson. 24M GRANGE: From Dr Tony Pearson.25
185
187

185
(The hearing adjourned until 10 am on Monday, 13 July 2020)
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[^0]:    cavities and whether they were continuous in certain locations?
    A. No.
    Q. Would you agree that you are not in a position to provide comprehensive advice without full details of the cladding system and the design and should not have sought to give that advice without having that?
    A. No, I was answering a fairly simple question and I felt able to answer that without being in full knowledge of what was going on. The specific question was: do we need to have cavity barriers if the material we're using is a class 0 rating? And the answer is you still do. Now, maybe I should have just stopped at that.
    Q. Did you not think there was an immediate need to correct Harley's interpretation that all they needed to be concerned about was whether or not it was class 0 ?
    A. I thought I did by this response.
    Q. You also say you need to prevent fire spread from one flat to the flat above. Where is that requirement taken from? What were you thinking of when you said that?
    A. Approved Document B.
    Q. And any particular part of it?
    A. Well, it's the provision of cavity barriers that's in B -- in section 13 of Approved Document B.
    Q. Yes.

[^1]:    MS GRANGE: Yes, just a couple of follow-up questions from this morning's evidence.

    At what point did you consider that your retainer as per the fee proposal had ended? You seemed to be saying you had entered a different stage and you weren't part of the design team and you didn't consider you were appointed anymore. At what point are you saying you thought that?
    A. I think when I became aware that Rydon had been appointed and they hadn't approached us to help them.
    Q. Isn't it quite common for fire engineers to stay client side, so to carry on advising your client, the TMO, despite the appointment of a design and build contractor? Doesn't that happen on some projects?
    A. That's exactly what is happening on a project that I'm currently working on, the client said, "I want you to carry on", notwithstanding the fact that there has been a contractor appointed to do the job. That being the case, I would have expected some sort of indication from the client that he wanted us to carry on.
    Q. But you didn't get any kind of indication that they didn't want you to --
    A. No, no.
    Q. -- carry on, did you?
    A. Obviously. That's the obvious inference --

