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(10.00 am)
            (Proceedings delayed)
(10.10 am)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to
    today's hearing. Today we're going to hear evidence
    from one of the Building Control inspectors with the
    Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea who was
    concerned with the refurbishment of Grenfell Tower.
        Yes, Mr Millett.
MR MILLETT: Good morning, Mr Chairman. I now call
    Mr John Hoban, please.
                MR JOHN HOBAN (sworn)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much, Mr Hoban.
    Would you like to sit down and make yourself
    comfortable.
            Now, Mr Hoban, before I invite Mr Millett to put
    some questions to you, there are just a couple of things
    I would like to say.
            The first is: I understand that there are things you
        would like to say to the people who were affected by the
        fire. You will be given an opportunity to do that, and
        I think it would probably be most convenient if you were
        to do that at the end of your evidence. All right? But
        we'll make sure you get that chance.
```
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    THE WITNESS: Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: The other thing is that we have
a break during the morning and during the afternoon in
any event, but if you feel that you need a break from
time to time, would you just indicate that to me, and we
can ensure that it happens?
THE WITNESS: I will.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good. Thank you very much.
Yes, Mr Millett.
Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY
MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, thank you very much.
Mr Hoban, good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. Can I start by thanking you very much for coming to
the Inquiry and assisting us with your evidence in our
investigations.
If you have any difficulty understanding the
questions that I'm asking you, I'm happy to repeat the
question or put the question in a different way.
Can I also ask you to keep your voice up so that the
transcriber, who sits to your right, can get down your
evidence on to the transcript, and add that if you nod
or shake your head, that doesn't go on to the
transcript, so you have to say "yes" or "no" as the case
may be.

If you need a break, as you have heard from the Chairman, at any time other than the scheduled breaks that we plan to take during the morning and the afternoon, please just indicate and we can take a break.

Now, you have made two witness statements for the Inquiry, I think. They are in a folder on your desk. You have also made a police statement which I'm going to take you to as well.

Can I ask you to go to your first statement, please, that's \{RBK00033934\}. Is that your first statement, dated 30 November 2018?
A. Yes, it is .
Q. Can you go to page 12 \{RBK00033934/12\}, please. Is that your signature?
A. It is.
Q. You have also provided exhibits JEH/1 to 5 with the statement. Just for the transcript -- no need to turn that up -- those are \{RBK00033936\} to \{RBK00033931\} inclusive.

Can I ask you: have you read this statement recently, Mr Hoban?
A. I have.
Q. Can you confirm that the contents are true?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I now take you to your second statement. This is at
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\{RBK00050416\}. This is dated 9 July 2019. Is that your second statement?
A. It is.
Q. Can we please go to page 24 \{RBK00050416/24\} --
A. Yes.
Q. -- where you will a signature above the date. Is that your signature?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Now, you have also provided exhibits JEH/6 and JEH/7 with that statement, and their references are \{RBK00050415\} and \{RBK00050414\} respectively. There is no need to look at those, I'm just reading those into the record.

Have you read this, your second statement, recently?
A. I have.
Q. Thank you, and can you confirm that the contents are true?
A. Yes. I would say that, at the time of writing this statement, I didn't have access to various documents at the time, so my answers would be more detailed now with some of the information that I've got in my possession now.
Q. Very good. Well, we will see how we go with that.

Now, the Inquiry also has a copy of the draft statement provided by the Metropolitan Police but not
signed by you. But as I understand it, there are some corrections which you have made to it. That should be in your witness bundle in front of you. It's at \{HOB00000218\}.

Now, if you would just look at that, we can see from the front page that it's not been signed. We understand from your legal representatives that you annotated this statement and returned it to the Metropolitan Police on 14 February 2018. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go back, please, to be shown \{RBK00033934\}. This is your first Inquiry statement. Can I ask you to go to page 1, paragraph 2.
A. Yes.
Q. You say there:
"As per the Witness Statement Protocol, I confirm that I have provided a statement to the police regarding this matter. Although I have yet to formally sign that statement, I confirm that to the best of my recollection the matters stated within that statement are true and accurate. I consent for that statement to be disclosed to the Public Inquiry."

Is the annotated statement that we've just looked at, or just referred to, \{HOB00000219\}, the statement that you're referring to there?
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A. Could you repeat the numbers, please? Sorry.
Q. Yes. It's \{HOB00000219\}, if we could put that up on the screen in front of you.
A. Yes.
Q. Yes, thank you.

You have made some amendments to it. Can I show you one of those, and just ask you to confirm something. If you would be shown page 11 \{HOB00000219/11\} in this document, please, you will see that at about a quarter of the way down there's a paragraph break which starts:
"I was aware new windows were being fitted ..."
Do you see that? Do you see that?
(Pause)
About a fifth of the way down, there's a paragraph indentation, and then a line that starts, "I was aware ..."
A. Oh yes, yes.
Q. Thank you.

Now, if you go down a little bit, four lines from that, you say:
"As far as I can recall I went up on the hoist on three occasions."
A. That's incorrect.
Q. Can you explain what you mean there, or what you would like that to say?
A. Six occasions, as far as I can recall.
Q. But three occasions with Qas, I think?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Subject to that correction, and you will see also that there are some parts -- perhaps you can explain -- of this statement in red and parts in green, could you just explain for us what you indicate by the red and the green?
A. I can't exactly remember. One was that I wanted something taken out.
Q. Yes.
A. And the other colour was I wanted it included.
Q. As we understand it, the green was to go out --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and the red was to come in. Would that be right?
A. Yes.
Q. Just for an example of that, while we're on this page, just to be absolutely accurate, if you look about two-fifths of the way down this page, you'll see that the first red addition there, or the first red words, can be found in the line:
"There are no specific guidelines for [and then you have added in red] this Council's building control surveyors."
A. Correct.
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Q. So that's an addition you would wish to make?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. So all the reds are additions you would like to make and the greens are those to go out, thank you very much.

Subject to that, Mr Hoban, can you confirm that the contents of this statement are, with those corrections, true to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. There's one further amendment at the end.
Q. Yes, we can turn to the last page, please
\{HOB00000219/13\}.
A. No, not that -- sorry, not that page. Yes. There's a comma -- sorry, bear with me ...
(Pause)
Q. If it's a comma, then we may be able to find it later rather than interrupt --
A. Right. It's in relation to a fire safety regulatory reform order. What it indicates is -- it should all read as one paragraph and not just fire safety and then the regulatory --
Q. Very well. Subject to that potential correction, which we'll find during the break, can you confirm that this statement is true to the best of your belief and that you adopt it as your evidence?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Thank you very much.

[^0]9
Q. That's the first page of it.
A. Right.
Q. We can see from that that you --
A. Yes, I've signed it, yes, that is my CV.
Q. At the bottom right-hand corner, that's your signature?
A. Yes.
Q. We can see that you have a BTEC ordinary certificate in building studies which you obtained in 1982.
A. Yes.
Q. And a BTEC higher certificate in building studies obtained in 1985.
A. Yes.
Q. Am I right that your professional experience includes working as a junior technical officer in the Building Regulations division and later than that a technical assistant in the District Surveyor's Service of the Greater London Council?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was from 1979 to 1986 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Since 1986, up to the end of March 2017, you worked, I think, as a senior Building Control surveyor at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
A. Yes.
Q. You have no other professional qualifications, I think?
A. No. I'm an associate member of the Association of Building Engineers.
Q. Yes, and am I right that you effectively worked your way up from a junior position?
A. Correct.
Q. And retired on 31 March 2017?
A. I resigned.
Q. Was there any particular reason why you resigned?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us very briefly what those are?
A. I resigned because I had enough. I wasn't able to do the job that -- how I was trained to do, and it was affecting my health, and I just decided that I didn't want to work there anymore.
Q. Right, okay. We may come back to that later on.

On page 2 \{RBK00050415/2\} of your CV, if we just go to that while we have it on the screen, you explain your role at RBKC, and you set it out at some length for much of that page.

Can I just summarise that for people watching. Is it right that you dealt with Building Regulation applications, which included review of documents and site visits?
A. Correct.
Q. And you gave general and specific advice on
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Building Regulations matters; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And advised junior colleagues.
A. Yes.
Q. And you dealt with enquiries from building professionals and the public.
A. Yes.
Q. And also investigated dangerous structures where you were asked to do that.
A. Yes.
Q. And liaising with other colleagues and departments and statutory bodies, such as the LFEPA.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I'm going to come later on to examine with you your role within the department, the Building Control department at RBKC.

Can you just confirm that at the time you were allocated to the Grenfell Tower project in the latter part of 2013, and more accurately we'll look at in a moment, you had about 35 years' experience as a Building Control surveyor in central London?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.

Now, you mentioned professional memberships, and you said you were an associate member of the Association of

Building Engineers; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And also an associate member of the Chartered Association of Building Engineers. Are they different or the same organisation?
A. The association got chartership, so it changed from being --
Q. I see.
A. -- an association and they got chartered association.
Q. So the ABE became the CABE?
A. Correct.
Q. Right. Did you do anything, like an exam or an interview, to become an associate member of the Chartered Association of Building Engineers?
A. I filled in an application form and I sent my CV in, and that's the level of membership that they gave me at that time.
Q. Right. And when was that, can you remind me?
A. I think it was ... sorry.
(Pause)
Q. You do say on page 1 January 2013.
A. Yeah, 2013, sorry.
Q. As a member of the CABE, were you required to undertake

CPD, continuing professional development?
A. There was no actual standard set out for my grade of
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officer .
Q. Right.
A. But I did take CPD.
Q. You did. We will come to that.

You say there was no actual standard set out for
your grade of officer. What was your grade of officer?
A. I was an associate member.
Q. Right.

Did they lay on any seminars or conferences for you to attend?
A. We had in-house seminars from time to time --
Q. Right.
A. -- in the office, and I did attend other training.

I went on a day course prior to becoming a member for the Chartered Institute. I also attended a day course in -- at Wandsworth Town Hall when part M of the Building Regulations got changed, I went on that.
Q. Those were courses organised by the institute, were they, or the association?
A. No.
Q. Or were they organised by RBKC?
A. They weren't organised by RBKC. I -- the institute one, yes, for the membership, that was organised by the actual institute itself --
Q. Right.
A. -- which I attended, I think, in 2012. The one relating to part M, I saw it somewhere and I asked my line manager if I could attend.
Q. Right.

Based on your professional experience and years of service, were you eligible for one of the higher grades of membership of the CABE?
A. I would have to take a professional -- or take an examination. It could be through interview, and I would have to put a thesis together.
Q. I see. Why didn't you go through those hoops?
A. At the time, I was looking after my mother.
Q. I see.
A. I was her carer.
Q. I follow.

What prompted you to become an associate member of the CABE in 2014?
A. I knew they were changing the rules. It was going to be ... they were setting the bar higher as regards -for membership. So I was told that, so I applied. It was my intention to go mature applicant's entrance, but as I say, because I was looking after or helping looking after my mother, that took up a considerable amount of my time, and I never did that.
Q. Yes, I see.

Can I then turn to CPD and training within RBKC, which we touched on a moment ago.

In that role at RBKC, were you required to undertake training?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, RBKC has provided your training records to the Inquiry. I just want to show you those. \{RBK00050414\}, please. Page 1 is the first page of that, and I want to look at page 2 \{RBK00050414/2\}. This is your training record, and at page 2 we can see that your records go back to January 1999. You can see at the bottom there:
"NLP diploma workshop - part one. Training centre. 29 January 1999."

So that's when they started.
If we can scroll up to the first page \{RBK00050414/1\}, we can see that, according to this record, they end on 7 November 2016. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to tell us whether this record covers all internal training that you undertook at RBKC during this period?
A. No, it doesn't.
Q. Right. What does it not cover?
A. As I say, I had attended outside courses. We also had
in-house seminars from time to time that were organised.
Q. And those aren't on this record?
A. They're not.
Q. Are they on other records?
A. I would have had handwritten records at the time, but I don't believe they're available now.
Q. Right, so you would have had them. Were they yours or were they RBKC's?
A. They were mine.
Q. And you don't have them now; can you explain why not?
A. When I left, I no longer kept them.
Q. Right. So you kept them in the office --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and left the office and now don't have access to them?
A. Correct.
Q. I see.
A. There was other -- as I say, we would -- when regulation or new approved documents came in, we would have in-house lunchtime seminars on the changes to the Building Regulations.
Q. Right. You would have in-house seminars. We will come back to that in a moment.

Just on this document, your internal records,
I think, indicate that you had training on matters which
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aren't directly relevant to Building Control. So, for example, if you look halfway down page 1 , you get training on the "Local Government Pension Scheme-2014 pension changes".
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right? You would have training on all kinds of things that weren't directly part of your job?
A. Yes.
Q. If you look at the WorkRite training you undertook in February 2015, you can see that there are a number of entries there --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for 18 February 2015 --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- including stress awareness, manual handling, mobile workers, et cetera.

Was that specific to Building Control or was that just more general training?
A. That was for the council.
Q. When you say, "That was for the council", what does that mean?
A. It was a requirement that officers did these WorkRite training courses, and that was automatically registered on to the system when you completed the actual course.
Q. I see.
A. That's my understanding.
Q. I follow.

In the last-but-one of those WorkRite entries, we can see "WorkRite Fire Safety Awareness Training". Was that to do with the Building Regulations and your role as a building surveyor --
A. No.
Q. -- and control officer?
A. No, that was general -- or as far as I can recall, that was to general fire safety awareness in the office.
Q. I see.

Looking a little lower down the same page, we can see that there is a Complywise fire safety programme on which you get $100 \%$ as an online grade on 1 June 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. Did that relate to your role as a Building Control surveyor?
A. Not that I'm aware of. I couldn't be certain.
Q. Looking at page 1 as a whole, Mr Hoban, which spans a period from March 2009 to November 2016, do any of these courses or meetings or seminars relate to your role as a Building Control surveyor?
A. Dangerous structure training.
Q. Yes, I see. Anything else?
A. Not there.

## Q. Right.

You mentioned lunchtime seminars provided by RBKC --
A. Yes.
Q. -- specifically on the Building Regulations.
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you have any internal training on approved documents?
A. Yes, as and when they came out --
Q. Right.
A. -- or there was amendments.
Q. I see. Who delivered that training?
A. It was generally managers in the office.
Q. Right.

Can you remember getting any specific training on Approved Document B?
A. Yes, it would be some years ago --
Q. Yes.
A. -- when the new document came out. We also had in-house training when there was changes to the regulations,
I believe in 2010.
Q. Yes, and who delivered those, managers again?
A. Managers again.
Q. Can you give us some names?
A. It would be John Jackson and Mr Gammon, Mr David Gammon, I believe.
Q. Who would receive those training courses or seminars?
A. Surveyors.
Q. Right. I see.
Did you get training on any aspect of Approved
Document B in particular, or on Approved Document B
generally?
A. As I say, we would talk about amendments. We would go
through the amendments when they came out and discuss
them. Likewise, when there was -- there was
a communities performance standards, we had -- I can
recall having an afternoon seminar on that.
Q. Did you get any training at any stage on technical
industry guidance, for example the CWC standard?
A. No.
Q. What about the Building Control Alliance technical
notes?
A. No.
Q. Right. We may come back to those shortly.
Can we just look at another record for your personal
development or training: \{RBK00048696/6\}, please. This
is your personal development plan. We can see that this
is from 2014 through to 2015, July 2014 to
February 2015 , and if you look at item 1 , it says:
"Keep up to date with changes in the 21
will be a number of changes before May 2015 due to the findings of the Housing Standards Review.
"Date this will be achieved: Feb 15.
"Progress: Will look through draft proposals for ADH, ADM, ADQ etc."

Do you know who came up with the goals for your selected personal development plan in particular?
A. It would be the line manager that did my performance review.
Q. Was that John Allen at this time?
A. What is the date of this one again, please?
Q. Well, this is a running record.
A. Yeah.
Q. And this covers this period.
A. I think, yes, this would be John Allen.
Q. I see.

Were those goals selected because you were not up to date with the Building Regulations?
A. No, they were new documents that came in, or were amendments at that time.
Q. I see. So do we take from that answer that every surveyor in your position or at your level in RBKC's Building Control department would have been told as a development goal to keep up to date with the changes in the Building Regulations?
A. I believe so, but I wouldn't have direct knowledge of what their personal development plan was.
Q. If you look down at item 5, it says:
"Provide training opportunities to support CPD requirements of professional associations. RBKC commitment to provide 2 days training per year."

Did RBKC fulfil that commitment?
A. Er ...
(Pause)
There would have been a certain amount of lunchtime seminars, and so I don't know whether that would have mounted up to two days, but it was considered acceptable to read professional magazines and other information on the regulations. That was considered training as regards the two days' training.
Q. I think you told us that your associate membership of the CABE didn't have a CPD requirement. Did that mean that you didn't take advantage or weren't required to take advantage of the two days' training per year offered by RBKC to support membership?
A. No, as I say, I would read documents --
Q. Right.
A. -- and magazines, and ...
Q. Right.

Now, you say in your second statement that you
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attended seminars which you paid for yourself --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and you attended those in your own time. Did you keep any records of those?
A. Yes.
Q. Where are those records, do you know?
A. I can obtain them for you.
Q. Have you been asked for those documents before?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Right. Are they in your personal possession?
A. At home. I would check. I would think they -- I can get copies.
Q. From memory, can you tell us whether any of those seminars which you paid for yourself covered Approved Document B?
A. It may have formed part of the day. I can't recall that far back.
Q. Right.

Did any of those seminars cover things like fire performance on external wall constructions, or fire safety classification of materials to be used in external wall constructions?
A. No, not that I'm aware of.
Q. All right.

Now, if we look at your second witness statement,
please, \{RBK00050416\}, I would like you to look at page 1, paragraph 3. You do identify one of these seminars as one operated by ABE , and you say that one of the seminars was on means of escape, BS 9999, and that's
"Fire safety in the design, management and use of buildings, code of practice ".

That relates to non-residential buildings, I think, doesn't it?
A. Yes. That was after I left Kensington.
Q. Yes, and that's 11 June 2017.
A. Yeah.
Q. Why were you attending a seminar on that matter at that time?
A. It was my intention to go back into Building Control once I left the council.
Q. Right, I see. So you were keeping yourself up to date?
A. Correct.
Q. I follow.

Now, if we go back to your appraisal and personal development plan a little bit later on, this is a slightly different document, \{RBK00048753/3\}, this records -- this is under, "Targets" -- you attend a seminar by John Allen on 22 September 2015, if you look under "Mid Year Comments", second item down. Do you see that?
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A. Yes.
Q. What did that seminar cover?
A. I can't recall.
Q. Right. It says just above that:
"Attended training by LABC on (Date to be supplied by JEH )."

What did that cover? Well, did it happen, I think is the first question?
A. Sorry, I can't recall.
Q. Right. Do you remember having any training by the LABC in your time at RBKC?
A. The only thing that comes to mind is whether this -- in relation to part M, whether that was -- which I attended at Wandsworth Town Hall.
Q. Right.
A. That would -- I would think that would reflect that particular time, because, as I say, they introduced considerable amendments to the old part M.
Q. Right, and other parts as well, I think?
A. Yes.
Q. But not B?
A. Not B.
Q. Can we look at \{RBK00048852\}, please. This is your
tri -borough appraisal and personal development plan 2016 to 2017 , and if you go to page 2 \{RBK00048852/2\},
please, you can see there that under "Targets", it says that there are normally five targets, and if you look down there, you can see in the bottom right-hand corner, under "Success Criteria ", there are eight examples to be provided of professional development, and those are to be provided by February 2017. You can see that one of those was Building Control related courses. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you achieve that?

## (Pause)

A. I would have attended some in-house seminars.
Q. I see. But not outside?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. On those Building Control related courses provided in-house, did any of those specifically at that time cover Approved Document B or industry guidance?
A. I can't recall .
Q. Right.

Did you attend any technical seminars or CPD activities in the period 2011 to 2016 , in other words just before and during your involvement with Grenfell?
A. As I say, I would attend in-house seminars, as I say, read magazines. I mentioned that course that I went on relating to part M , and we did have a company come in
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and give us a presentation on -- under part P as well.
Q. Right.

Did any of the training that you got here, which is indicated by this document, cover the requirements of part B of the Building Regulations or Approved Document B?
A. I remember when regulation 38 came in we had a -- and there was other amendments at the time, and we had a seminar or in-house training at the time. I think that was about 2010, actually, when that came in. And we went through generally the changes in the regulations at that stage.
Q. I see. Did that or any of the seminars cover overcladding of high-rise residential buildings at all?
A. No.
Q. If we go to your second witness statement, please, at page 2 \{RBK00050416/2\}, you also refer to seminars there. If we look at paragraph 4(iii ), right at the top of the page, you say:
"Attending from time to time seminars provided by manufacturers and other organisations relating to Building Regulation matters."
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever attended seminars by -- and these are examples -- Celotex?

| Q. Right. Can you just help us a bit with your memory on that: roughly when do you think you attended a seminar given by Celotex? |
| :---: |
| A. It may have been 2005 , something like that. It was some time -- |
| Q. Right. |
| A. -- previously. |
| Q. Do you remember what the subject of the seminar was or presentation? |
| A. It was mainly to do with thermal conductivity, I believe. |
| Q. Right. |
| What about Kingspan? Did you ever attend a seminar given by Kingspan? |
| A. I can't recall. |
| Q. Right. |
| What about a company called Alcoa, later Arconic? |
| A. No. |
| Q. Siderise? |
| A. No. |
| Q. When Celotex gave the seminar or presentation that |
| you've referred to, did they come direct into |
| the council offices? |
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A. They were lunchtime seminars that were set up by one of the managers who was responsible for doing that, and what would happen was they would invite architects and surveyors in, and it would be -- lunch would be given, sandwich sort of buffet, and then it would be a presentation between an hour and an hour and a half just going through generally the product.
Q. Was it common for manufacturers of building products to come to RBKC's Building Control department and make seminars or presentations about their product?
A. There would be a number of in-house seminars. For further details on that, we had what was known as the RBKC Building Control News, and it would list out -- it was a newsletter, and that would list forthcoming lunchtime seminars.
Q. Right.
A. I don't know who that was sent to. It was printed out, and I don't know whether it was emailed. Somebody else was responsible for that.
Q. Over what years do you remember receiving RBKC News?
A. From when it started. I believe it was some years -- it would be about 2000, something like that.
Q. Right.
A. It was a newsletter, I believe, produced by Paul Hanson, and it would be -- as I say, it would be what was going
on as regards Building Control. It would sometimes give a profile of a surveyor, it would sometimes give guidance on certain aspects of the Building Regulations for architects and surveyors.
Q. How frequently did it come out?
A. I'm not certain. As I say, I looked at this information prior to coming here, and there would be -- there was a number of them. It would go generally spring.
I don't know whether there was other editions.
Q. Right.

You say it was produced by Paul Hanson; did
RBKC News or the editions that you saw have a particular emphasis on fire safety?
A. It would call up fire safety in relation to sometimes domestic properties. I believe there was some advice on fire curtains. It would sometimes give a profile of, as I say, the surveyors, and it would sometimes give a -I'm trying to think of the correct words, sorry. it would give, like, a page case study of a particular project.
Q. Looking a little bit further down this page in front of us, (iv) you say:
"Reading technical literature and other information relating to products/systems."

Did that include Celotex RS5000 insulation board,
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for example?
A. Yes. When I was dealing with the project, I looked that information up.
Q. Right. Well, we'll come back to that in a little bit more detail later on.

Did it include product literature produced by
Kingspan in respect of K15 Kooltherm insulation?
A. I may have looked at that at another time in relation to U-values.
Q. I see. What about TP10?
A. Again, it would have been -- if I had -- it wasn't at the time of Grenfell, it would have been prior, if I was looking for a U -value requirement in relation to an extension.
Q. What about Reynobond ACM rainscreen panels, particularly PE rainscreen panels produced by Arconic?
A. I looked at the BBA certificate for Reynobond at the time of -- I believe I did, at the time of -- when I was dealing with the Grenfell Tower project.
Q. You did, did you?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. Well, we'll certainly come back to that later on.

Did you ever read product literature relating to Siderise rainscreen cavity barriers, do you think?
A. Yes.
Q. Again, was that at the time of the Grenfell project?
A. Yes.
Q. I see.
Now, you say in (vii) on the same page:
"Contacting technical departments of manufacturers
and product providers when I needed advice on such
matters."
Did you do that at any time in respect of any
product used on the Grenfell Tower?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. I see.
Just going back to the practices within RBKC for
a moment, was there any system or practice within RBKC
where if someone else other than you went to a seminar
or a conference, they would share what they learnt with
the rest of the team?
A. Sometimes. It wasn't consistent.
Q. No, I understand. The reason I ask is that José Anon,
if that's how you pronounce his name --
A. Yes.
Q. -- who was the deputy Building Control manager under
John Allen, says at paragraph 13 that that would happen,
but you I think recall that, do you, happening from time to time?
A. I know when I went on the part M one I actually gave a presentation, I think to the office, on that, to actually the planners as well.
Q. I follow.
A. We used to have -- every so often, I think it was once a month, we'd have a Planning/Building Control meeting, and I actually -- I do recall giving a presentation on what I'd learnt at that seminar to planners and my colleagues.
Q. Very well. I just need to read a reference in. The reference to Mr Anon's statement is \{RBK00029897/3\}, and the reference is to paragraph 13.
I don't need to show you that, but building on your last answer, can I show you a document: \{RBK00001221\}, please. This is a set of minutes of the London District Surveyors Association general meeting on 15 October 2015, Mr Hoban, at the time of 10 o'clock. You can see who was there and the councils they represented.
A. Yeah.
Q. And you can see that Kensington and Chelsea was represented by José Anon.
If you go to page 4 \{RBK00001221/4\}, you can see that there, at the very end of the large box, just above paragraph 11, "LABC":
" PC has a large office building (nine storeys) that has PIR cladding as opposed to rockwool insulation over 18 metres high (BCA Technical Guide 18). At the LABC conference last year there was a presentation on this subject and the cladding has to be of limited combustibility, but Kingspan confirmed that their PIR insulation does burn. PC attended a recent LFB seminar and advised that their smoke control guide and suppression system guide are due soon. In addition 9999 and 9991 revisions are due next year."

Now, you weren't there. My question is: did anybody at RBKC attend the LABC conference in 2014, in other words the year before this one --
A. No, it would only be managers that would go to those.
Q. Right. Do you remember whether anybody, like a manager, went to the LABC conference in 2014?
A. I wouldn't know.
Q. Did anybody come back from that conference or was there any word in the office about what had been learnt at that conference about the cladding having to be of limited combustibility?
A. No, I don't recall that.
Q. Did Mr Anon share the information from this 2015 London District Surveyors general meeting with you?
A. I don't recall ever seeing that.
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Q. All right.

Can I then turn to a different topic, which is regulations and guidance.

Now, in general terms, Mr Hoban, would I be right in thinking that, as a building surveyor with some 35 years of experience or so, you were familiar with the requirements of schedule 1, part B to the Building Regulations 2010?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you also be familiar with the guidance in Approved Document B?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you deal with part B of the Building Regulations and Approved Document B regularly as part of your role as a surveyor within the $B C O$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. What about parts B3 and B4 specifically ?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's just examine ADB in a little bit more detail, and I want to focus on external fire spread, if I may.
A. Yeah.
Q. Can I ask you to go to \{CLG00000173/95\}, please, which is ADB. 95 is section 12, "Construction of external walls", and if we look at the bottom right-hand corner, we can see, "External wall construction", and underneath
that, paragraph 12.5.
A. Yes.
Q. Were you familiar with that part of ADB, that section?
A. Yes.
Q. So the rule or the guidance:
"The external envelope of a building should not provide a medium for fire spread if it is likely to be a risk to health or safety."

That was something you knew well, did you?
A. Yes.
Q. Then it says in the next paragraph -- well, I should read it all:
"The use of combustible materials in the cladding system and extensive cavities may present such a risk in tall buildings.
"External walls should either meet the guidance given in paragraphs 12.6 to 12.9 or meet the performance criteria given in the BRE Report ... (BR 135) for cladding systems using full scale test data from BS 8414-1:2002 or BS 8414-2:2005."

Did you understand from this, at the time of the Grenfell Tower project and your involvement in it, that ADB contained essentially two potential routes to compliance with the functional requirement of part B4 of the Building Regulations?
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A. It gave you four options, as far -- you could use the Approved Document B, you could do a desktop study, you could offer a fire engineering solution, or you could use BR 135.
Q. Which of those routes to compliance was followed on Grenfell Tower?
A. At the time, I thought it was AD -- Approved Document B.
Q. What do you mean by that in detail? Could you just explain?
A. That the actual panels themselves were class 0 , that the insulation was suitable for use on buildings of that height, and that cavity barriers would be provided in the appropriate location.
Q. When you say that the insulation was suitable for use on buildings of that height, what do you mean by that?
A. Well, the information that I looked up on the LABC website said that the Celotex RS5000 was suitable for use on buildings of that height.
Q. Was there any suggestion -- we'll come back to that later on -- that the applicant for Building Control approval on Grenfell Tower was relying on BR 135 and the test criteria under 8414 to demonstrate compliance?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Right. So do I take it from that answer and the previous answer that, when it came to the insulation,
you thought that the materials being used were of limited combustibility?
A. No. In fairness, I should have asked for a -- I realise now that I should have asked for a full report. But at the time, the information that I looked up on -- as regards the Celotex, it was suitable for use on that -or for a building of that height.
Q. Right. Well, we'll come back to that, but I just want to get your answer clear at this stage.

Did you think that the Celotex RS5000 complied because it was of limited combustibility, or complied because it had passed an 8414 test in accordance with BR 135?
A. I considered it okay by reading the information on the LABC website.
Q. I'm sorry, that's not quite an answer to my question.
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you think that the Celotex complied because it was a material of limited combustibility --
A. No.
Q. -- or because it had passed a BS 8414 test in accordance with BR 135 ?
A. 8414.
Q. Yes. I see. So when you answered my question a moment ago whether the applicant for Building Control was
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relying on BR 135 and 8414, I think you said no. Is that right or is it wrong?
A. Sorry, I'm -- could you repeat that again, please?
Q. Yes. You said, I think, in answer to an earlier
question whether there was a suggestion that the
applicant for Building Control approval on
Grenfell Tower was relying on BR 135 and an 8414 test --
A. Yes.
Q. So what is your evidence?
A. That they were relying on the material as a BS 8414-meeting the criteria for that and suitable for use on buildings over 18 metres.
Q. Right. So that was the route to compliance?
A. Yeah.
Q. Not, as you put it earlier, ADB ?
A. Yes, sorry. Yes. The --
Q. I see.

Can we then move on a little bit, staying on this page, to the question of external surfaces. This is regulated by section 12.6 , and it says:
"The external surfaces of walls should meet the provisions in Diagram 40."

We don't need the rest of that.
A. Yes. Yeah.
Q. If we go to diagram 40, it's at page 97
\{CLG00000173/97\}, and can we just look together at it slowly. Here it is. If you look at e -- it's divided up into five, a, b, c, d ande, ande is in the middle, and it says "Any building".
A. Yes.
Q. We can see the requirement for a building that is more
than 1 metre from a relevant boundary here, don't we?
A. Yes.
Q. With a part of it which is above 18 metres.
A. Yes.
Q. Did you understand there that the guidance says that, above 18 metres, the external wall surface classification should be class 0 , national class?
A. Yes.
Q. Or class B-s3, d2 or better, which is the European standard.
A. Yes.
Q. You understood that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know at the time of your involvement in Grenfell what those classifications meant?
A. Yes.
Q. What did they mean?
A. Well, a class 0 was a combination of two tests: a fire propagation test and the surface spread of flame test.
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Q. Yes. And to be clear, are you able to give us the numbers?
A. BS 476-6 and BS 476-7.
Q. Yes.
A. Then from that they would give a standard, whether it met that.
Q. Right. Those are the tests .
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware of the different ways in which national class 0 could be achieved?
A. Only through what I've just said.
Q. Right. The reason I ask is because there is some further guidance in appendix A, and I just ask you to look at that. It's page 120 of Approved Document B \{CLG00000173/120\}, and I just want to look with you at appendix A.
A. Ah, yeah.
Q. If you look at paragraph 5, you can see where the relevant tests are set out, and then the European tests as well.
A. Mm .
Q. Do you also recall that there is a paragraph in Approved

Document B which deals with linings?
A. Yes, there is .
Q. And were you aware that class 0 could be achieved if the
material was of limited combustibility throughout?
A. Yeah. Yes, yes.
Q. Right, okay. Perhaps we don't need to find it .

If we go back to paragraph 12.6, this is back to pages 95 and 96 \{CLG00000173/95\}, we can see that there is a reference there to external surfaces of walls. Did you have a view at the time of what "external surfaces of walls" meant?

## (Pause)

A. The actual surface itself .
Q. And at the time of the Grenfell Tower refurbishment, did you understand that that requirement under paragraph 12.6 applied to the rainscreen, the panels?
A. To the external surface.
Q. When you say "the external surface", do you mean to the panels or to the external surface of the panels?
A. The external surface of the panels.
Q. Thank you.

If we go on, please, to section 12.7 on page 96 \{CLG00000173/96\}, please, this deals with insulation materials/products, and it says:
"In a building with a storey 18 m or more above ground level any insulation product, filler material (not including gaskets, sealants and similar) etc. used in the external wall construction should be of limited
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combustibility (see Appendix A). This restriction does not apply to masonry cavity wall construction which complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9."

At the time of Grenfell Tower and your involvement in it, what did you understand the phrase "limited combustibility" to mean?
A. That would be in accordance with the test. I think it's ... it's either BS 476-4 or BS 476-11. One is for non-combustibility and the other one is for limited combustibility.
Q. At the time of your work on Grenfell Tower, how did you understand that provision, 12.7, to apply to a rainscreen cladding system?
A. Well, the insulation would ... well, the insulation should be of limited combustibility. As I referred previously, I -- it said that it was suitable for use on buildings over that height because it passed the other test.
Q. What, the 8414 test?
A. Yes.
Q. As I say, we'll come back to that.

You just mentioned insulation. Can I just ask you whether you agree that paragraph 12.7 also applies to products with an insulating core, such as window infill panels, for example?

## (Pause)

A. Yes.
Q. What about insulating materials which are packed behind window surrounds, would that be covered by 12.7?
A. Sorry, could you repeat the question?
Q. Yes.

Did you think at the time of your involvement in the Grenfell Tower project that insulating materials which are used to pack window surrounds or used behind window surrounds --
A. Inside or outside?
Q. Well, that's a good question. But window surrounds --
A. Yeah, round the outside.
Q. -- forming part of a rainscreen cladding system.
A. It would have to comply with that.
Q. What about insulating materials packed into cavities which are created by the overcladding system or scheme? A. Yes.
Q. At the time of the refurbishment, did you have any views or thoughts about the relationship between the requirements of paragraph 12.7 and a composite panel, an ACM composite panel with a PE core?
A. It's not something I considered at the time.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Sorry, it was something you considered or it was not something you considered?
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A. Not. As I say, I was concerned that it had the surface spread of flame, the actual -- that it was class 0. I didn't consider the material inside at the time to be a filler material. My understanding of filler material at the time was filler material to make good joints and to round the -- as I say, to finish off the insulation, as it were.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
MR MILLETT: Was it your understanding at the time of your involvement in the Grenfell Tower refurbishment that, when a building has a storey with a floor level over 18 metres in height, paragraph 12.7, as we can see here, applies to the whole of the external wall construction and not only to those parts above 18 metres?
A. Yes, in that -- in this particular case, yes.
Q. Finally on this topic, I want to look very briefly, if we can, at what is said in ADB about cavity barriers .
A. Yes.
Q. All right? Can we look at page 96 \{CLG00000173/96\}, paragraph 12.8 , under the heading "Cavity barriers", just below where we were looking, and it says:
"Cavity barriers should be provided in accordance with Section 9."

We're going to come on to look at this later on in your evidence, but at this point I just want to ask you:
did you understand at the time that cavity barriers were required in the cladding?
A. Yes.
Q. And just breaking that up a bit, first of all, at the line of the compartment floors and walls?
A. Yes.
Q. And what about around openings, such as windows?
A. Yes.
Q. What about at the junction of the top of the cladding and the crown of the building; did you think --
A. I didn't -- at the top, yes. I didn't consider we had control of the crown, because it wasn't a concealed space.
Q. You say, "I didn't consider we had control of the crown ..."
A. Yes.
Q. "... because it wasn't a concealed space."

I'm not sure I follow that. Are you saying the crown was outside your remit as a Building Control officer?
A. My understanding of the regulations was that cavity barriers were for concealed spaces.
Q. Right. That I think I do understand, but I think the answer to my question is that the crown itself wasn't outside your remit as a Building Control officer ; you
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were still required, were you not, to assess whether or not --
A. Oh, yes, yes, I did assess it, sorry.
Q. Fine.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But I think the point you were making, if I have understood you correctly, was that there was no concealed space in the crown that would require a cavity barrier within the crown; is that the point?
A. Yes, yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
MR MILLETT: Mr Anon in his statement -- and this is \{RBK00029897/3\}, paragraph 12 -- says that RBKC Building Control was generally informed of any changes and updates to the Building Regulations and guidance by the LABC. Is that correct?
A. Yes, as far as I can recall.
Q. Do you recall having access to a provider called IHS?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware that technical and other information concerning the Building Regulations was available online via IHS?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you access information such as that yourself?
A. From time to time, yes.
Q. When did you do so? What would prompt you to do so?
A. If I wanted to look up a product sometimes --
Q. I see.
A. -- I would do that.
Q. Do you remember whether you did so for the specific purposes of the Grenfell Tower refurbishment?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Did the information which came through the IHS website include any information on fire safety?
A. We would look -- or I would use it when I was looking up products or particular information. I don't think we actually got, as it were, bulletins, for want of a better word.
Q. Right.

Do you recall using the IHS information source to look up information on fire safety generally or specifically in relation to any query you had on the Grenfell Tower project?
A. Not that I can recall.

MR MILLETT: Right.
Mr Chairman, we're going to move to a slightly different topic -- not a hugely different topic, but nonetheless a different one -- which I won't finish before a natural break. It might be convenient to take a break now.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. Shall we say 11.35 to give
Mr Hoban time to get back to the room and have a break?
MR MILLETT: Yes.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.
Mr Hoban, we're going to take a break at this point.
I hope you have been holding up all right so far.
THE WITNESS: Yes, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We will stop now and come back at 11.35.

Please, while you're out of the room, don't talk to anyone about your evidence or anything relating to it.
All right?
THE WITNESS: Right.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: If you go with the usher, she' ll
look after you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
(Pause)
Right, Mr Millett, 11.35.
MR MILLETT: Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
(11.17 am)
(A short break)
(11.35 am)

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, Mr Hoban, ready to carry on?

## THE WITNESS: Yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you.
Yes, Mr Millett.
MR MILLETT: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
Mr Hoban, right at the start of your evidence you referred to your police witness statement and a comma.
A. Yes.
Q. I have been helpfully taken by your legal representative to this comma at $\{\mathrm{HOBOO000219/12} \mathrm{\}}$. I just want to clear that out of the way before we go back to your substantive evidence.

If you look at the second paragraph break, you will see a third paragraph which starts:
"My role did not involve ..."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Then there is a second sentence which says:
"In relation to the fire safety, risk assessment and management of the building, I had no involvement in that."

Can you help us, which is the comma you --
A. It's the comma an after "safety".
Q. "Fire safety"?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you want the comma there or not there?
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A. Removed, please.
Q. Right. So that should read, "In relation to the fire safety risk assessment ..."
A. Yes.
Q. "... and management of the building ..."

Is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you very much.

Can I then go back to your evidence on technical matters. I want to turn to the question of what you knew about industry guidance, please.

Were you familiar with the detail of BR 135 at the time of your involvement in the Grenfell Tower refurbishment?
A. I was aware of the document, but I hadn't read it substantially .
Q. Right. You hadn't read it substantially .

Is BR 135 something that you would normally be required to refer to regularly as part of your role or not?
A. No.
Q. Not?
A. That was the first time I'd come across it.
Q. You say that was the first time; when was the first time you came across it?
A. Sorry. I was aware of it being in the regulations.
Q. Right. Is that because it's referred to in --
A. In the approved document.
Q. Which we looked at before.
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.
A. What it is, there's -- in various approved documents it refers to various British Standards in relation to all -- many aspects of the regulations.
Q. Right. Have you or had you ever read it at all?
A. No.
Q. Right.
A. I was aware of the document, but I hadn't --
Q. Right. Well, let's see how we go with this. Maybe we can take this a little bit more quickly, then.

Can I show you the document. It is \{BRE00005554\}, please. This is the second edition, published in 2003. There was a third edition published in 2013, Mr Hoban. This is the first page of it. If we can go to page 7 \{BRE00005554/7\}, please, there is a reference to a building, Garnock Court, Irvine, under figure 1, and this publication followed the fire in that building in the summer of 1999.

Were you aware that there had been a tower block fire in Scotland in 1999 which had given rise to the
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production of BR 135 ?
A. I may have --
Q. At least the second edition.
A. Well, I may have seen it in the news on television.
Q. Right. I see.

Can we go to page 9 \{BRE00005554/9\}, please, where the document explains the mechanism of rapid fire spread up a building, and it explains it both in text and with a picture.
A. Yes.
Q. Were you familiar, perhaps from other reading, with this picture or diagram and what it's showing?
A. No, not at the time.
Q. Did you understand at the time the general proposition that cladding systems can create the opportunity for rapid unseen flame spread, causing an unacceptable risk to the occupants?
A. I may have been -- or I would have been aware of it, but not -- it wasn't in the forefront of my thoughts.
Q. Right.

Did you know that there were principles such as these which warned that external cladding systems offer a potential route for fire spread through multistorey buildings, and that close attention should be paid to the installation cavity barriers, which would inhibit
the spread of flame?
A. Yes.
Q. And specifically do so in the event of a fire involving an external cladding system?
A. Yes.
Q. You did.

Were you aware -- and we can take this from page 10 \{BRE00005554/10\}, paragraph 3, under the heading "Cavities" -- of the general principle shown by figure 4, that if flames become confined or restricted by entering cavities within the external cladding system, they can become elongated as they seek oxygen and fuel to support the combustion process?
A. I was -- sorry, could you repeat the question?
Q. Well, I can do it by reference to the text, actually, in the middle of the page. Under "Cavities ", the bullet point there, which is under the heading "Interaction with the external envelope", in the third line it says:
"If flames become confined or restricted by entering cavities within the external cladding system, they will become elongated as they seek oxygen and fuel to support the combustion process. This process can lead to flame extension of five to ten times that of the original flame lengths [and this is in bold] regardless of the materials used to line the cavities. This may enable
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fire to spread rapidly, unseen, through the external cladding system, if appropriate fire barriers have not been provided."

And there is a reference to figure 4.
A. Yes.
Q. You knew the principle, even if you didn't know the text?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. You did?
A. Yes.
Q. Right.

Then in the same vein, same page, under paragraph 5, it refers to the fire service intervention, and it says: "Where the external cladding system is not significantly contributing to the spread of fire from one storey to the (sic), then intervention by emergency services should prevent continued fire propagation by way of the building envelope. However, [and this is the important bit] where the external cladding system is contributing to the fire propagation rate, the potential exists for the fire to affect multiple storeys simultaneously, thus making firefighting more difficult ."

Again, although you didn't read the text of this at the time, were you aware of that as a general principle?
A. By seeing fires on the news, yes.
Q. By seeing fires on the news?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you help me with that, when did you first see fires on the news that you're --
A. Well, one that comes to mind was the Dubai fire .
Q. You say the Dubai fire ; in fact, there were two fires in 2015. Were you aware of earlier cladding fires on high-rise buildings?
A. Yes.
Q. There were some in the UAE in 2012 to 2013. Were you aware of those, do you think, at the time?
A. If they'd been on the news, yes.
Q. They'd been on the news. Did you see those?
A. I couldn't say. I would expect myself to have seen those in the news.
Q. Okay. We will come back to some specific examples later on in your evidence, but I' ll note the answer for this purpose.

Can we just move on to page 17 \{BRE00005554/17\} of this document, please, and I just want to look with you at this section which says "System-specific details : ventilated cavities ". In the third paragraph down there it says:
"Once the fire is within the cavity, it may
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propagate unseen through the system if adequate fire barriers are not employed. This may result in significant risk of system collapse or fire break out at significant distances from the fire origin."

Now, again, were you aware of that as a general principle, even if not the specifics of --
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Then under the heading, same page, of "Performance of materials in fire ", "Insulation", it says:
"The performance of insulating material when subjected to this type of fire scenario has been outlined in the previous section. Typically, non-combustible materials are used in these systems as it is difficult to prevent fire entering the cavity and spreading through the insulating material."

Again, same question, Mr Hoban: were you aware of that as a general principle, if not the text?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Then at the bottom of page 17, under the heading "External panel", it says:
"Materials used for external panels used can vary from non-combustible through to combustible."

Then there is a first bullet point:
"Non-combustible materials and materials of limited combustibility [and that's a heading] (as defined in

Tables A6 and A7 of Approved Document B). Typically cementitious-based products through to natural products such as stone veneers and coated metal panels."

Then if you look at the next page \{BRE00005554/18\} in the last two sentences, it says:
"Metal panels such as aluminium may fall from the system if the strength of the fixings is affected by the local fire source. They may also melt, generating molten metal debris if exposed directly to the sustained flame envelope."

Again, were you familiar with that as a principle, if not the text of this particular guidance document?
A. Not at the time.
Q. Right.

That's the 2003 edition. As I said before, there was an edition published in 2013, and that's at \{CELO0003364\}. I just want to identify one or two further things in this document, which was a revision.

Just to be clear, I think you've said you didn't read this document before --
A. Correct.
Q. -- the Grenfell Tower project or at the time.

Can we just jump to page 11 \{CELO0003364/11\} and look at paragraph 2.1. In the third paragraph down it says that there are potentially conflicting

59
requirements. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It says:
"These potentially conflicting requirements are highlighted in the area of innovative materials and designs, which are being driven by the need to construct more energy-efficient and sustainable buildings. In order to meet these design challenges, the range of new and innovative materials and designs of systems being offered as potential solutions has also increased the volumes of potentially combustible materials being used in external cladding applications."

So is that something -- I know you weren't aware of the text at the time, but is that a principle or view or understanding that you were aware of?
A. It's not something I considered at the time.
Q. Right.

Then looking at page 13 \{CELO0003364/13\}, if we can, this is in the context of external cladding systems offering a route for fire spread through multistorey buildings and the need for cavity barriers, similarly to what we saw in the 2003 edition. At paragraph 3.3.2 on that page it says this:
"Cavities.
"Cavities may be incorporated within an external
cladding system, or may be formed by the delamination or differential movement of the system in a fire. If flames become confined or restricted by entering cavities within the external cladding system, they will become elongated as they seek oxygen and fuel to support the combustion process."

Then it says the same thing as the 2003 edition.
So, again, were you aware of that principle at this time -- this is 2013 -- still being very much a live principle?
A. Could you go through that again, sorry?
Q. Yes, of course.
A. Right.
Q. It's about cavity barriers.
A. Yes. I was aware that cavity barriers needed to be provided.
Q. Yes, and that the reason they did so is because if flames become confined or restricted by entering into cavities in the external cladding system, they' ll become elongated as they seek oxygen and fuel to support the combustion process? That's why they're important.
A. Yes, I'm aware of that.
Q. Yes.

If you go straight on to page 22 \{CEL00003364/22\}, let's look at paragraph 6.4 -- actually, sorry can we 61
just move back, page 19 \{CEL00003364/19\}, sorry. I skipped over too fast.

At page 19 there is a paragraph I just want to look at with you. This is under the heading of "6.3 System-specific details : rendered systems", and then on the right-hand side of the page, under 6.3.2, "Fire barriers", it says:
"If fire enters a void in the system, whether that void is created by a fire or is part of an existing design, and the insulation is exposed to the fire source, any combustible material present may become involved, and there is potential for the fire to propagate throughout the system if adequate fire barriers are not installed. Since a cavity is likely to be present behind the insulation boards in LFS, it is important that this potential is recognised, and adequate fire-stopping is provided, using fire barriers or fire-stopping details to maintain the system's stability in the case of fire ."

Is that something that you were alive to?
A. As I say, with cavity barriers, yes.
Q. Yes, and then if we turn to page 20 \{CELO0003364/20\} at paragraph 6.3.4 -- I think, in fact, I don't need that. I' ll just go straight to page 22 \{CELO0003364/22\}, paragraph 6.4, probably quicker, "Ventilated cavity
systems", and in the second paragraph there it says:
" If the fire is able to enter the cavity, it may propagate unseen through the system if adequate fire barriers are not employed. This may result in significant risk of system collapse, or in the fire breaking out at significant distances from its origin."

Again, was that something you were aware of at the time of --
A. As regards cavity barriers breaking up, yes.
Q. Yes.

It goes on at the bottom of that subparagraph to say:
"In order to counter the possibility of rapid fire spread and potential system collapse, the design and selection of materials used to construct these systems should address these issues, including the provision of fire barriers."

Again, you took it from that, did you --
A. Yes, fire barriers, yes.
Q. There are a number of other parts of this which say very much the same thing, but if we can look at 6.4.1,
"Performance of materials in fire ", "Insulation ":
"As it can be difficult to prevent fire entering the cavity and spreading in these systems, the selection of the insulation materials used and the design of the fire
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barriers to close these cavities are particularly important."

Same question again, Mr Hoban: even though you didn't read this text at the time, were you aware that that was a generally applicable principle?
A. Yeah, yeah. Yes.
Q. Then if we look at 6.4.1, lower down, over the column to the last paragraph just above 6.4.2, it says, do you see:
"Combustible panels are typically based on vinyl or glass-reinforced plastic, although various new products are being developed in this area, some of which also contain insulation materials. These products generally have good surface spread of flame characteristics to prevent rapid fire spread across the surface of the system, but once the panels become involved in the fire, they have the potential to generate falling debris, add to the overall fire load, and provide a route for fire to propagate up the outside of the building."

That's an important paragraph for our purposes.
Was that a principle that you understood and were aware of at the time?
A. Not at the time.
Q. Right.

Do you agree that, had you read this document --
which, just to be clear, is a 2013 edition -- you would have understood that cladding systems can create the opportunity for rapid unseen fire spread, causing an unacceptable risk of fire to the occupants?
A. Yes.
Q. And that an external cladding system offered a potential route for fire spread through multistorey buildings, and that close attention should be paid to the installation of cavity barriers to inhibit the spread of flame?
A. Yes.
Q. And particularly in the event of a fire involving the external cladding system itself?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes. That meant that you would have understood that particular attention should be paid to the selection of insulation materials?
A. Insulation material -- the actual insulation material itself, yes.
Q. Yes.

Can I now turn then to a different document or different subject, which is the BCA guidance.

Are you familiar with the Building Control Alliance as a body?
A. I was aware of it.
Q. Right.
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Now, were you aware that the Building Control Alliance, or BCA, issued guidance documents for the construction industry?
A. No, at the time I wasn't.
Q. You weren't aware?
A. No.
Q. Right. Even though it's an alliance or association
directly designed to assist and support
Building Control?
A. I read about it in relation to -- I mentioned the performance standards. It brings up a number of bodies on that. But my principal reference bodies were the LHBC and the government body.
Q. Now, we've got you down here as saying LHBC. Do you mean --
A. LABC.
Q. Because there's the NHBC as well, National House-Building Council, and you're not referring to that, are you?
A. No, no, no.
Q. So, to be clear, LABC?
A. Yeah, Local Authority Building Control.
Q. Right, okay.

Can we look, then -- and this might not take long if you're not familiar with it -- at a guidance note
produced by the BCA, Technical Guidance Note 18. This is at \{CEP00057294\}, please. This is, as I say, BCA
Technical Guidance Note 18, and it's issue 0, June 2014,
"Use of Combustible Cladding Materials on Residential Buildings ".

Have you ever seen this document before?
A. I have since the fire.
Q. Right, but not before?
A. Not before the fire.
Q. Right.

Did you know about its existence before the fire --
A. No.
Q. -- even though you -- no?
A. No.
Q. Right.

Did you know at all that the BCA published technical guidance notes for the benefit of its members in the construction industry to promote --
A. No.
Q. You did not?
A. Not at the time.
Q. Can I then just take you into the chunk of this first page which deals with key issues, and I just want to show you the last paragraph:
"A Surface Spread of Flame Classification does not
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infer any resistance to combustibility, it is solely a measure of the spread of a flame across the surface."

Did you understand that at the time?
A. What, class 0 was to do -- across the surface? Yes.
Q. Yes.

If you go on to the first bullet point under there, 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."

Were you aware of that as a general principle or --
A. No.
Q. -- guidance? You weren't, right .

Were you aware in particular that thermosetting insulants like PIR don't meet or didn't meet the limited combustibility requirements of ADB2?
A. At the time, no.
Q. You weren't, right.

Can we go, then, to the June 2015 version of this document, which is \{CELOO002347\}. This is issue 1.

Do I take it from your earlier answers that you
weren't familiar with this document at the time of Grenfell either?
A. No.
Q. Right.

Can I then turn to CWCT. Have you ever heard of the
Centre for Windows and Cladding Technology, Mr Hoban?
A. Since the fire, yes.
Q. You had never heard of it before the fire?
A. No.
Q. I suppose it would follow that you therefore weren't aware that the CWCT also produced technical guidance relevant to the fire performance of curtain walls and rainscreen systems?
A. No, I wasn't aware.
Q. Right.

Did you ever refer to any CWCT guidance work at all in your work on Grenfell?
A. No, I never used it at all on any --
Q. Right.
A. -- building.
Q. Were you not aware that the CWCT standard was
specifically provided for in the NBS specification for Grenfell Tower?
A. I don't believe I actually saw that document.
Q. Really?
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Can we then turn to your second statement, please. If you go to that second statement and look at page 19 \{RBK00050416/19\}, we go to paragraph 48, and this is under the heading "Inspections". You say there:
"I am not aware of any formal written policy by RBKC on the subject, however, I am aware that the Building Control Performance Standards July 2014 produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government states that 'the scope and frequency of inspections should be determined, and incorporated in a formal written plan ${ }^{\prime \prime}$

Just for completeness, you say:
"I decided that I would endeavour to conduct site visits once a month. I made this decision based on the scope of the project."

I want to talk a little bit with you about the standards, if we can.

Those standards, I think, were first published in 2006, weren't they?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And then they were revised in July 2014; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. When they were revised in July 2014, do you remember being alerted to that revision?
A. Not from works. I don't believe -- when it first came
A. Yeah, we had a --
Q. Right.
A. And there was -- Mr Jackson produced a document as a -subsequently upon those -- that document being produced.
Q. Just so I'm clear, you say Mr Jackson produced a document?
A. Yes.
Q. That's in 2006, is it --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- when those standards were first promulgated?
A. Yes.
Q. What about in 2014 when they were revised?
A. I don't recall seeing any revised document in the office at that time.
Q. I see. Did you know that there had been a revision?
A. Yes.
Q. But you didn't look at it?
A. I did look at it, yes.
Q. You did look at it?
A. Yes.
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Q. In 2014?
A. Yes.
Q. I see.

In carrying out your role as Building Control officer on the Grenfell Tower project, did you have in mind the standards set out in the Building Control Performance Standards as revised in July 2014?
(Pause)
A. I think generally they were the same. As I say, I -- we had detailed discussions and we had -- as I say, there was a document. I was aware, as I say, of the 2014 amendment. I can't say how much detail I went into, but I was aware of the documents.
Q. Yes, I follow.

Well, let's be a little more specific. Can we look at the 2014 standards themselves now. They are at \{CLG10006814\}. That's the first page, and you can see the date at the bottom, July 2014, published by the Building Control Performance Standards Advisory Group, part of the DCLG at the time.

If you go to page 4 \{CLG10006814/4\}, internal page 2 of this document, you can see the introduction there, and in the penultimate paragraph on that page it says in the last sentence:
"The Standards and supporting guidance establish the

```
level of performance considered as a minimum in carrying out those tasks so that a Building Control Body's duties and responsibilities under the legislation are adequately discharged."
So did you understand that this document was essentially setting out the minimum standard for Building Control officers to discharge their statutory functions?
A. It's not something that strikes me immediately, but obviously it says it there.
Q. Right. Can we go on to page 11 \{CLG10006814/11\}, then. This is standard 3, "Consultation", and the standard is there in the green box:
"Building Control Bodies shall undertake all statutory consultations in a timely manner and the observations of consultees should be communicated in writing to clients. It shall also consider the benefit of undertaking additional consultation. It shall where appropriate co-operate in an integrated approach to consents relevant to development control."
Just breaking that down a bit if we can, statutory consultation, did that include consultation with, for example, the fire authority, in this case LFEPA?
A. Correct.
Q. It says "an integrated approach to consents relevant to 73
development control"; would that be planning permission or the planning department?
A. Sorry ...
Q. It's the last part of the third sentence, I'm so sorry, in the green box:
"It shall where appropriate co-operate in an integrated approach to consents relevant to development control."
Would that be planning permission?
A. Yes, it would --
Q. Right.
A. Although it doesn't say "planning development control".
Q. No, it says "development control".
A. Control.
Q. I know you perhaps weren't familiar with this specific document in its revised form.
Let me try it this way: in your experience as it stood in the years from 2013 onwards, would the planning department provide information to Building Control about a development?
A. Only if they had a specific question on a matter.
Q. Right. What about in circumstances where an application was made to the planning department for approval of a material to be used on the outside of a high-rise building?
```

A. No.
Q. That wouldn't come to the Building Control department?
A. No, no, it wouldn't.
Q. So does that mean that there wasn't an integrated approach to consents relevant to development control?
A. Yes.
Q. Right.

To be specific about this, as we know from the record in relation to the Grenfell Tower refurbishment, if the planning department at RBKC had been told that ACM panels were to be used on Grenfell Tower as a high-rise residential building, would that be the sort of information that should be shared back with Building Control by the planning department?
A. I would say that's a matter for the planners to decide, whether it's their policy to do that.
Q. But in your position as a Building Control officer --
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. -- in respect of a development or refurbishment over which you had Building Control responsibility --
A. Yes.
Q. -- would you expect RBKC's planning department to alert you to any design or planning matters, such as the application of ACM on the exterior of a high-rise building, that would be something which would fall
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within Building Control's remit, so that you could have an integrated approach?
A. It would, yes, it would.
Q. It would. You would expect it to be shared with you, would you?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we look on, then, to standard 5, which is on page 13 \{CLG10006814/13\}. We can see there -- again in the green box, which is where we see these standards, and this is under the heading "Assessment of plans". If you just look at the green box itself --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and just read what's in there. Just take a moment to do that. I just want to ask you to look at the guidance underneath it.

If you look at the first paragraph under the guidance, sitting under the green box, it says:
"The purpose of plan assessment and design appraisal is to assist the process of achieving compliance of building work with the Building Regulations. Accordingly contraventions of Building Regulations identified in drawings should be communicated in writing to the designer. A written opinion should be issued on all proposals submitted for assessment."
A. Yes.
Q. Would that be, in your understanding, a formal opinion, or would advice by email suffice in order to comply with the standard?
A. Could be either .
Q. Looking down at the fourth paragraph, it says:
"If plans are passed, or approved subject to conditions, a schedule written in clear and unambiguous terms outlining the necessary modifications and/or of the further plans or information required to demonstrate compliance should be issued to the client."

So does that mean that a record of the conditions should be made and kept?
A. Yes.
Q. The guidance also says that records of the plan assessment process should be kept. Is that not just a record of the formal decision, but a record of the Building Control officer's review of the plans themselves?

## (Pause)

A. What -- yes, yes, yes.
Q. In terms of record-keeping at RBKC, we know there was a computer system called Acolaid.
A. Yes.
Q. How in general terms was that used for managing full plans applications at the time of the Grenfell Tower
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project, and specifically 2012 to 2014 in this case?
A. When an application came in, it was assessed by a manager, whether it was a valid application or not, and then it was sent to the business support group to put on the system, and then a file would be produced and then it would come to the surveyor, and then an assessment of the plans would be done. There may be discussions and meetings in the course of that particular period.
Q. I see. Would all that be done through the Acolaid system? So all these communications would be on the Acolaid system, would they?
A. That I'm not certain of.
Q. Right.

How did you decide or did the Building Control department decide what went on to Acolaid and what didn't?
A. As regards what particular things?
Q. Well, as regards specifically managing full plans applications .
(Pause)
A. Well, I know they would enter the details of the agent. That would be done by business support when the application came in. As regards what information came in, whether that was -- that would be a business support
matter.
Q. Right. I'm not quite sure that's really answered my question. Let's try it a different way.

Acolaid is an information system.
A. Yes.
Q. Who decided what should go on to it or what shouldn't go on to it?
A. That would be a manager -- well, we would, as a surveyor, put information relating to inspections. Decision notices would be processed by business support, and the actual application itself would be put on the system once it was validated by a manager.
Q. I see.

Now, can we look at your second witness statement,
please, and I want to go to paragraph 18d
\{RBK00050416/6\}. There we see:
"Did you run a building control tracker for Grenfell Tower?
"No. I used a plan check record sheet instead."
A. Yes.
Q. What kind of matters would you record on the plan check record sheet?
A. Sorry, it's been a while since I've done ...
What I looked at ... I haven't got that form in

79
front of me anymore, so it was a form that had been adopted some years previously, so you would be considering the application under the various approved documents.
Q. Right.
A. And I don't know whether it would go on about consultations or not, because, as I say, I don't have that form to hand. But as regards consultations, I would send all the proposals to the fire regulation group, and they would --
Q. Right.
A. -- consider the application.
Q. What did a plan check record sheet look like just in outline?
A. It was an A4 sheet divided into the various elements. As I say, (a) structure, (b) fire, (c) damp-proofing and contamination.
Q. Was it a record of what you looked at or was it a record of a plan that you had to look at things?
A. It would be of the actual application itself .
Q. Oh, I see.

Where did you keep the plan check record sheet generally?
A. That would be in the file .
Q. Was it kept on computer or handwritten or hard copy

| files ? | 1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| A. Handwritten. | 2 |
| Q. I see. | 3 |
| Now, the Inquiry doesn't have a copy of your plan | 4 |
| check record sheet for the Grenfell Tower refurbishment. | 5 |
| Do you remember whether it was retained on the hard copy | 6 |
| file, or what might have happened to it? | 7 |
| A. I don't know. | 8 |
| Q. Now, you have also referred in your statement to keeping | 9 |
| records in a notebook. Was that your A3 notebook? | 10 |
| A. Yes, I would have a number of these books, I would use | 11 |
| those. | 12 |
| Q. Did you ever transfer the notes in your notebook on to | 13 |
| the Acolaid system? | 14 |
| A. I did, although there are -- from what I've seen, | 15 |
| there's some notes missing, of both myself and | 16 |
| colleagues. | 17 |
| Q. Right. Can you explain why that might be? | 18 |
| A. I can't. As I say, I don't know -- I would generally | 19 |
| put the notes in either on the day or a few days later. | 20 |
| Q. Right. | 21 |
| A. Sometimes notes, if you didn't tick the box and went on | 22 |
| to another job, it may not retain them. But I certainly | 23 |
| know that I did more visits than what was reflected on | 24 |
| Acolaid. | 25 | 81

Q. Indeed, and we're going to come to that in detail later in your evidence.

When you say, from what you have seen, there's notes miss, "both myself and colleagues", does that mean that you think they're missing from the Acolaid system because you didn't put them in?
A. At the time, I thought I put all my notes in.
Q. Right.

Did you have a practice of entering your handwritten notes or the content of those notes into the Acolaid system?
A. Yes, I would, as I say, do it if I had time on that day, or sometimes I would come in at weekends to do my notes.
Q. Right. Do you remember any times when you let that practice lapse and failed to enter your notes on to the Acolaid system?
A. Not that I'm aware. As I say, there was a lot going on outside work at the time, so I don't know whether ... there could have been events where I didn't, but generally I was very good, because what I would do, I would get my book and put a line through the notes as I put them on.
Q. Right.

I think what you are telling $u s$ is that it's possible at this time that some notes on some occasions
may not have been transferred to the Acolaid file .
A. Maybe. As I say, it 's not consistent with the way that I would do work.
Q. Very well.

Did you mark up drawings or other documents on the physical file?
A. Yes. Well, what I would do, when I was reviewing a drawing, I would actually initial and date when I looked at it, and then I would highlight anything that would concern me.
Q. Right.

Let's just look at what you say in your second statement about that. It's page 8 \{RBK00050416/8\}, please, if we can look at paragraph 27. You say there at the very top of the page -- perhaps we will just look at the question you're answering at the bottom of the previous page \{RBK00050416/7\} first of all. The question is:
"Did you review the proposed design for the exterior cladding on the tower? If so, when did you do that and where is that recorded?"

Then if we go to the top of page 8 , you say:
"Yes I did. I would have recorded this either on my plan check record sheet or my physical diary or other notes kept on file ."
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I just want to ask you about the other notes kept on file . What are those?
A. If I went to -- I remember going to a meeting on -- in the first initial meeting, and I made certain notes of that meeting and kept that on file, made my own notes of things that were discussed.
Q. Right.
A. I have asked for some minutes. Unfortunately, it would appear that no minutes were done at that meeting.
Q. Why were those not transferred to the Acolaid system?
A. You couldn't -- Acolaid was for site visits, as I say.

It wasn't --
Q. It wasn't for private notes of meetings internally?
A. Yes.
Q. I follow that.

If you also look on in the statement to page 10 \{RBK00050416/10\}, you can see at paragraph 33(e) there you refer to your A3 notebook.
A. Yeah.
Q. You say, "RBKC cannot locate my notebook". Was that a number of notebooks you kept?
A. It was. As I say, it would be, as I filled in one, I would get another.
Q. Yes. I think you also had a physical diary. Was that different from your notebook or was that the notebook?
A. I had that and I obviously had my Outlook calendar, and
there was a system where we would have to put on our --
all surveyors had to put on their daily visits so that
people were aware where people were.
Q. Yes. So in total, just so that we're all clear about
where you would record things, we've got Acolaid.
A. Yes.
Q. We've got your Outlook diary.
A. Yes.
Q. We've got a physical diary.
A. Yes.
Q. I think we have also got your notebook you've referred
to.
A. Yes.
Q. A plan check record sheet and then the file itself .
Have I missed anything out?
A. Sorry, could you go over those again, please?
Q. Yes, of course. First, there is Acolaid.
A. Yes, that would --
Q. We've got your Outlook diary.
A. Outlook calendar, yes.
Q. Calendar. Then we've got your physical diary, which you
A. Coferred to a moment ago.
Q. Then there is the notebook, the A3 notebooks you have 85
referred to.
A. That -- yeah.
Q. There is the plan check record sheet, which we discussed earlier, for looking at applications, and then finally the file itself, the physical file.
A. Well, the plan check would be in the file .
Q. I follow.
A. Yeah.
Q. Other than that, were there any other places where you would record discussions or your findings or inspections?
A. No, I can't think of any other --
Q. Right.

Can we then go back to the standards we were looking at earlier on, which we'll find at -- this is the July 2014 edition -- \{CLG10006814/15\}, please. This relates to site visits, "Site inspection", as you can see, and we're going to be going through your site inspections on the Grenfell Tower project in due course in a lot of detail. But just looking at this standard, you can see that it says that standards need to be adequate and that sufficient records are kept. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. I have summarised it perhaps a little bit quickly, but
that's the effect of the green box.
If we look at page 16 \{CLG10006814/16\}, under "Inspection frequency", you can see the little mini heading there just below the bullet points, halfway down the page, it says:
"The scope and frequency of inspection should be determined, and incorporated in a formal written plan."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember whether that was done as a matter of course --
A. No.
Q. -- within the Building Control department overall?
A. I don't believe it was.
Q. It wasn't, right. Do you know why it wasn't?

## (Pause)

A. It just wasn't done that way.
Q. No, I know, but do you know why?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever raise this issue with John Jackson or John Allen or anybody else within the RBKC Building Control department?
A. No, it was just the way it was done in the office.
Q. Right.

So without a formal written plan, how would you go
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about planning the scope and frequency of inspections?
A. Generally, as I say, I decided for that particular job that I would visit every month.
Q. Right.
A. As regards other jobs, it would depend on what was going on, the standard of workmanship --
Q. Right.
A. -- and, you know, generally what the standard of the builder -- or the type of work that was going on at the time. Because, again, with basements, there would be a bigger frequency because you were looking at structural matters.
Q. You decided on once a month at the start of the project; did you review that constantly? Did you review the sufficiency of once a month constantly through the life of the project?
A. I did review it in relation to -- I got an addition -well, I got additional work when colleagues left, left the department, I actually got their areas, a couple of my colleagues. One left in -- or not left ; she went to go and work in the planning department in I think it was 2014, so the number of jobs that I was dealing with increased, so I was having to look after more jobs, and it would, as I say, depend on whether there was site supervision, what the builders were like --
Q. But --
A. Sorry.
Q. I understand that that might be an exception, but once you had fixed a frequency of visits for a particular project, am I right in thinking that, in general, you didn't go back and review that?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. You did?
A. Yes, I would, depending on what was going on.
Q. Would anybody supervise your initial assessment of the frequency of visits required for a project?
A. No.
Q. So you were just left to your own devices, were you?
A. Correct.
Q. Right.

I think it would follow, then, from what you have told us before that the next paragraph down, which says "All sites should be inspected frequently", and gives a frequency that's suggested there, that wasn't guidance adopted generally within RBKC, was it?
A. No, it wasn't.
Q. No.

Can we then turn to a different topic, which is your knowledge of high-rise buildings and relevant products.

If we look at your first statement, please, which is
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\{RBK00033934/10\}, I want to just look at paragraph 99 on that page. You say there, in the fourth line from the end:
"At the time of the Grenfell refurbishment I had approx. 35 years experience and had previously overseen high rise projects under the London Building Act and constructional byelaws in force at the time."

In general, do you remember when those projects took place?
A. From time to time -- sorry. I dealt with sort of flat refurbishments and refurbishments of hotels from time to time. I couldn't give you exact dates, because it would -- as I say, I don't actually recall any particular time, but when I was working in Chelsea prior to moving up to the top of the borough in 1998, I do recall dealing with some refurbishments of some hotel rooms in a hotel in Sloane Street. I also did -- when I moved up to the Notting Hill area, I dealt with a couple of flat refurbishments in -- on a tower block in Notting Hill.
Q. Right.
A. But, as I say, the dates, I couldn't tell you.
Q. In relation to the high-rise projects that you identify in this part of your first statement, did any of those involve the re-cladding or overcladding of a high-rise
residential tower?
A. No.
Q. So would it follow from that that the Grenfell Tower refurbishment was the first time as a Building Control officer you had come across the overcladding of an existing and occupied high-rise residential building?
A. Yes.
Q. Right.

Coming back to the topic of previous high-rise fires, we discussed Garnock Court in Scotland, Irvine, in 1999. Were you aware of a fire early on in that decade, in 1991, at Knowsley Heights?
A. Yes, in the news, I remember or --
Q. Right.
A. I ... sorry to hesitate. I believe I would have seen it in the news at that time.
Q. Right, in the early 1990s?
A. Yes.
Q. What about a fire in a building called the Mermoz Tower in Roubaix in France in 2012?
A. That I don't recall.
Q. Right. What about the fire in the Wooshin Golden Suites in Busan, South Korea in 2010?
A. That again doesn't --
Q. Right.
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We discussed earlier very briefly fires in Dubai.
A. Yes.
Q. Let's take this in stages.

Do you recall a spate of fires in high-rise buildings in the UAE, the United Arab Emirates, in the period 2012 to 2013, particularly in Sharjah and in Dubai at that time?
A. I do recall seeing, as I say, one particular one, whether, as I say -- were they close together?
Q. In time, yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Geographically, yes. Two were in Dubai.
A. Yeah, but in time.
Q. Yes. They were carried on the BBC News.
A. Yes, as I say --
Q. Some of them were, so you remember those?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you also remember further fires in Dubai in 2015 at The Address Downtown Hotel and The Torch residential building?
A. That doesn't come to mind.
Q. Right.

Going back, then, to the fires in the UAE that you became aware of in 2012 to 2013, did that tell you anything about the risks of external fire spread on
high-rise buildings? You mentioned earlier that it might have done and I just wanted to --
A. Yes, yes.
Q. What did it tell you, do you think?
A. As I say, as regards that, I was -- the thing that came to mind was: what were their regulations over there?
Q. Right. That came to mind, did it? Did you investigate that?
A. No.
Q. Was there any discussion internally at the RBKC

Building Control department about the fires?
A. I don't recall. I don't recall.
Q. Right.

Do you remember seeing any industry or perhaps internal circulars, or any news or industry gossip, even, about the impact of those fires and what you learnt or should learn from them?
A. No, no.
Q. Do you remember a fire in Southwark in 2009 in a building called Lakanal House?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know about that fire at the time it happened, the summer of 2009?
A. Yes.
Q. From that fire, did you gain any understanding of how
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fire can spread up the exterior of a building?
A. I thought -- or, sorry, I saw that it went up the outside, but I didn't know whether -- or the thing that comes to mind with that particular fire was the firestopping there internally.
Q. Right.

Did that cause you, that fire, to look at the Building Regulations and, in particular, at Approved Document B?
A. Not at that time. I would look at firestopping as part of my duties.
Q. Right.

Did the fire itself alert you to the dangers of rainscreen cladding systems?
A. No.
Q. Can I then turn to a different topic, which is the role of Building Control generally.

First, do you agree that the role of a Building Control body is to check for compliance with the requirements of the Building Act and the Building Regulations?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's their only requirement, their only role: to check and ensure for compliance?
A. We did have many other duties.
Q. Yes, well, let me be a bit more specific: do you accept that a Building Control body has no role to play in the design?
A. Correct.
Q. Right, and its role is to check submitted proposals?
A. Yes.
Q. And to inspect works on site to ensure compliance --
A. Yes.
Q. -- with the statutory requirements and guidance?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.

Do you also agree that it's ultimately for those designing and carrying out building works to ensure that the Building Regulations are complied with?
A. Yes.
Q. And that Building Control approval isn't conclusive evidence that the Building Regulations have been complied with?
A. Could you repeat?
Q. Yes.

Was it your understanding that the effect of Building Control approval being given wasn't, as it were, conclusive evidence --
A. Yeah, it wasn't.
Q. -- that the Building Regulations had been complied with?
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A. It wasn't conclusive.
Q. I'm going to put a number of propositions to you and I want to know whether you agree with them.

A Local Authority Building Control surveyor is required to take such steps as are reasonable to enable him or her to be satisfied within the limits of professional skill and care that the applicable aspects of the Building Regulations are complied with.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you agree that a Building Control body's ability to do its job properly depends in part on the quality of the information provided to it?
A. That's one of the -- one of them.
Q. Do you agree that where there are gaps or contradictions in the information which is submitted to it, a Building Control body should follow up with questions and investigations of the applicant?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you also agree that, in exercising reasonable skill and care, that would include seeking missing or incomplete information from the applicant?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes. Now --
A. If -- well, I would say that if he didn't know the information himself from investigation.

```
Q. Yes.
Now, I don't know how closely you have been following the evidence in this part of the Inquiry, Mr Hoban, but I will see if I can summarise the point I want to put to you succinctly, but I hope also fairly . TMO, Studio E, Rydon and Harley witnesses have said, either orally or in their witness statements or both, that they relied on Building Control to ensure that the refurbishment complied with the Building Regulations.
My question is: did you yourself appreciate, at the time of the Grenfell Tower refurbishment and your role in it, that those parties involved in the refurbishment project viewed Building Control in that way?
A. No.
Q. I now want to turn to yet again a different topic, which is the structure of the RBKC Building Control department.
Now, your role during the time of the Grenfell Tower project was, I think, as a senior Building Control surveyor.
A. Yes.
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the same as a principal Building Control surveyor?
```
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A. No.
Q. Can you just explain the differences to us, please?
A. Principal -- originally a principal Building Control surveyor was a manager of a team of surveyors. At the time of Grenfell, the principal was a deputy. Also, the principal would deal with more complex projects and manage staff.
Q. And a senior Building Control surveyor, where would that fit into the hierarchy?
A. He was generally an area surveyor that would deal with the area that he was dealing with.
Q. I see.
A. As instructed by managers.
Q. Instructed by managers. How did a senior

Building Control surveyor relate to a principal Building Control surveyor?
A. They were junior, junior to a principal Building Control surveyor.
Q. I see. Immediately junior?
A. Yes.
Q. Right.

Just give me a feel for this: how many senior or principal Building Control surveyors worked in the RBKC Building Control department at the time of the Grenfell Tower project?
A. There was one principal surveyor.
Q. Yes.
A. We had -- well, the numbers changed, because originally
in 2013, after our restructuring, we had ... bear with
me for a moment, please. We had the head of
Building Control, we had his deputy, who was
a principal. There was ...
Q. Yes.
(Pause)
A. There was three senior surveyors, and there was three Building Control surveyors. I believe that Colin, who passed away in October 2015, had just been made a senior prior to him passing away.
Q. Yes, I see.

Now, in 2013, September 2013 specifically, I think it 's right that John Allen was appointed as Building Control manager, wasn't he?
A. Correct.
Q. Where did he fit into that structure that you've just explained?
A. He was the top, he was the --
Q. He was the head of $B C$, was he?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. From that time onwards, is it right that

John Allen was your line manager, or was there
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an intervening principal surveyor?
A. Well, John Allen was my manager, but in his absence José was --
Q. Right. Was José a principal Building Control surveyor?
A. He was.
Q. Right, I see. So although he was effectively your senior, nonetheless you reported mostly directly to John Allen as the head of BC?
A. Correct.
Q. Have I got that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, thank you.

So was John Allen also in control of allocating work within the department?
A. I think that was done between him and José.
Q. I see.

Work, I think as you say, was usually allocated on a patch system.
A. Correct.
Q. Does that mean that you covered everything in your patch, in other words a geographical area?
A. Yes, although saying that, when I got the -- I was given the responsibility of looking after the academy and the sports centre. That was in Hilary's patch at the time.
Q. Who is Hilary?
A. Hilary Wyatt, she was a colleague that transferred to the planning department.
Q. Did the allocation of work within your patch take into account current workloads, skill, experience and qualifications?
A. I was just given the work.
Q. Right.

It may be a question for others, but to your knowledge and understanding at the time, did the allocation of work which would ordinarily fall within your patch take account of your workload, for example?
A. No. Or ... it was given to me.
Q. It was given to you because it was in your patch regardless of your workload?
A. Yes.
Q. And regardless of your skill and experience?
A. Yes.
Q. And regardless of your qualifications or absence of them?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I think you said before, just earlier on in your evidence, that changes were made to the structure of the Building Control department --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- in 2013.
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A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware at that time that local authority Building Control services, and particularly RBKC, were expected to be cost neutral?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you understand by that idea?
A. That we had to be self-funding, I believe.
Q. Self-funding?
A. Yes.
Q. I see.
A. There was obviously austerity measures as well that went
on.
Q. Yes.

Prior to September 2013, I think John Allen was in charge of special projects.
A. Yes.
Q. Does that tell us that, before September 2013, special projects were dealt with separately from the general run of Building Control applications?
A. Yes.
Q. And from 2013, special projects were then re-allocated within the department, were they?
A. Yes.
Q. So did those become part of the patch system?
A. Correct.
Q. So if there was a special project that would normally be dealt with before September 2013 by John Allen as a specialist project, after that date, if it fell in your patch, you would get it?
A. Yes.
Q. I see.

Does that mean -- this may sound obvious -- that after September 2013, you were doing special projects that were not part of your day-to-day role before that date?
A. Yes.
Q. Before September 2013, did you yourself have any experience of working on special projects?
A. Er ... sorry. Initially, before -- when the local authority took over the responsibilities of Building Control, the area surveyor would look after the jobs in his own particular area, but we had a fire regulations group that would deal with the fire regulation matters, and so you would go to them for advice, and they would deal with the aspects of B1-- or not B1, part B.
Q. Right. What would count as a special project?
A. I don't know if there was a definition. It was generally a major project.
Q. Right. So major and complex project?

## 103

A. Yes.
Q. I see.

My question again: did you yourself, before September 2013, have any experience of working on special projects?
A. No, not as defined -- when the group came into -- when it was set up.
Q. Right.

I think KALC, the Kensington Academy and Leisure Centre, if I can use that as an abbreviation, which ultimately came to include Grenfell Tower, was a special project, wasn't it?
A. It was.
Q. Therefore, does it follow that Grenfell Tower was itself considered by RBKC as a special project?
A. Yes, I would say so.
Q. So does it follow from that that Grenfell Tower was your first special project?
A. I dealt with the academy and the leisure centre when I was instructed to do so by John Allen.
Q. Right, I see.

Now, you, I think, were not John Allen's first choice of Building Control officer for Grenfell Tower, were you?
A. I don't know.

| Q. Right. Do you know that he initially offered it to | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| José Anon? | 2 |
| A. I wasn't aware of that. | 3 |
| Q. Did José Anon have greater experience of working on | 4 |
| special projects than you did? | 5 |
| A. He may have had, because he was a principal. | 6 |
| Q. Yes. | 7 |
| A. As I say, he was a principal, so they had greater | 8 |
| responsibility . They would deal with the bigger | 9 |
| projects. | 10 |
| Q. Were you given any other special projects to work on in | 11 |
| and after September 2013? | 12 |
| A. I was dealing with -- I don't know whether it would be | 13 |
| classed as a special project. I was given a -- there | 14 |
| was a partnership scheme that I was dealing with that | 15 |
| involved a number of townhouses, four townhouses, and | 16 |
| a low-rise office building, and a façade retention with, | 17 |
| I think, nine flats , and it was all new-build. | 18 |
| Q. Right. | 19 |
| A. So I was dealing with that as well as the other | 20 |
| projects. If that had come along when the special | 21 |
| projects group was done, it most probably would have | 22 |
| Qone to the special project surveyor. | 23 |
| I see. | 24 |
| Now, taking the period from September 2013 onwards, | 25 |
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Mr Hoban, you say in your first statement, paragraph 36
\{RBK00033934/4\} -- I don't think we need to go to it -that you would take decisions on B2, B3 and B4 issues, and that you would consult with Paul Hanson and John Allen where necessary.
A. Yeah.
Q. On Grenfell, how often did you consult with John Allen?
A. Er ...
Q. Just in general terms.
(Pause)
A. Sorry, I'm trying to think here. I know I asked -well, I don't know whether it's consulting. I asked him to do a visit for me because I wasn't available, because I wasn't available one day, and I spoke with him -well, not consult. I spoke with him about my work every month. We would have monthly one-to-ones generally, and he would -- we would talk about my work.
Q. Yes, I see.

Did you talk about your work on Grenfell Tower specifically, or was it a discussion about your workload and general questions?
A. Just generally .
Q. Right.

I'm going to ask you about Paul Hanson separately later on in our discussions together.

Can I then turn just to a question of austerity. Can I show you paragraph 3 of your first statement on page 1 \{RBK00033934/1\}. You say there:
"As a result of restructuring, due to austerity measures, the planning department was restructured with substantial cuts to building control. This led to a substantial reduction in the number of employees in building control. Consequently, the remaining employees had their work load increase commensurately."

Can you tell us or give us an idea of the number of employees reduced?
A. There was six surveyors that -- well, that were due to retire. One of my colleagues, unfortunately, Michael Wing, passed away just before he was due to retire. So we lost John Jackson, who was the head of Building Control; David Gammon, who was the head of the fire regulations group, who was a principal; we also lost Gary Sharp, who was a principal surveyor; there was, as I say, Mick Wing who passed away;
Richard Beddoe, who was a senior surveyor; and
Alan De Souza, who was a senior building surveyor.
Q. You have mentioned six names.
A. Yes.
Q. One died, five retired. Did they retire because of austerity or did they retire because they were retiring

107
anyway?
A. No, it was to do with the restructuring.
Q. I see. So five in total, essentially?
A. Yeah.
Q. How many did that leave behind? How many Building Control surveyors were left in the Building Control department by the end of 2013?
A. We had -- as I said, we had a head, head of Building Control, the fire regulations group was just made up of Paul Hanson at that stage, and José Anon was the principal, and there was myself, Parvinder Virdee and Amir Fardouee, who were senior surveyors, those three, and we had Hilary Wyatt, Colin Ryan and Celia Burt, who was -- they were all ordinary building surveyors.
Q. I see.
A. We introduced -- I can't remember when. We had an enforcement surveyor. One of my colleagues that worked in the business support team became an enforcement surveyor in I believe it was 2016. Principally he was going out and making discoveries.
Q. Okay. So do it take it from that list that all of those people you have mentioned -- so Paul Hanson, José Anon, Parvinder Virdee, Hilary Wyatt and Colin Ryan -- were all there before the restructuring and stayed on?
A. Yes.
Q. Although Colin Ryan died and --
A. Hilary left and Celia Burt left.
Q. Right. So you went down from about 12 to about four or five?
A. Area surveyors. Originally we went down to six --
Q. Yes.
A. -- area surveyors, and then, as I say, Hilary moved to planning, Celia left and Colin passed away.

The last -- in 2016, we got the graduate who was taken on as a Building Control surveyor, Waqaas Rashid, but it was -- he had never worked in a Building Control office before, so he was starting from scratch, as it were. He had -- I think he had graduated the summer before he joined us. He did some work for a housing association.
Q. Yes.

Did the Building Control department lose staff due to increased competition from the private sector, by which I specifically mean approved inspectors? (Pause)
A. I couldn't answer that -- I wouldn't know. As I say, it was mainly to do with cuts, austerity cuts, as far as --
Q. Now, you said that -- I'm sorry, I may have cut you off at the end of that answer. Do you want to finish that
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answer?
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Had you finished your answer, Mr Hoban?
A. Well, they just -- Mr Jackson put a proposal forward for restructuring the department, and that was approved by the managers and the councillors.
MR MILLETT: I think you have said that there was an increase in workload resulting from these reductions.
A. Yes.
Q. What impact did that have on your workload in the period after 2013?
A. It meant that I couldn't visit as frequently as previously, the jobs that I had been dealing with prior to that.
Q. Did your patch get bigger?
A. It did.
Q. Right.

When you say the remaining employees had their workload increased commensurately, did that affect the efficiency and thoroughness with which you were able to carry out your role on each project?
A. I tried to work to the efficiency, but as time progressed, I wasn't able to do -- as I mentioned, I wasn't able to do the job the way I wanted to do it --
Q. Right.
A. -- in that I wasn't able to visit jobs as much as I wanted to. Also, you're making decisions on ... sometimes writing emails, some jobs you would say -for example, if an email came through and you phoned somebody up, and say, "Is this adequate for the purposes of the response to your email?", and they would -- if they agreed, then you could, as it were, sign that off. Sometimes there were jobs where you would know or consider that there could be issues at a later stage, so I would make certain that these were followed up with emails in order that, if there was an issue at a later stage, you could actually show what had been done previously.
Q. Now, in his evidence to the Inquiry, Neil Crawford of Studio E told us -- and this is \{Day11/131\} -- that you had told him that you were supposed to oversee hundreds of projects. Do you remember whether you did say that to him?
A. No, I don't recall saying that.
Q. Right. Were you overseeing literally hundreds of projects?
A. No, I would say I was -- about -- it would fluctuate towards the end, about, I would say -- or in 2016, between 120/130 projects, plus my other duties.
Q. So although it wasn't hundreds, it was certainly more
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than 100 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Right.

Can we just go back to your appraisal for 2015 to 2016, which we will find at \{RBK00048753/3\}. At the bottom of the page, under "Mid Year Comments", can you see that it says:
"Covering inspections for surveyors in 2 other areas."

And then if you would go over the page to page 7 \{RBK00048753/7\}, you can see there that on the right-hand side of the page, under "Manager Mid Year":
"John has already achieved a number of the targets. Currently has high workload as covering for 2 other colleagues."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Over what period were you covering for two other colleagues?
A. Well, Hilary left in 2000 and -- or not left ; she moved to the planning department sometime in 2014.
Q. Yes.
A. And Celia Burt left the employment of the council at the end of March 2015.
Q. So it was them?
A. Then, and then Colin passed away in October 2015 and I got a percentage of his work.
Q. I see. So in fact it was three colleagues from September 2015?
A. No, October.
Q. October 2015?
A. Yeah. Yes, it was, yeah.
Q. Yes.

What impact did your covering for those two and then three other colleagues have on your workload?
A. Well, as I say, I wasn't visiting certain jobs -- I was making sort of judgements on who to visit, on who to write to, sort of confirm things.
Q. Right.
A. So you're making judgements on sort of the level of supervision, the standard of workmanship, whether you worked with particular people in the past and whether you considered that they were doing what they needed to do.
Q. When you were covering for two other colleagues, did that increase the number of projects?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. Right. And then latterly three, so did the number of projects double and then triple from your base, as it were, in September 2013?

113
A. Well, as Building Control surveyors, they had slightly less numbers than myself in their areas. So, as I say -- although Colin, in fairness, had quite a big area, and he was dealing with major projects as well, or one particular major project as well. So Colin was working far above, in my opinion, what was expected of a Building Control surveyor.
Q. Right. So you took on two other patches and then another patch after that?
A. And then, as I say, I would say maybe a third or slightly more of Colin's area when he passed away.
Q. I see.

Can I show you Mr Allen's statement, that's his first statement, \{RBK00033930/3\}, please. I just want to show you what he says at paragraph 16 and then ask you a question about it before we break.

It's the first six lines of paragraph 16. He says:
" Typically as the manager I would meet the area surveyor's monthly, check through their monthly job sheets and in particular what was actually still current ( live) to confirm that their workload was manageable. I would always ask if the surveyor needed any help or assistance but I had great confidence in the team as I had been out with them all and whilst they all had different approaches to the work and relationships,

## I found them all to be good and competent."

Then he goes on about the files .
Did Mr Allen meet with you monthly to check through your job sheets so as to ensure that your workload was manageable?
A. I would say he did meet with me monthly, but as regards manageable, that wasn't something that was discussed. I actually -- I remember in -- I think it was March or April 2015, when he gave me Hilary's patch, I did ask for help, and I made a number of suggestions as to how to deal with Celia's patch when she left, and none of these were taken up, and I was given Celia's area to look after.
Q. He says he would always ask if the surveyor needed any help or assistance. Did he always ask you if you needed help or assistance?
A. No, I wouldn't say that.

## MR MILLETT: Right

Mr Chairman, I have one very short document just to show the witness and then I can finish off this line of questioning, if that's acceptable.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right.
MR MILLETT: \{RYD00004218\}, please. This is an email of 8 May 2014 from Mr Stephen Blake to Simon Lawrence and Zak Maynard. This is an internal Rydon document.
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I just want to show you the very last line in the email. It says there at the bottom of the page:
"Ps Claire mentioned Building Control submission as the dept is swamped-use someone else?"

My question is: at this time, May 2014, was the RBKC Building Control department swamped?
A. May 2014?
(Pause)
I would say for me personally, I was having to come in at weekends in order to deal with the academy and the leisure centre because it was a new-build and there was quite a lot to look at. So it was challenging. You know, I was doing my own area and, as I say, I was doing those two major projects, and the demands -- or not the demand -- I don't know whether the word "demand" ... the contractors were looking for my -I spent a lot of time looking at those particular projects.
MR MILLETT: Right. Thank you.
Mr Chairman, is that a convenient moment?
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think it is, yes, thank you very much.

Mr Hoban, we're going to have a break now so everyone can get some lunch. We will resume at 2.05, please.

```
While you're out of the room, please don't talk to anyone about your evidence or anything to do with it.
THE WITNESS: No, no.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: If you go with the usher, she' ll look after you. Thank you very much. (Pause)
Right, 2.05, please. Thank you.
( 1.05 pm )
(The short adjournment)
( 2.05 pm )
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, Mr Hoban?
THE WITNESS: Yes, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Ready to carry on?
Yes, Mr Millett.
MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, thank you.
Mr Hoban, I have just a couple of follow-up questions arising from this morning's evidence.
The first is you mentioned to us earlier that, after about September 2013, you had some 120 to 130 projects to oversee. Can you give us a feel for how many of those were small, simple, domestic projects as opposed to larger buildings, more complex projects?
(Pause)
A. It's hard to answer that question, because sometimes the simple -- what were considered to be the smaller
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projects would be difficult in that there could be issues regarding the workmanship, or sometimes you had difficulty getting into properties, or there was things wrong with the work. So although it could be small in nature, it could be difficult from other aspects. But maybe \(50 \%\), maybe more. I was dealing with a lot of basements at the time.
Q. Right.
A. And also I had a number of projects scattered round the borough on the partnership scheme. I had 18 projects. So it was quite time-consuming getting from one part of the borough to the other, because I used public transport, so I would take up a lot of my day in travelling arrangements.
Q. Yes, I see.
A. If -- I don't know whether that helps slightly .
Q. Yes, I think that does help, thank you.
Can I also ask you about Lakanal House. You told us this morning -- and this is \{Day45/94:2-11\}, this is today -- that you remember Lakanal for the firestopping.
A. Yeah.
Q. What did you think, before the Grenfell Tower fire occurred, was the problem with firestopping at Lakanal House?
A. That it hadn't been provided, or it hadn't been done
```

properly.
Q. When you say firestopping, do you mean firestopping in the technical sense or do you mean cavity barriers?
A. Firestopping. There may have been cavity barrier issues as well internally.
Q. Right.
A. As I say, I ... how much -- you know, it's a long time ago, so I can't recall how much detail -- I know obviously there was recommendations put in by the Inquiry about --
Q. You mean the inquest?
A. At the inquest, sorry, at the inquest, about certain regulatory matters.
Q. Did you ever receive any training to learn the lessons of the Lakanal House fire at all?
A. I think it could have been mentioned in in-house seminars, but specific training, no.
Q. Right.
A. But, you know, in-house training or seminars, it may have been mentioned in the actual presentation.
Q. Yes. What about Shirley Towers, does that fire mean anything to you?
A. Is that the one in Hertfordshire?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I remember it being on the news, because a couple

119
of -- or three people lost their lives, two of them were firemen.
Q. Yes, all right. But you don't remember any training in relation to the Shirley Towers fire?
A. No, no.
Q. Can I then turn to the question of the involvement of Mr Hanson and the means of escape group.

Now, we know that within RBKC there was something called a means of escape group that could be consulted by Building Control officers such as you. Is that right?
A. Well, we did use their services, but we had -originally the fire regulations group would have dealt with all aspects under B, but there was a change in policy, I can't remember when, it was prior to the restructuring, where they -- management said that the surveyors were to deal with B2, 3 and 4 on buildings, whereas prior to that section 20 buildings -- because this was what was known as a section 20 building under the old London Building Acts -- would have been dealt with by the fire regulation group.
Q. I see. So there was a group called a means of escape group?
A. Well, I think they were actually called the fire regulations group.
Q. Right.
A. Although primarily it would be B1.
Q. Does the division of responsibilities that you have just described to us, whereby surveyors were to deal with B2, B3 and B4, mean that you, as a surveyor, had not dealt with B2, B3 and B4 specifically on buildings prior to this restructuring?
A. No, on smaller jobs, you know, like a house or
a low-rise block, yes, we would deal with those. On high-rise buildings such as Grenfell, prior to that instruction, the fire regulations group would have dealt with all aspects.
Q. Right, and you were not part of that group?
A. No. I stopped -- I became a general assistant in 1985.
Q. Yes.

At the time of the Grenfell Tower project, Paul Hanson was part of the means of escape group, I think.
A. He was the only person.
Q. He was the means of escape group, was he?
A. He was.
Q. Right. He is or was a qualified fire engineer, isn't he?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in your first statement -- there is no need to
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turn it up, it 's paragraph 36 \{RYD00033934/4\} -- that
Paul Hanson would make decisions on B1 and B5 of the Building Regulations.
A. Yes.
Q. That was so in relation to Grenfell, was it?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it fair to say that, strictly, he was a consultant who could make observations? That's how he has described his role in his statement at paragraph 31. Would you agree with that?
A. No, well, he was the person that did all the consult -or arranged for the consultation with the fire authority. He would do all the paperwork with that. The process was, when we got his observations, I would sit down with him and we'd go through his observations, and I would get his advice from time to time on other matters, because on Grenfell there was a number of emails relating to cavity barriers, I think it was in March 2015, where I sought his advice --
Q. Yes.
A. -- on that.
Q. We'll come to that
A. And when I was dealing with the academy and the leisure centre, he gave -- he was involved with considerations other than B 1 in relation to no sprinklers being
provided to the academy, and there was consideration over the hose reel lengths, I believe.
Q. Can I see if I can cut through this a bit.
A. Yeah.
Q. On Grenfell, who was ultimately responsible for B1 and B5? Was that Paul Hanson?
A. I would say yes, because he was the person that I would go to for ... sorry I'm hesitating here. He's the expert, so I would not go against his advice.
Q. Yes, but did you divide up responsibility? He would do $B 1$ and B5 and you would do B2, 3 and 4, or were you responsible for all of those parts of the Building Regulations, with him giving specialist advice on B1 and B5?
A. Well, ultimately I would say I'm the area surveyor, but he was the expert, and I would -- he would do the negotiations with the Fire Brigade, and if we had meetings, he was the person -- with the architect, he was the person that would lead those meetings.
Q. Would you generally defer to Paul Hanson on all fire - related Building Control issues if they arose in a Building Control application?
A. Yes.
Q. Right.
A. If he pointed something out to me, yes, I would seek his
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advice, and obviously when considering an application under B, you have to consider all aspects, in my view.
Q. So would you say that you consulted with Paul Hanson on B 2 to B 4 matters as well as B 1 and B5?
A. I sought his advice from time to time.
Q. Yes. Did Mr Hanson refer matters on B3 and B4 back to you to decide?
A. Yes.
Q. He did?
A. But, again, as I say, if I wanted clarification on B2 -I was aware of the standards, and -- or not aware, I understood the standards, but where there was ... new codes came in, and he would be working with them all the time, he was on various committees, so I would defer to him.
Q. Yes.

Now, Beryl Menzies, who is one of the Inquiry's experts, considers that it was a failure on the part of RBKC not to have used the resource of a qualified fire engineer for the benefit of the Building Control department as a whole. Do you agree?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you also agree with her that the working relationship between the means of escape group, in other words Mr Hanson, and the other part of the Building Control
department was undefined and unclear to those involved? Do you agree with that?
(Pause)
A. Well, as I say, I would refer to Paul from time to time. It would have been -- it could have been a lot clearer.
Q. Do you agree that the working relationship didn't necessarily support project surveyors like you in reaching the best decisions under or for the purposes of compliance with part B --
A. Yes.
Q. -- of the Building Regulations?
A. Yes.
Q. You do.

Can I just show you a document before we turn to
a different topic, \{RBK00048682\}, please. Again, this is another internal Rydon document, so you won't have seen it, Mr Hoban. It's an email of 5 September 2014.

I'm so sorry, it's from you, actually, so you will have seen it. It's from you to Simon Lawrence and Simon O'Connor at Rydon. You say there in the second sentence:
"I would confirm that I am the building control surveyor charged with dealing with all building regulations matters for the project. Paul Hanson is the building control surveyor (fire regulations) for the
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scheme and he will provide me with technical advice and observations on the proposals submitted under Parts B1 and B5 in Schedule 1 of such regulations, as that is his reference for this project.
"Should you have any proposals and/or issues that you desire technical advice on from this office, under Parts B1 and B5 of The Building Regulations, I would be grateful if you would contact myself in the first instance, so that I am aware of these matters, as they may impact on other parts of the building regulations."

Do you agree with what you said there about the respective roles of you and Paul Hanson in relation to this project?
A. That's what we were instructed to do from -- as I previously mentioned, instruction prior to the restructuring that we were to deal with B2, 3 and 4 .
Q. Right.

The impression given by this email from you is that, in relation to B2, 3 and 4 matters of the Building Regulations, you would be the person to give technical advice, and it was only Mr Hanson who would be giving technical advice on B1 and B5. Is that what you wanted to impart?
A. Yes, but, as I say, I would go back to Paul from time to time on -- to get advice on matters.
Q. I see. So does it come to this: Paul Hanson would be the go-to man for B1 and B5, you would be the go-to man for B2, B3 and B4, but he would be your private in-house resource for any particular technical questions you had on B2, 3 and 4 ?
A. Yes, and he would come out with me on site from time to time.
Q. Thank you.

Can I then turn to your specific involvement with Grenfell Tower.

We know that RBKC is the freehold owner of Grenfell Tower. Would RBKC Building Control treat applications that it received in relation to buildings owned by RBKC in exactly the same way that it would in relation to applications for buildings owned by other people?
A. Yes. As regards the regulations, we wouldn't give them any, as it were, favourable consideration. We may ... I know when I was dealing with the academy and the leisure centre, I spent a lot of time on there because I was instructed to do that.
Q. Yes, and there is some evidence of that.

Now, we know that John Allen had been the primary point of contact with Studio E in 2012, and that will be explored with him perhaps.
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By the time you became involved, RBKC Building Control had already met Studio E and had received some documents, such as the Exova outline fire safety strategy. Can you confirm that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, John Allen suggests in his first statement that he allocated the KALC/Grenfell project to you after he was appointed Building Control manager in the September of 2013.

Now, in your second statement to the Inquiry -- just for reference purposes, this is paragraph 5 on page 2 \{RBK00050416/2\} -- you say you think you were appointed in December 2013.
A. Yeah.
Q. Were you appointed in September or in December of that year, do you think?
A. I believe that John Allen had some dealings with Studio E in the September time. I believe, as I say, from my recollection, that he was -- he had some involvement, and then I was told in the November or the December, when I wrote that statement --
Q. Okay.
A. -- or that email.
Q. Well, let's explore some more detail.

Who was the Building Control surveyor in respect of
the Grenfell Tower project during the period September
to December of 2013 , do you remember?
A. I would say John Allen was, until it was handed to me.
Q. Right. This may help you --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- just to fix it --
A. If I may, sorry.
Q. Yes, of course.
A. I don't know whether I actually attended a meeting with Bruce Sounes prior to that date. That's what I'm not certain of.
Q. I understand, thank you for that clarification.
\{SEA00010232\}. I think we may be able to use this document to pin down a time. This is an email of 31 December 2013 from you, and you say in the first paragraph:
"Thank you for your preliminary submission."
It's addressed to Bruce Sounes.
"I have now been appointed the surveyor responsible for the part of Borough where your project is situated.
"Please find attached marked up plans and observations relating to the fire strategy for the Grenfell Tower project, for your information/records."

So that gives a date of 31 December 2013. Do you think you had any involvement with Grenfell before that
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point?
A. Not that I'm -- the only question mark is: I had a meeting -- Paul Hanson and myself had a meeting with Bruce Sounes at some stage, but I'm not certain of that date.
Q. At this point --
A. But I -- sorry.
Q. No, I'm so sorry.
A. But I believe that it would have been after that, but, as I say, I can't say with absolute certainty.
Q. No, I understand.

When you did take over, as you say you had on or as at 31 December, what steps did you take to familiarise yourself with the project?
A. I looked at the information that was given to me at that stage. I looked at the -- John Allen sent me some emails and a fire strategy, but -- and then, as I say, until an application came -- because I believe there was very little contact until I met with Bruce Sounes, whenever that date may be.
Q. Did you have a handover meeting with John Allen about Grenfell Tower?
A. No, no, just the email and, as I say, that contents.
Q. Right.

Do you remember what the documents were more
specifically? You say emails and the fire strategy. We'll come to look at that in due course, but do you remember what the emails were about?
A. It was mainly to do with smoke venting.
Q. Right.

At this stage -- this is the pre-application
phase -- was there a project file on Acolaid for you to look at?
A. No.
Q. What about a hard copy file for you to look at?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Right.

Did you discuss the project with Paul Hanson at this stage, late December 2013?
A. I would have only discussed it with him when we met with Bruce.
Q. Can we go to $\{$ RBK00044900\}, please. This is a -- and this is all we have of it --
A. Ah, right, yes.
Q. You say, "Ah, right". That's helpful ; this seems to trigger a recollection. Just to explain what it is, it looks like an Outlook diary entry for 30 December 2013 to you and Paul Hanson, subject: "Grenfell Tower". Can you tell us what this is signifying?
A. When I was saying "Ah, right ", I remember Neil Crawford
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at some stage mentioning -- when I was dealing with the academy, he spoke briefly to me during a site visit there.
Q. Right.
A. This -- I can only assume that there was a meeting, but the date is Christmastime, so I don't know whether we would have had anybody in the office for a meeting round that time, because that's the day before New Year's Eve.
Q. Indeed, but we've seen that you sent an email on New Year's Eve, the next day, to Bruce Sounes saying that you had been appointed --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- the BCO for the Grenfell Tower project, so you were in and working at that stage.
A. Oh, yes, I would most probably be --
Q. Does this Outlook diary entry signify that there was a meeting between you and Paul Hanson on that day, 30 December?
A. That I couldn't say, and was Paul working that week?
Q. Do you remember prior to your appointment at the end of December 2013 whether you had had any discussions at all with either Paul Hanson or John Allen about the cladding and risk of external fire spread?
A. No.
Q. Can I ask you to go to \{SEA00009805\}, please. This is
an email from John Allen to Studio E of
11 November 2013. Now, it's not copied to you, and it explains that RBKC's view -- and this is about the smoke extract system, as you can see from the third paragraph -- was that the information submitted to date was not adequate to enable effective consultation with the fire authority.

Were you aware of this email or discussions about that topic at this time?

## (Pause)

A. I'm not certain. I can't give you an answer on that.
Q. All right.

If we turn to the second page of this email run \{SEA00009805/2\}, this is an email from Bruce Sounes to John Allen, dated 25 October 2013, which attached the proposed fire strategy for Grenfell, and that included the fire access and fire strategy drawings and the Exova issue number 2 of the outline fire safety strategy, as you can see from the list of documents that are said to be attached. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, that document, the OFSS issue 2, was dated 24 October 2013, so a little bit -- the day before, I think, probably, by the time this email is sent.

Do you remember reading the Exova outline fire
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safety strategy issue 2 when you started working on the project?
A. I can't say what issue I looked at. I did look at a fire strategy.
Q. Right.

Issue 3 was dated 7 November 2013. Do you think you might have looked at that?
A. I --
Q. There is not a great deal of difference between them.
A. I really can't say, sorry.
Q. Were you told at the time why it was that either John Allen or Paul Hanson or both of them had reached the view that the information provided by Studio E, which included this outline fire safety strategy, about the smoke extract system was insufficient?
A. No.
Q. Can we go to \{SEA00000154\}, please. This is a run of emails in early December 2013, the top one is dated 3 December 2013, which attaches a "Fire Strategy .pdf". Do you see that?
A. Mm.
Q. Do you remember seeing or being aware of these emails at the time?
A. Not at the time, because, as I said, I believe I took the project over at the end.
Q. Right. Because you said earlier in your evidence that, as part of the handover, you were shown some emails. Was this --
A. Yeah, I don't --
Q. -- one of the emails you were shown, do you think?
A. No, I don't believe so.
Q. Can we then go to \{SEA00010232\} again. This is the 31 December 2013 email we looked at five minutes or so ago, where you tell Bruce Sounes that you have been appointed as the surveyor responsible for the area where Grenfell was situated.

You refer in the second paragraph down to "marked up plans and observations relating to the fire strategy for the Grenfell Tower project, for your information and records". Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Just for the transcript, the documents that you returned to Studio E are \{SEA00010369\}, \{SEA00002629\}, and \{SEA00002630\}, just so we have those on the transcript.

I just want to ask you about the mark-ups and comments. Were they Paul Hanson's?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any input into those mark-ups and observations yourself?
A. We would have discussed them prior to -- the usual
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practice -- as I say, I don't know when I had that -- we would usually go into an office and we would look at the plans, because -- so that I was familiar with what was going on.
Q. Did you discuss with Paul Hanson the marked-up plans and observations, with him specifically, before sending this email to Mr Sounes?
A. That would have been the practice, common practice.
Q. Right.
A. I can't say that I did, but generally that's how I would do it.
Q. And might that have been the day before --
A. Yeah, it could've been.
Q. -- according to the Outlook diary entry?
A. Well, maybe. Yes, maybe that is, sorry.
Q. Do you remember that? I mean, it's possible, but --
A. I can't. Possibly we had a meeting.
Q. All right.
A. And maybe that was it, that we agreed to sit down and go through so that I was aware what was going on.
Q. Can we go to \{SEA00010369\}. This is a memo from Paul Hanson to John Allen dated 6 December 2013, "B1 means of escape observations", and in it he gives his comments about the smoke vent proposals.

Do you think this was a document you were shown or

```
saw before you took over?
A. I don't recall ever --
Q. Right.
If we look at page 4 \{SEA00010369/4\}, please, at the very bottom of that page, it says that Paul Hanson had not yet consulted the fire authority.
Was it your understanding at this point that
Paul Hanson was still not satisfied that
Building Control had sufficient information from
Studio E to enable him to consult the fire authority, or did you not know anything about this?
A. I didn't know anything about this, but reading that, you know, Paul has said that he hasn't enough information.
Q. Yes.
Just physically in the office at RBKC, did you sit in the same office as John Allen or Paul Hanson or can you overhear each others' work?
A. We had a hot-desking system, so you would -- you could sit wherever you wanted. Generally we would sit in the same area, but sometimes if you wanted or if I wanted a quiet time in order to do some particular thing,
I might go and sit in corner.
Q. Right. Okay.
A. Sorry.
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Q. All right.

When you did come into the project, as you can see, at the very end of December 2013, were you aware that the Grenfell Tower project involved overcladding the building?
A. Yes.
Q. You were?
A. Yes.
Q. Who told you that?
A. I could see that on the drawings.
Q. Right, could see it on the drawings.

Now, then, could we go to \{RBK00048649\}, please, and look at the second email down on that page, page 1.
This is an email from Bruce Sounes to you and Paul Hanson, 6 January 2014, and in it he says:
"Your comments [are] split roughly between the smoke "Your comments [are] split roughly between the smok
vent and fire separation, the former will be covered by the Engineers, the latter mostly by Studio E. The design has been the subject of lengthy deliberation and while I can understand some of the requests for additional separation there are reasons why we hadn't indicated them and we would like to discuss these with indicated them and we would like to discuss these with
you in further detail (access to the risers, refuse chutes etc).
"The priority for our client, the TMO is to
```

,

```

Now, then, could we go to \{RBK00048649\}, please, and
look at the second email down on that page, page 1.
    Paul Hanson, 6 January 2014 and in it he says
eliminate the risk of significant design changes before appointing a contractor and I believe the consultation with the Fire Authority is key to this. I hope this can be made before we arrange another meeting with you. Will a response to the smoke ventilation be enough for this to happen?"

Did you get the impression from this that Studio E was putting you under time pressure to consult the fire authority at this stage?

\section*{(Pause)}
A. Yes, but we wouldn't -- until we were happy with it, you know, we wouldn't put an application in.
Q. Right.
A. But you can see that they're doing that.
Q. Go to the top email, then. This is Paul Hanson's suggestion to you internally where he is recommending the following response. He had been copied in on the email and was recommending a response to you. You see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It's sent to you at about 15.06 on that day. Just look at the text, he says:
"I recommend the following response:-
"We are happy to pass on the question to the fire authority regarding changes to the smoke vent system as
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a separate exercise to the building control submission."
I will not read it all out to you. Clearly that's what he was suggesting you should say to Studio E.

If we now go to \{RBK00003854\}, please, we can see your response to Bruce Sounes sent at 15.20 the same day, so just about 15 minutes later. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. That looks like a cut and paste from Mr Hanson's suggestion in his email 15 minutes earlier; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. I see. So you were simply passing on Paul Hanson's comments that he had suggested to Studio E, effectively?

\section*{A. Yes.}
Q. I think, in the event, Studio E didn't provide the further information relating to the smoke vent system that you had asked for, did they?
A. That I can't comment on, sorry.
Q. Right. And I think it's right that there was no consultation at that stage of the fire authority either.
A. No, no.
Q. Okay.

Let's move on in time. Please go to \{ART00003931\}. These are minutes of progress meeting number 10 on site, 21 April 2015, so a long way ahead in time. But if we
look at page 3 \{ART00003931/3\}, you can see at the
bottom of the page it says there:
"[Simon Lawrence] is meeting with building control on 17/04 [that must be 2015] to inspect the reinforcing to the mezzanine prior to the concrete pour."

Do you remember, was it you who was the
Building Control officer attending that meeting?
A. It most probably was, but I can't be absolutely certain.
Q. Right.

Can we go back, then, in time. \{RBK00052478\}. This
is a record of the RBKC site visits . Now, I just want
to be clear with you what document this is, because it's a document that we will be going to quite a lot in the course of your evidence to come, Mr Hoban. It 's a document that was compiled on 14 June 2017, so the same day as the fire, and it's sent to Claire Williams of the KCTMO, and it's the records from Building Control, John Allen, of the site notes for the application. It's a long document, and it ends on page 1, so you start at the bottom end of it.

Can we go to page 8 \{RBK00052478/8\}. This is the first entry or site visit taking place on 29 August 2014. Now, I should just tell you, this is the first RBKC record of any site visit we have by Building Control to the Grenfell Tower refurbishment
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site.
Is that right? Was that your first site visit, do you think?
A. I believe -- well, from that, yes.
Q. Okay.

Now, if we go to \{RBK00003810\}, this is an email from you to Neil Crawford dated 17 July 2014. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So this is after the fire.
A. No, this is before.
Q. I'm so sorry, it 's 2014, I'm sorry.
A. Yes.
Q. "Neil,
"Please find detailed below the last e-mails that I have in my possession relating to the Grenfell Tower Project, for your information."

The email you sent him is 8 January 2014 from Paul Hanson to you, which is the one at 15.06 that we saw I think earlier on. That then became the one you cut and pasted and sent on.
A. Yeah.
Q. This suggests, looking at it, that there had been no further email contact between you and Studio E between 8 January, in the email we saw before, and mid-July

Do you remember in these initial discussions with Mr Crawford about Grenfell Tower what it was you discussed?
A. I think it was, "I' ll be dealing with it and I need to see you".
Q. I see. Did he give you any further information about the refurbishment at that time?
A. Not at that stage.
Q. Did he mention overcladding the building, do you think?
A. No, I think it was just that he would be dealing with it.
Q. I think you then made this visit on 29 August 2014, which is referred to in the document we looked at a moment ago. Was that before you had seen any drawings for the building, other than perhaps the marked-up version that was sent on 31 December --
A. I believe so.
Q. -- 2013? Right.

Can we look at a note of the site visit , \{RBK000052478/8\}, which we just looked at a moment ago. You can see there it says, 29 August 2014.
"Action: Pre-start Visit.
"Result: Satisfactory.
" Officer: John Hoban.
"Notes: visited site met project manager had brief discussion about the project, asked to be contacted when construction works commence on site, gave advice as to what stages of the works we need to [be] contacted to inspect. Workmen still presently carrying out demolition works nothing to check at time of visit. Demolition works to go on for some time. Also informed the project manager that I had yet to receive up to date details of the works."

The reference to meeting the project manager, was that Simon O'Connor of Rydon?
A. I believe so.
Q. Do you think you met Neil Crawford of Studio E on site at that meeting as well?
A. No, I don't believe I did.
Q. It refers to a brief discussion about the project; do you remember what the content of that discussion was?
A. Just generally what the works were to be.
Q. Right. Did you look at any drawings at that meeting?
A. I may have.
Q. You may have?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any specific recollection of it?
A. I can't remember that meeting, but -- or I can remember
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having the discussion, but I can't specifically remember saying we got the drawings -- generally, when I go on site, I would look at drawings.
Q. Right. Would you look at drawings that you brought with you or would you be provided with the drawings when you got to site?
A. They would be the drawings on site . Sometimes I would bring drawings at the end in order that -- in order to check that they corresponded with the fire strategy, but up until that time I would look at the drawings on site, because obviously --
Q. Right.
A. -- that's what I would be checking against.
Q. I understand. So to get to the drawings on site, where would you go?
A. The site office.
Q. And who was running that?
A. At that time it was Simon Lawrence -- no, Simon O'Connor.
Q. Simon O'Connor?
A. Sorry, Simon O'Connor.
Q. So the up-to-date drawings that you would want to see would be held in the site office?
A. Yes.
Q. I see.
A. I don't know how much information he would have had at that time.
Q. At that meeting, do you remember whether you discussed the overcladding proposals, with Mr O'Connor?
A. Not in specific detail, but I would have known that the building is being overclad.
Q. Was there any discussion about the materials that were planned for use in the external wall construction?
A. No, I don't believe so.
Q. Did they tell you that they had an outstanding planning application for approval of the materials on the façade which had not yet been resolved?
A. No, I don't believe so.
Q. Now, Mr Crawford says in his witness statement -- and this is paragraph 206 \{SEA00014275/65\} -- that he recalls meeting you on site in the week commencing 25 August 2014. Now, he was also asked about that in his oral evidence, \{Day11:137/12\}, and he said -- and I' ll just put to you the gist of his evidence -- that he had with him the basic project drawings, and he says he recalls sitting and discussing the project and that you took drawings away with you.

Did you sit and discuss the project with Mr Crawford in late August 2014?
A. I don't recall that.
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Q. Did you have any discussion with Mr Crawford in late August 2014 which included the basic project drawings?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Do you remember taking any drawings away with you from any meeting with Mr Crawford in late August 2014?
A. No, no, I don't -- as I say, as far as I recall, I didn't.
Q. Were you ever given drawings in any face-to-face meetings that you had with Mr Crawford?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. What about another member of the Grenfell design team?
A. I don't know whether Bruce left any drawings with us when he had the meeting in our office.
Q. Which meeting are you referring to?
A. Paul and I had a meeting with Bruce Sounes at some stage. I mentioned this previously.
Q. Yes. Was this prior to this site visit or afterwards?
A. I can't recall. Generally I wouldn't take information away with me, because I'd be out on site all day, and I wouldn't be carrying drawings with me, because, as I say, I would be going in and out of sites.
Q. Do you remember telling Mr Crawford at this time that you were primarily concerned with fire-related matters and that those were your priority?
A. No, I'd be concerned with all aspects of the Building

Regulations.
Q. Now, your site visit note here says that you informed the project manager that you had yet to receive up-to-date details of the works.
A. Yes.
Q. Was that a matter of concern to you at the time?
A. It was, but it wasn't unusual that we didn't have -- on lots and lots of jobs it would be chasing people for drawings and information.
Q. Right.
A. So it wasn't unusual.
Q. Was there any particular aspect of the project that you had in mind when you asked for up-to-date information on that occasion?
A. No, it was generally details of the work.
Q. Did you see a mock-up of the cladding on site during your visit?
A. No.
Q. So we know that there was a mock-up presented in July of 2014, but we're not sure when it was taken down. Did you see anything on site showing --
A. I don't recall seeing anything on site.
Q. Right.

We know that the full plans application had been submitted already on 4 August, so much earlier in that
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month. Were you concerned that there were no up-to-date details, given that the full plans application was already live?
A. We got in applications from time to time with no drawings. It was validated, that's the way the office worked. So it was a concern, but it wasn't unusual.
Q. Yes, I see.

Was the absence of plans, given that there was at this stage a live full plans application, something which drove you to ask for more details?
A. Oh, yes, yes.
Q. Right, okay.
A. Yes.
Q. The note also refers to the stages of works that you would need to be contacted for, for inspection. Do you see it says "advice as to what stages of the work we need to [be] contacted to inspect"? What were those stages, do you remember?
A. It was mainly the structure, DPCs, drainage, the notifiable notifications as specified in the Building Regulations.
Q. For a project involving cladding, overcladding -- and I know you say you have not done a high-rise before -did you have any sense of what stages you would expect to carry out inspections at, from that point on?
A. I would go along and do interim visits and see what was going on at the time, and then if anything concerned me then I would react accordingly.
Q. So you say you would do interim visits, and you told us this morning that you set these at monthly for yourself.
A. Yeah.
Q. Was that just a diary entry, or were your site visits related to particular stages the project had reached?
A. No, I think at the start, with Simon O'Connor, after I finished one visit, I would agree a date for another, but that didn't continue.
Q. Right.

More specifically, would you expect to inspect particular elements, like insulation and cavity barriers, where they had been installed but hadn't yet been covered up by cladding panels?
A. I did -- well, I did go and see, as works was progressing, on certain occasions --
Q. Yes, and we'll come to those. Let me put the question slightly differently, because I'm not sure I've really got the point across.

When you were saying, as this note says, "gave advice as to what stages of the works we need to [be] contacted to inspect", did you have in mind that, even though you might be doing site visits monthly, you

\section*{151}
needed to inspect each element of the cladding system as it was installed to make sure that it was installed correctly and compliantly before it was covered up by the next element?
A. No, not --
Q. You didn't?
A. No.
Q. Now, we move forward a little bit in time, not much, \{SEA00000189\}, 3 September 2014. We see here an email to you from Simon Lawrence on that day, copied to Simon O'Connor and Neil Crawford, and he says:
"Morning John,
"We haven't been introduced properly yet, but I am Rydon's Contracts Manager for the Grenfell Tower project. I understand that you dropped into our site office recently and had a brief introduction to the project and drawings from our Project Manager, Simon O'Connor."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, first of all, you hadn't had any contact, I think, with Simon Lawrence before that point, had you?
A. No, I don't believe so.
Q. Looking at the second sentence of this email, is this your visit on 29 August, do you think?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. And he says that you had had an introduction to the project and drawings. It looks very much from this contemporaneous document that Simon O'Connor did show you some drawings.
A. Yes, it would appear so.
Q. But I think you can't remember what drawings he showed you; is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Then if we look at the last sentence, he says that he is going to arrange a meeting with yourself on site shortly with Studio E. Does that help you remember whether you had already met Neil Crawford on site in the week of 25 August as he says, or not met him yet?
A. I don't believe I had met -- as I say, that's -- but I meet so many people, and I was meeting Neil on the academy.
Q. Yes.
A. So it's ... I can just say that. But I don't believe I had, or it's my belief that I didn't have a meeting with --
Q. Yes, I follow.
A. -- him before then.
Q. Right.
Is it possible that you met Neil Crawford on the

\section*{153}
KALC site in the week, the last week of August 2014, and met Simon O'Connor on the Grenfell site in the same week?
A. Maybe. I can't say.
Q. You can't remember.
Can we go up a little bit in this email to the long first paragraph. Halfway through that, Simon Lawrence says:
"To be honest we would have liked to have got yourself on board earlier but there has been some Client design changes which we were hoping to confirm before our application so as not to confuse issues in the future."
Would you expect to have had more involvement with a project of this nature before a full plans application was formally submitted?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you expect a contractor or an architect to ask for your input on particularly the overcladding proposals as part of the pre-application advice or input from you?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you think at this time that the full plans
application was coming rather late in the day?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you get the sense that it would have been better to
have involved you at a much earlier stage so that you had had input from a Building Control perspective into the full plans application before it was submitted?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, were you aware at this point -- so early September 2014 -- that RBKC's planning department was considering Rydon's proposal to install ACM polyethylene-cored panels as the rainscreen instead of zinc panels with a metal honeycomb core?
A. I wouldn't have been aware of that.
Q. Can you help me: at that time, would you expect the planning department to flag matters like that to the Building Control department, as part of its integrated, co-operative approach?
A. As I said previously, we would have contact with the planners when they asked for advice on certain matters. It wasn't -- I'm not aware of any policy. There may have been a policy but I wasn't actually aware of it. As I say, with planners, they would come to me occasionally with plans, for example if they were altering a listed building and they were concerned about a particular type of construction. But generally, the planners didn't consult us on a regular basis.
Q. I mean, would you expect the planning department to come to you and ask for your view as a Building Control
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officer where something like the panels on the exterior of an overcladding system were to be changed from zinc to aluminium?
A. It would have been good if they had.
Q. Well, it would have been good if they had.
A. Yes.
Q. But did you expect them to do so at the time as a matter of fact?
A. As I say, my contact with planning officers was they would come to us when they felt it was necessary.
Q. Right.

Was there any communication, to your knowledge, between the planning department and the Building Control department within RBKC about Grenfell Tower at around this time?
A. No, not to my knowledge.
Q. Can we then inch forward in time to \{RBK00052478/6\}, please. This is another record of a visit, 5 September 2014, and it copies into the document an email from you, Mr Hoban, to Simon Lawrence and Simon O'Connor of 5 September, and it's labelled an interim site visit.

Did an actual site visit take place on that date, do you think?
A. I would have to see my diaries. That's why I was asking
for my Outlook calendar to confirm that.
Q. Right.
A. I believe there -- it would have happened that day, but
without access to my Outlook calendar or the other --
I can't confirm that.
Q. I mean, clearly, somebody who had compiled this thought
that your action was an interim visit by reference to
this email.
A. That would've been me.
Q. I'm sorry, could you repeat what you just said?
A. I said that would have been me, I believe I would have
put that. I think I was still waiting for -- well, you
can see it's unsatisfactory I'm still waiting for
information, I believe.
Q. I follow.
If we can go to page 7 \{RBK00052478/7\}, we can see
that you're sending, as part of that entry, the email,
or you're recording the email, from Neil Crawford to
Simon Lawrence, copied to Paul Hanson. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Which says that Paul Hanson is a fire engineer and best
placed to answer questions regarding the dry riser and
AOVs, and then your email above that that we saw earlier
on.
A. Mm.

157
Q. Looking at those two together, are you saying there that all queries should come to you first?
A. Yes, so that I'm aware what's going on on the project.
Q. Yes, exactly. The question is: did Rydon and Studio E comply with your request after you had made it clear to them?
A. I think sometimes there was direct contact with Paul.
Q. I see.

Now, moving on in time to later in September, can we go, please, to \{RYD00018742\}. This is an email from Neil Crawford to you of 24 September 2014, and it attaches a zip file containing a pack of drawings. It's also copied to Paul Hanson and Simon Lawrence, as we can see. Now, this is about seven weeks after the full plans application had been submitted on 4 August.

Was this the first time that you'd received drawings relating to the project, other than those that had been marked up by Mr Hanson at the end of December 2013?
A. Yes.
Q. In the second sentence of the email, he says:
"I believe yourself and Paul Hanson sat down earlier in the year and did an initial appraisal of the proposed layout changes to the lower levels with Bruce Sounes from our office."

Is that correct? Had you done that?
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A. That's the meeting I was referring to earlier .
Q. I see. Do you remember when earlier in the year you had done that initial appraisal?
A. I can't recall. As I say, there may be records in Paul Hanson's files --
Q. Right.
A. -- on that.
Q. Do you remember whether that appraisal covered the design, construction or make-up of the overcladding system proposed?
A. That I couldn't tell you.
Q. Looking at this pack of drawings that comes in, did you review this pack when it came in?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you take notes about the drawings or on the drawings?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you recall in general terms what your impression was about the quality or the completeness of the drawings that were submitted?
A. They weren't complete.
Q. Now, these drawings were issued to you clearly outside the statutory five-week time limit for a decision on the full plans application. Did that concern you?
A. It did concern me that I wasn't getting information from
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them. In my view, the original application wasn't a valid application because it wasn't complete, but our office would accept just a form as a valid submission.
Q. Was there any policy within the Building Control department concerning compliance by surveyors with the five -week time limit?
A. I don't know whether there was anything written down. Generally we would work to those timetables, but as I say, with this particular project, the drawings weren't there and, as I say, we were waiting for information, and I was trying to work with the contractor and the architects.
Q. Was there any policy within the Building Control department for enforcing compliance by applicants with the time limit, so for example rejecting applications that were out of time?
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. What was that policy for enforcement?
A. Well, I don't know whether it was written down, but if ... sometimes if I had an application and there was no drawings, I would actually write down that, "Rejection, please submit details A, B, C, D, E, F G".
Q. Do you know why you didn't reject the full plans application --
A. At this stage --
```

Q. -- even though it was out of time?
A. -- because I was trying to work with --
Q. Right.
A. -- the contractor and Studio E.
Q. Now, Ms Menzies says at paragraph 326 of her report --
just for the reference, it's {BMER00000004/101} -- that
you should have rejected the full plans application due
to a lack of supporting documentation to enable the
application to be decided within the statutory time
limit. Do you agree with that?
A. In hindsight, yes, but as I say, at the time I was
trying to work with them.
Q. Yes, I understand. Okay.
Now, before we look at the details of these
drawings, I just want you to look at the last sentence
of Neil Crawford's email. He says:
"I know you like to go through the drawings on an
agreed process of release rather than just being swamped
with everything at once so I am just sending the
following drawings to start with."
Now, if we go to his statement, I do want to show
you this, this is {SEA00014275/17}, please, I would like
to show you paragraph 40 on that page, and he says
there, in the middle of the paragraph:
"Building Control set its own agenda for checking
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    off items, and it made it clear to me that I would be
    contacted should further information be required."
        So that's what he said in his witness statement.
        On \{Day11/142\} he told us that that reference was
        a reference to his conversation with you on site in the
        week of 25 August 2014.
            Do you remember saying something along those lines
        to --
    A. No --
    Q. -- Mr Crawford at that time?
    A. No, I don't.
    Q. Is it right that you told Neil Crawford that you didn't
        want to be swamped with everything at once?
    A. We would have it generally in stages, that's how it
        would work, but I don't actually recall actually saying
        those words. When I was dealing with the academy, as
        I said, things came in stages.
Q. Did you tell him that your workload was particularly
    heavy at this point and that therefore --
A. I don't believe I did.
Q. Right.
    Do you agree that only asking or only getting things
        in pieces, tranches, runs the risk that relevant
        information might be missed or might not be given to you
        because the relevant professionals are waiting for you
to ask for it, in other words when you were ready you would take on more?
A. No, as I say, it's their responsibility to provide us with information, and I was chasing them for information, and -- I don't -- perhaps "chasing" isn't the word. I did mention it on numerous occasions. As I say, it's sort of highlighted with the calculations. They didn't come in until whatever date. So I was always after them for information, and I think it was "Yes, it's coming".
Q. Let's now look at the drawings contained in the zip file that Mr Crawford attached and sent to you on 24 September 2014. Can we please bring back document \{RYD00018742\}.

Now, I just want to start with a general proposition.

The Inquiry's experts, by whom I mean Ms Menzies, Dr Lane and Mr Hyett, each of those experts to the Inquiry have looked at this zip file and come to the conclusion that the drawings listed in the covering email don't match the drawings in the zip file .

Did you yourself do any checks of the drawings that you had in the zip file against the list to see if there were discrepancies?
A. No, I don't believe I would have. I would have asked
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for somebody to process these drawings, so that I would have a number -- as I say, I don't know whether I actually emailed Paul Hanson this or whether I actually got them printed and filled in a consultation form, because there's a formal consultation form that I have to fill in and send to the fire regulations group when consulting with them.
Q. Right.

Did you note that the drawings named in the list were missing from the zip file, or some of them were?
A. No, I don't believe I did.
Q. For example, did you note that fire access plan 1279 SEA (08) 100b, which is listed as the second drawing --
A. I can't recall.
Q. -- was missing? You didn't.

Let's just go to an example of what those drawings did show. Can we go to \{RYD00018750\}.

Before you do, this is drawing 1279 (05) \(100 \operatorname{Rev} 00\) south elevation, and that's the sixth drawing down under "Basic Plans".

Can we just go to that. The email says it's included, and this is that drawing.

Did you generally check the revision numbers for drawings to see if they matched the covering email?
A. Sometimes I did, sometimes I didn't.
Q. Right, okay.
Looking at this drawing, can we just zoom in on the
top left -hand side. This is the south elevation. We're
going to have to do our best, I think, with this, unless
we can make it a little bit clearer, but I want to show
you item 5 in the top right-hand corner. I can read it
to you. Item 5 says -- perhaps we can't zoom in any
further -- "Zinc spandrel panel for cladding to
residential floors ", item 7 says, "Zinc crown elements",
and item 9 says, "Zinc column cladding".
Do you remember seeing a drawing like this at that
time telling you that zinc cladding panels were
proposed?
A. Yes.
Q. You do?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, it doesn't say what kind of panel, whether it's
a zinc panel with a metal core or zinc with a composite
core, which did exist. Did you think to yourself at the
time: well, what kind of panel is this?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. You did think it, did you?
A. I believe so.
Q. Did you ask anyone at the time: what kind of panel is
this? 165
A. I can't recall .
Q. Right.

Were you aware that there were available in the market two kinds of zinc panels, at least two kinds, one with a honeycomb core, in other words a metal inert core, and one with a composite core?
A. No.
Q. There is also no mention here of any type of insulation that would be installed behind the panel. Did you spot that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you take that up with anybody?
A. I did. I was waiting for details.
Q. Did you say to anyone at the time, "Well, this drawing is incomplete because it doesn't tell me what the insulation is"?
A. As I say, I was waiting for further details on --
Q. Yes, that wasn't quite my question.

Did you actually say to anyone, "What's the insulation? I don't see it on the drawing"?
A. I can't recall.
Q. Right.

How would you be able to assess if the cladding was likely to comply with B4 of the Building Regulations if you didn't know the type of zinc rainscreen panel or the
insulation being proposed?
A. I think the contractor told me what they were using at some stage, and obviously on site I could see that they were using Celotex when it arrived on site, whatever date that was.
Q. Well, that is looking forward in time, and we'll come to that. But at this stage, you're given these drawings and you can see what you can see and you can see what you can't see.
A. Yes.
Q. My question is: did you take up at that stage with either the architect or Rydon the fact that you did not see what kind of, for example, insulation was being --
A. I asked for more details.
Q. On the insulation specifically?
A. On the job.
Q. Right.
A. On the job.
Q. Let's move on. \{SEA00000231\}, please. This is a few days later, 29 September 2013. This is an email from Neil Crawford to you in which, if we go to page 3 \{SEA00000231/3\} of that document, we can see that there is an email to you:
"John,
"Please see attached the current Exova Study which
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was written prior to the Fire Strategy Rev B changes and also attached the correspondence with Exova relating to the Rev B changes which we will modify accordingly ."

When that came to you, did you read the Exova outline fire safety strategy version 3 ?
A. I would assume so, I can't -- as I say, I can't -- it doesn't stand out.
Q. Right.

Do you think you made a record of your thoughts or comments about it anywhere?
A. I may have highlighted something on it. I would have sent this on to Paul as well at that time.
Q. Right.

Let's just look at the document he sent you. We can't see from the face of the email what it is he's sending you, but from another document we can, and it is \{CST00000702\}, please. This is the Grenfell Tower outline fire safety strategy, issue number 3 ,
7 November 2013.
Just looking at its first page, does it trigger a recollection that this is a document you've seen before?
A. As I say, I can't remember, unfortunately.
Q. You can't remember?
A. No.
```

Q. Right.
Let's look at page 9 {CST00000702/9} and see if this
triggers a recollection. I would like you to look,
please, at paragraph 3.1.4 under "Compliance with B4
(external fire spread)". Now, this was your domain.
A. Yes.
Q. "It is considered that the proposed changes will have no
adverse effect on the building in relation to external
fire spread but this will be confirmed by an analysis in
a future issue of this report."
When you received this document on
29 September 2014, did you notice that? Did you notice
that paragraph?
A. I was aware of that, that statement, but whether it was
at that particular time, because I'd seen it in the
initial fire strategy.
Q. The initial fire strategy for --
A. Or some -- sorry, using my hands there.
Q. Let me see if I can help. You had received issue 2,
which had been dated }24\mathrm{ October 2013, or rather it had
been received by Building Control; do you think you had
seen that?
A. I had seen that.
Q. Right.
A. As I say, this one, I feel I would have read it, but
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    I can't say that I read it on a particular day.
Q. Did you come to any conclusion about whether this
    document, so far as you can recall it at all, was
    sufficient for the purposes of the full plans
    application?
A. No, it would be ... sorry, could you repeat the
    question, please?
Q. Yes.

When Mr Crawford sent you this document, and I know you say you can't remember reading it, did you have any thoughts at the time about whether it was sufficient for the purposes of the full plans application?
A. It was part of it.
Q. Right.

We know that no future analysis on B4 was ever carried out after November 2013.
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you note the fact that it had been promised?
A. I may have. What I would say is when I was issuing the certificate at the end, I may not have gone back to the file and done things as I should have done.
Q. I think it would follow from that answer that you never as a matter of fact went back to Rydon or Studio E and asked for this report to be updated with a future analysis?
A. No, I don't think I did.
Q. Do you know why that is?
A. As I say, at the end there was a lot of outside influences going on, and I was having difficulty in dealing with things generally, due to family matters that were going on at that time. And, as I say ...
MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, I'm in the middle of a line of questions, but I think it's probably the right time for a break.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.
We will have a bit of a break now, Mr Hoban. THE WITNESS: All right.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We will come back at 3.40, please, and again, please don't talk to anyone about your evidence while you're away. Thank you.
(Pause)
3.40 , then, please.
(3.25 pm)
(A short break)
(3.40 pm)

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, Mr Hoban, ready to carry on? THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: I don't know ...
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.
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(Pause)
Right, just take your time. Would you like to go out for a moment?
THE WITNESS: No, I'll be ...
(Pause)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Shall we have a couple of minutes out?
THE WITNESS: No, I'll be okay.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Sure?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: There's no rush.
THE WITNESS: In relation to my last answer about not asking for the fire strategy, I don't know whether it would be appropriate for me to tell you what was going on in my personal life at that particular time.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, can I suggest we just pass over that for the moment.
THE WITNESS: All right, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think we all understand that you were going through a very difficult time, and we don't want to pry into your private life at all.
THE WITNESS: All right, thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So just take a moment to compose yourself.
THE WITNESS: Right, sorry.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. & 1 \\
Right, yes, Mr Millett. & 2 \\
THE WITNESS: Right, sorry. & 3 \\
MR MILLETT: Mr Hoban, it's quite all right. & 4 \\
Just coming back to where we were before the break, & 5 \\
and just focusing on the question of the cladding & 6 \\
package, is it right that no comprehensive cladding & 7 \\
package was ever provided to you? & 8 \\
A. Not full comprehensive cladding package. & 9 \\
Q. And I think it's right that you didn't request one & 10 \\
either? & 11 \\
A. I did ask for information. & 12 \\
Q. Yes. & 13 \\
A. I did -- as I say, I repeatedly asked for information. & 14 \\
I found out certain information myself through talking & 15 \\
with the contractor and actually seeing what was done & 16 \\
on site . & 17 \\
Q. Can we look at a document, \{RBK00048693\}, please. Now, & 18 \\
just to put it in its precise time context, this is & 19 \\
an email from you, Mr Hoban, of 29 September 2014 to & 20 \\
Mr Hanson, and you forward to him on that day the email & 21 \\
that you had had from Neil Crawford on 24 September. & 22 \\
You can see that. You ask him, you say: & 23 \\
"Please may I have your observations under Part B of & 24 \\
The Building Regulations, for the attached proposals for & 25
\end{tabular}
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the Grenfell Tower Redevelopment."
Now, this is, looking at the timing, quite curious, because you can see that you get the Exova OFSS that we saw before on 29 September, as we saw before, and this is an email you're sending to Mr Hanson ten minutes before you got that. So it looks on the emails that you were asking him for his observations only a few minutes before you actually then receive the outline fire safety strategy.

My question is: did you intend Mr Hanson to comment on B3 and B4, or the whole of B?
A. Well, the whole ... well, it was B1 and B5 but when you're considering B1 and B5, you also look at other aspects.
Q. Now, as I say, just to be clear, we saw earlier that you had received on the same day, 29 September, the email from Neil Crawford at 16.37. That was \{SEA00000231\}, where he sent you the Exova OFSS, the outline fire safety strategy version 3 . Here we see you ten minutes before that, at 16.27 , asking Mr Hanson for a view.

Did you send the outline fire safety strategy that you then got ten minutes later to Mr Hanson?
A. That I don't know.
Q. Right. It looks as if you could have done, but we don't see any record of you doing so. Can you help us with
\[
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\]
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why you didn't do so on the face of it?
A. I'm fairly certain that I would have sent it, because in order for him to consider it, it would have, you know, been part of that.
Q. How would you have sent it to him if not by email? Would you printed it off and put it on his desk?
A. I may have.
Q. Right.
A. Generally what happened, as I say, there was a special form to be filled in as well that we had. It was a standard form that we would have to fill in, which I would generally hand write, and that was part of the process we had, together with drawings.
Q. Now, we can see you sending this request on 29 September. It appears that Paul Hanson didn't reply to this request for comments until 10 November 2014. I' ll show you a document in a moment to show you that. Does that correspond with your recollection, that long gap?
A. Yes, yeah, from what I've read through, the information that I've received.
Q. Let's have up \{RBK00033895/2\}, please, this is his response on 10 November 2014. This is over a month after you had asked him to give comments. Do you know the reason for the delay?
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A. That would have been ... I can only surmise it was his workload at the time.
Q. Right.

It deals with "B1 - means of escape observations".
There is nothing in here about B3, and critically nothing about B4, "External fire spread", and about the cladding. Do you know why that is?
A. That's a standard form that he uses, and, as I say, I was responsible for B2, B3 and B4, but as I mentioned to you, when considering B1, you have to look at other aspects of the scheme as well, and it -- as a whole.
Q. Yes. But you told us earlier that you hadn't limited, as indeed we see from the email --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- Paul Hanson to comments on B1; you had said part B, you made it very clear, but here you're only getting comments on B1.

Given that he was your go-to man for fire issues on B4, why did you not go back to him and say, "Well, Paul, this is fine for B1, but can I please have your comments on B4"? Why didn't you do that?
A. I can't --
Q. You don't know?
A. I can't answer that question.
Q. Let's look at page 3 \{RBK00033895/3\} of that document.

About halfway down page 3, under the heading "New non residential access to residential stairway", he makes a comment about the boxing club, connected to a single stairway, and then a comment about the fire consultants providing 0.4 square metre natural ventilated lobby connections. He then says:
"Therefore RBKC are not in a position to approve the proposals at this stage due to the need for the design team to establish an acceptable extract rate for the powered lobby ventilation system and the provision of ventilated lobby protection to all stairway connections to residential and other uses."

Now, can we take it from that statement that Paul Hanson's view, limited though it was to B1, was that the full plans application could not be approved at that stage?
A. Yes, or he couldn't send it to the LFEPA for consultation.
Q. If it couldn't be approved at that stage or even be submitted to the LFEPA for consultation, it couldn't be approved at all?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You also went to site on 29 September 2014, and we can
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see that from your note, \{RBK00052478/6\}, please. Halfway down that page, we can see this date entry, and the action is described as a "Pre-start visit ", and you say:
"Visited site met project manager had brief discussion about the project. Workmen still presently carrying out demolition works nothing to check at time of visit. Demolition works to go on for at least another month. Also informed the project manager that I had just received up to date details of the works."

Was the reference to receiving up-to-date details of the works a reference to Neil Crawford's email of 24 September 2014 in which he sent you that zip file full of drawings?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Do you remember whether you looked at those drawings before going to site?
A. No, I don't recall.
Q. Okay.

What did this second " brief conversation about the project" involve, do you remember?
A. I can't recall it --
Q. Right.
A. -- now. As I say --
Q. We then go on in time to the full plans decision, which
is a different topic. You say in your second statement -- and just for reference purposes, to save time, this is paragraph 11 on page 4 of your second statement \{RBK00050416/4\} -- you say that the RBKC document P6 sets out the formal process used by the Building Control department for the full plans application. That's right, is it?
A. Yes, that's --
Q. If you go to the P6, this is \{RBK00052486\}, please, it looks as if this is a P6.
A. Yes.
Q. This one is dated 10 August, issue 3, prepared by John Allen. Is this a standard form?
A. It's a form that he -- the P6 is a document that was produced by John Allen.
Q. I see.

If we look at the fourth box down, in the last sentence, it says:
"For FPA [ full plans application] meaningful response made to applicant within 10 days from receipt of application and noted on Acolaid."

Do you see that?
Do you agree that that did not happen with the Grenfell Tower full plans application?
A. Correct.
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\section*{Q. Why is that? Why didn't it happen?}
A. I was waiting for observations from Paul.
Q. Right. From Paul Hanson?
A. Yeah.
Q. Which you then didn't get until --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- mid-November, or 10 November?
A. No.
Q. And that was only on B1.
A. Yeah.
Q. And even then it wasn't enough to pass the application.
A. As I say, "meaningful response" was -- could mean a meeting or a request for details . That's how generally it was in our office.
Q. Right. You say, "That's how generally it was in our office ". I wonder if that is quite right.

Can we look at what John Allen says. Can we go to his first statement which is \{RBK00033930/3\}, please. On page 3 , we go to paragraph 15 , and he says:
"As a surveyor the typical process of checking a Building Regulation application would be to sort out the drawings you need to look at, look at each drawing, make a list as you go along, thinking through the building regulations and then usually write a letter suggesting amendments with a commentary which includes reference to
the building regulations. For example, one might tell the applicant that they have not provided structural calculations."

Do you agree with that summary?
A. No, that wasn't the case in our office .
Q. At all?
A. I believe -- that's my view.
Q. So let's just go through this in bits, if we can.

Would you say that it wasn't a typical process within the RBKC department that you would sort out the drawings you needed to look at?
A. Well, you would do that, but it wasn't -- yes, you would do that, but that -- there was requesting information as well, or having a meeting would be classed -- to discuss proposals, that would be classed as a meaningful response.
Q. I'm getting the sense from your answers that that was an iterative process a little bit?
A. Sorry?
Q. You wouldn't do it in one go; you might do it in stages.
A. Yeah.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Hoban, would it be fair to understand that Mr Allen here is assuming that you have
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got a full plans application in front of you with all the plans?
A. Yeah, yeah.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And then he is describing how typically you would go about processing it?
A. Yes. Yes. Yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: If you did have all the plans, would you do it in this way?
A. Yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Or would it typically be done in this way?
A. Yes. As I say, that wasn't always the case.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Ah, well, I understand.
A. That's --

MR MILLETT: So just following up on that, when he says "the typical process" is a process typical when applied to the full plans application. How typical was it that you would have a full plans application to which this process could be applied?
(Pause)
A. In most cases it would. It would depend on the size of the project, obviously.
Q. Yes. "In most cases it would", I think is your answer.
A. Yes.
Q. So does that tell us that Grenfell Tower was
an exception to the norm?
A. No. As I say, there were cases where you got little information.
Q. Was it your experience that you wouldn't have a fully compliant or a full full plans application, capable of being submitted to this typical process that's described where it was a design and build contract, in your experience?
A. Well, the only one I can relate to is the academy and the leisure centre, and I took those over at -- when they were coming out of the ground, and I did a schedule for both when they were coming out of the ground.
Schedules hadn't been done prior to them starting.
Q. Right. I don't think I've quite got a feeling for where that answer takes me.
A. As I say, the full plans applications for those went in and there weren't schedules. I was asked to -- not asked; I was instructed to deal with them and then had a meeting and the process started.
Q. So that was a design and build contract, as we know.
A. Yes.
Q. So your experience of design and build contracts, it seems, certainly on KALC --
A. Is very limited to those particular projects.
Q. I see. All right.
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Do you agree that a part B review of a full plans application for Grenfell should have comprised a detailed scrutiny of the fire safety proposals set out in the plans and documents provided by the applicant?
A. Yes.
Q. And an assessment by you, as the Building Control officer, as to whether there was adequate detail to allow an assessment to be made?
A. Yeah.
Q. And a record of the review noting any variations from recognised guidance?
A. Well -- yes. As I say, they had certain information on the plans, but, as I say, as we know, they changed.
Q. Should it have comprised also an assessment of whether the proposal was generally compliant as regards B1 to B5, so as to allow the fire authority to have a proper consultation?
A. Yeah, as far as I can recall, there was two consultations with the Brigade.
Q. My question is a more general one: should the full plans application have given you enough information to allow consultation with the fire authority in relation to compliance with B1 and B5?
A. Yes.
Q. And should it have comprised enough information so as to
allow the issue of a decision notice as a record of the approved or rejected works?
A. Yeah.
Q. Yes, thank you.

When you carried out your review, did you use a checklist?
A. Yes, as I mentioned, that -- sorry, that document that I mentioned checked --
Q. The plans checker?
A. Yeah.
Q. I see.

Did you record your review anywhere, whether on that plan or in your notebooks or ...?
A. As I say, it would have been on the sheet.
Q. Right.
A. And then there would be a list of information.
Q. Now, we've seen the memorandum prepared by Paul Hanson in response to your question, limited though it was to B1. Did you prepare a similar memorandum in respect of B2, 3 and 4 ?
A. Yes.
Q. You did?
A. Yes.
Q. In a formal way, in the way we've seen it with him?
A. No, it would be -- well, cutting and pasting clauses .
Q. Right. But did you prepare a formal standalone paper report?
A. As far as I'm aware, yes.
Q. Do you remember when you did that?
A. When that application came in, in the -- was it the September/November time.
Q. Well, it came in on 4 August 2014.
A. Oh, sorry, did it? Sorry.
Q. Yes.

In your second statement, if we can have paragraph 12 at page 4 \{RBK00050416/4\}, please, the question is:
"Following receipt of the application form for the refurbishment works to Grenfell Tower from Studio E dated 5 August 2014 [that should be 4 August], was a decision notice ever issued? If not, why not?" Your answer is:
"I do not know if a decision notice was ever issued.
" If it was not then I do not know why not.
I completed the standard form (From 60) and a schedule of conditions and informatives in order for the decision notice to be processed by the Building Control Business Support Team."

Now, we know that this was around 18 November 2014 because I think you emailed Studio E to say a decision
notice would be forwarded shortly. We have that at \{SEA00014276/25\}. There is no need to bring it up.

Can we take it that you had concluded, based on the information provided to you with the full plans application, that the project was likely to comply with the Building Regulations?
A. No, well, there would be conditions, it would be, I don't know, for example --
Q. Right.
A. -- the fire time on the building was two hours, linings shall be in accordance with such and such of the Building Regulations, cavity barriers shall be provided in accordance with section 9 , is it? It would be conditions.
Q. Do you remember where you put those conditions, was that into the standard form P60?
A. It would be attached to that.
Q. Yes, I see.

Now, we've just looked at Paul Hanson's view on the B1 proposals, and that was that RBKC couldn't approve them for the reasons he sets out.

Can you explain how it was that you were able to pass the full plans application, although with conditions attached?
A. It would be subject to conditions.
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Q. I see.

Now, we've seen some of the information provided with respect to the façade, and we noted zinc for elements of the exterior, but also the absence of any mention even of insulation on the south elevation drawing I showed you.

Given that that drawing that you had on 24 September 2014 didn't contain sufficient detail about the type of cladding panel or insulation to be used, how could you conclude that the full plans application should pass, albeit with conditions?
A. We would do that as a general standard. For example, if structural details hadn't been submitted, we would make that a condition.
Q. Right. Do you remember whether you did make the provision of details of the insulation a condition?
A. I can't recall. I would have said that the insulation would be in accordance with -- have you got -- could you call up the Building Regulations for me, please?
Q. Right.
A. Is that possible?
Q. Yes, it's CLG -- well, which part do you want to see?
A. Maybe section 12 .
Q. Section 12. I think that's \{CLG00000224/95\}, from memory. I think I showed you \{CLG00000173\}. There it
is. That's one of them.
A. Insulation and cladding systems shall be in accord -I can't actually remember the words, but, as I say, as a general it would be, you know, "The cladding system shall be in compliance with section 12 , please provide further information". I can't actually, as I say, recall what was --
Q. No. I mean, cutting to the point, do you agree that you should either have requested further details of the façade works, including the specifications for the insulation itself, or else rejected the full plans application because the applicant had not demonstrated that the works complied with B4?
A. That's how it was done in -- at that time. I understand what you're saying, but --
Q. Do you agree with me?

\section*{(Pause)}
A. In hindsight, yes, but, as I say, we would issue conditional approval with conditions.
Q. Well, let's just go back to --

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Can I just interrupt you for a moment, Mr Millett?
MR MILLETT: Yes.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I understand what you are saying about a conditional approval and so on. What steps
would you take to make sure that the condition was properly satisfied?
A. By site inspection and further information coming in.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Would you expect the designer to submit drawings or a specification identifying, for the sake of argument, the insulation?
A. Yes, I did ask for that, but, as I say, I found out what they were using on site.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Ideally you would want to know what it was before they started using it.
A. Well, ideally, yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I'm wondering whether you acquired a specification of the relevant material before --
A. I don't recall receiving a specification.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So the condition wasn't really a condition of satisfying you that the material was appropriate; it was a condition of using the appropriate material.
A. Yeah, yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: With the risk, of course, that they might not.
A. Well, as I say, I was looking at what was on site and then I checked against the BBA certificate.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. Right, thank you, that's helpful.

Thank you very much.
MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, I'm just going to follow that up a little more, if I can, with questions I've already got on this point.

Can we go to the email to Mr Crawford, 10 November 2014, which is \{RBK00033895/2\}, I think we've looked at that before. I just want to show it to you again. This is what was sent to Neil Crawford, and we've seen that this doesn't mention any lack of detailed information on B4. We can take that as read because it only deals with B1 and, I suppose, B5 as well.

Do you know why, at this stage, Neil Crawford was not told to provide detailed information which would help you decide whether the design was compliant with B4?
A. It would have come out in the decision notice.
Q. Right. Let's move on to the decision notice.
A. Sorry, I haven't got the ... my email to Neil Crawford up. I've got the memorandum form 53. As I say, it says "This scheme has been sent for consultation ".
Q. Yes. Well, in relation to the decision notice itself, that would be done on a form 60 or from a form 60, wouldn't it?
A. Yes.
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Q. As I think you have said.

Can we just have a look a blank form 60,
a pro forma, which is \{RBK00052487\}. I think this is no more than what it says there; it's a full plans decision tick sheet.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that? There doesn't appear to be any room on there for identifying what the conditions are.
A. It would be a schedule attached.
Q. Oh, I see, right. We can't locate, or rather RBKC I think are themselves unable to locate, the actual form 60 for Grenfell Tower.

Do you remember whether you did attach a schedule of conditions to the form 60 that you filled out?
A. As far as I'm -- as far as I can --
Q. Did any of those conditions relate to the façade, do you think?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember what they were?
A. As I say, I can't now, as I say.
Q. Right. Did you record those conditions anywhere other than on the form 60 itself?
A. The schedule.
Q. Right.
A. In the schedule.
\begin{tabular}{llr} 
Q. We've seen no record at all of any conditions in any & 1 \\
documents, either in correspondence or in any documents & 2 \\
or in any emails, and we certainly haven't seen any & 3 \\
emails from you to Neil Crawford showing that conditions & 4 \\
were attached, certainly which related to the façade. & 5 \\
Are you quite sure that you did impose conditions? & 6 \\
A. I'm as certain as I can be. & 7 \\
Q. Right. With that certainty, can you help us with what & 8 \\
the conditions were -- & 9 \\
A. I can't. & 10 \\
Q. -- doing the best you can with your recollection? & 11 \\
A. I can't, to be -- sorry, I would be only guessing. & 12 \\
Q. Was it not important to record the conditions elsewhere, & 13 \\
\hline other than on the P60, so as to make sure that you could & 14 \\
check that they were complied with as the project & 15 \\
progressed? & 16 \\
A. It would have been important, yes. & 17 \\
Q. Did you do that? & 18 \\
A. I don't know. & 19 \\
Q. Right. & 20 \\
\hline Once you had filled out the P60 form, what did you & 21 \\
A. It would go into a basket. & 22 \\
Q. A basket? & 23 \\
A. Yes, or a tray -- & 24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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Q. Right.
A. -- for the business support group to process.
Q. I see. Did you check if it had been issued after you put it in this basket?
A. I can't recall.
Q. Would you normally follow up to check whether a conditional P60 pass of a full plans application had been issued formally?
A. Not all the time.
Q. Given that you were responsible for this project, do you accept that you should have checked whether the decision notice had actually been issued?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Would a decision notice normally be signed or stamped or authenticated?
A. No, I think it was -- just had a normal -- I believe it had a facsimile of a signature, as far as I can recall.
MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, I'm going to turn to a totally different topic -- well, it's a topic which emerges from the last one, I think. I certainly won't finish it tonight, but I can certainly make some headway with it in the next 15 or 20 minutes or so, if we may.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Let's see how far we can get.
MR MILLETT: May we? Thank you. That'd be very good.

I want to examine with you, Mr Hoban, the façade, and in particular the cladding, by which I mean the external rainscreen panels, and the insulation, the two major elements of the exterior wall system.

We have already looked at the initial information provided with the full plans application. I'm going to start now, then, with the NBS specification.

You told us this morning, almost in passing, that you had never seen a copy of the NBS specification for this project. Is that correct?
A. I hadn't -- I don't believe it was sent to me. I may have seen some of it on site when I was visiting, but I can't be absolutely certain.
Q. Right. So you may have done. Right.

Now, the drawings, do you remember, refer to sections of the NBS specification?
A. What drawings are these, please?
Q. Well, the drawings that you were sent on 24 September.
A. Does it actually say that on the drawings, or --
Q. Well, we can --
A. Sorry.
Q. Let's see how we go with this.

Let me try it this way: do you remember seeing drawings which referred to, for example, H92 in a little ring?
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A. Yeah.
Q. You do? All right.

Now, let's then start with the rainscreen cladding panels.

We know from other documents that formal planning permission was granted eventually, I think, on 30 September 2014 to change the panels from zinc to aluminium composite material or ACM. We know that from the records.

At the time, did anybody within RBKC alert you to that development?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Right.

Now, in your second statement at paragraph 25 -and, for the transcript, this is \{RBK00050416/7\} -- you said that you had access to the planning section of Acolaid, but that you can't recall if that access was restricted.

Did you ever check Acolaid to see what materials had been approved for use on the façade?
A. No.
Q. Why is that?
A. I generally wouldn't --
Q. Right.
A. I would only go to planning drawings if I was aware of
a contravention and get planning enforcement involved.
Q. Did anyone from the project -- when I say from the project, I mean the professionals involved on it such as Studio E or Rydon -- tell you that the rainscreen panels, the materials or product, had changed from zinc to aluminium composite?
A. That I can't recall, but obviously I found that out at some stage. I don't know whether I was ... I know I met Ben Bailey, because he's the young person that
I described in my note. Whether he told me it was ACM or somebody else, I can't recall.
Q. Right. Well, Ben Bailey, as we know, came into the project as Harley's project manager from early February 2015.
A. Right.
Q. The change to aluminium composite panels, ACM, was essentially approved at the end of July 2014 and formally approved by planning at the end of September 2014, so five months before that.

My question is: did anyone from Studio E or Rydon tell you in 2014, either in July or in September or early October maybe, that the rainscreen had changed from zinc to ACM?
A. I can't recall.
Q. Would you expect a contractor or a designer to update 197
you about changes to the materials to be used --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in the façade?
A. Yes, I would.
Q. If they hadn't done so, would you keep tabs on the project to make sure that you at least could satisfy yourself that no changes had been made, or would you just rely on them to tell you, and if they didn't tell you, you would assume that it was as per the application?
A. Well, no, I could clearly see when the works was being done that it wasn't zinc, it was ACM.
Q. Indeed, and we'll come to that, but I'm just interested to know whether anybody actually just told you at the time that the material had changed.
A. As I said, I don't recall.
Q. Right.
A. But obviously the original drawings had zinc on there and I could tell that it wasn't zinc.
Q. Right. You could tell that it wasn't zinc, yes.

Did you ever see any drawings that said ACM?
A. That I can't recall.
Q. In your second statement, page 13 \{RBK00050416/13\}, can we just go to that, I want to show you paragraph 38 a and ask you a question about it. You say there, at the top
of the page:
"... from reports shown on television and given in the press, evidence given to the PI [that's the public inquiry, I think] by expert witnesses on the subject my belief is that the Celotex insulation boarding and filler material used on the project was not of limited combustibility as per Appendix A paragraph 9 of Approved document B."

What do you mean there by the term" filler material"?
A. Making-good filler material.
Q. Right. So you don't mean -- just to be very clear about this -- do you, the core of the ACM panel?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Right.

Was it your view at the time of your work on the Grenfell Tower project that filler material was making-good material as opposed to the core of a panel?
A. Correct.
Q. Right.

Now, you go on in that paragraph to say:
"The external surfaces of the ACM cladding used/fixed did not meet with the provisions set out in 12.5-12.6 B4 Approved Document B."

When you say the external surface of the ACM
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cladding did not meet with those provisions, what do you mean by that?
A. That it wasn't class 0 . It was my understanding, and from the information I had at the time, that the ACM was class 0 . In the news they said it wasn't class 0 , so I'm reporting on what was said in the press and on television .
Q. I follow.

In your first statement, if we can just go back that, \{RBK00033934/6\}, please, I would like us to look together at paragraph 57, and you say there, in answer to the question:
"Was the exterior of the building (including the cladding, insulation, fixings and windows) compliant with relevant building regulations, fire regulations, other legislation, British Standards (including testing requirements), guidance and industry practice?"

You say:
"Based on the information I had at the time it was my understanding that it was compliant. However, the cladding has now been shown not to be complaint as a result of the cladding that was specified would be used was not in fact used."

Is it your evidence that you were never told that the panels had been changed from zinc to ACM ?
```

A. As I say -- well, I go back to what I said before. I'm not certain of that, but I actually -- I could see that they weren't zinc. As I say, I saw that on site. Whether I was ever told or -- I don't recall receiving an email saying that it had been changed.
Q. Right.
A. But it became aware -- I became aware through my inspections. Whether I, as I say, was told at the time, I can't recall.
Q. Did it not surprise you, when you did first see Reynobond ACM panels on the building, that you hadn't been told at any earlier stage that those panels were going to be on the building, whether by Studio E or by Rydon and whether in a document or plan or drawing?
A. At the time it didn't surprise me, because things change.
Q. Things change, though, in accordance with the process, and my question is: you hadn't seen anything in the documents to alert you to this change; when you did see it on the building eventually in 2015 , did it not surprise you that the external surface had changed from zinc as per the drawings to aluminium as per what was on the building?
A. As I say, it's not something that comes to mind.
Q. Right.

```

\section*{201}
A. So ... as I say, things ... I' ll give you an example, if I may, with regards the sports centre. They were going to use a particular type of staircase, and then all of a sudden they got a different staircase in.
Q. Right.

Let me put it this way: given that you had seen that ACM was on the building, having been told in the drawings -- and we saw the south elevation -- in the September of 2014 that it was going to be zinc, did it not make you wonder what else Studio E or Rydon hadn't told you about the external façade and its make-up?
A. At the time it didn't register .
Q. Right. Should it have done?
A. In hindsight, yes. What I would say, I'd worked with a lot of the professionals on this project on the other schemes, and I had a confidence in them, you know, the architects and the various other professionals and Exova.
Q. Yes.
A. So I had ... you know, I'd dealt with them and I considered that they knew what they were doing.
Q. Right.

Do we take from that answer that, because of your experiences with Studio E and Exova on the KALC project, you had perhaps a closer working relationship than
otherwise you might have done?
A. Yes.
Q. And did that lead you to trust them?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know that Studio E had never done an external overclad of a high-rise building?
A. No, I didn't. And in evidence that had come out since, it was always my understanding that Exova were fully involved in the project. There's a number of emails that show Mr Ashton copied in. Nobody ever came back to me and said, "Well, we're not using Exova". It was always my understanding that there was a team there dealing with the project.
Q. Did you take comfort from the fact that Mr Ashton was involved in --
A. Yes, yes.
Q. -- some way?

On Studio E, were you a little bit softer on them than you otherwise might have been because of your relationship?
A. No, no, but, as I say, I'd worked with them for quite a considerable time on the academy, and I considered that architects would -- it was reasonable to expect that they would know and understand Building Regulations.

\section*{203}
Q. Was it not your job to hold them to the highest standards of compliance with the Building Regulations, completely independently and ruthlessly?
A. In hindsight, yes, but I'd worked with them on the other project and, as I say, working with them there, you know, I spent a lot more time because of the -dealing with it because I was only dealing with one area. In this particular instance, I'd worked with them over a period of time and it was my understanding that they knew what they were doing.
Q. Now, just before we finish for the day, Mr Hoban, you mentioned a number of times in your evidence that you saw the BBA certificate --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- for these panels, in other words the Arconic --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- manufactured Reynobond PE 55 --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- ACM panels. We're going to come to it in due course,

I think tomorrow now.
Do you remember the circumstances in which you saw that document?
A. I would have looked it up at some stage.
Q. Were you ever given it by anybody on the project?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you know what prompted you to look it up on the 1 project?
A. To check that -- to see if it was class 0 .
Q. Do you know at what stage you did that, do you remember?
A. No, I can't --
Q. Presumably it was after having seen it on the building?
A. Yes.
MR MILLETT: Yes.
Mr Chairman, as I say, we are mid-topic, but
I think, given it's been a long day --
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It sounds as though it might be a good point to break.
MR MILLETT: Given that it's 4.30, I think it probably is . SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. 14
Well, Mr Hoban, we're going to break there for the 15
day. I'm afraid I'm going to have to ask you to come 16
back tomorrow for some more questions, but I think you 17
were probably expecting that. 18
THE WITNESS: Yes, I was. 19
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: After you leave the room, please 20
remember not to talk to anyone about your evidence or 21
anything to do with it over the break. 22
THE WITNESS: Yes. 23
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We will resume at 10 o'clock 24
tomorrow morning, please. 25
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Thank you very much, would you like to go with the 208 usher, please.

\section*{(Pause)}

Thank you, 10 o'clock tomorrow.
MR MILLETT: Thank you.
( 4.30 pm )
(The hearing adjourned until 10 am on Thursday, 1 October 2020)

MR JOHN HOBAN (sworn)
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[^0]:    Finally on this, there are some exhibits with your police statement. Just for the transcript, these are \{MET00071032\} to \{MET00071033\}, and that's in the record now.

    Final question on this: have you discussed the evidence that you're going to give today with anybody before coming here?
    A. Just my counsel.
    Q. Right. When you say just your counsel, do I take it that you didn't discuss the substance of the evidence you're going to give?
    A. Oh, no, no.
    Q. Thank you.

    I'm going to start with some questions about your qualifications, Mr Hoban, if I may.

    Your qualifications and experience are set out, I think, in your CV, which you exhibited as JEH/6 to your second witness statement. Can we look at that, it 's \{RBK00050415\}, please. You won't find that in the file.
    A. I won't?
    Q. No, look on the screen.
    A. Yes.
    Q. Is that your CV?
    A. Can we scroll up a bit?

