

Grenfell Support and legacy: shaping priorities together

Session summary

13 July 2026



If you would like a translated copy of this document please contact futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

আপনি যদি এই নথির একটি অনুবাদিত অনুলিপি চান তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk এর সাথে যোগাযোগ করুন।

የተተረጎመውን የዚህ መረጃ ይዘት ከፈለጉ እባክዎ በ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

إذا كنت ترغب في الحصول على نسخة مترجمة من هذه المعلومات، فيرجى الاتصال بـ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk أو

«اگر یک نسخه‌ی ترجمه شده از این اطلاعات را می‌خواهید، لطفاً با ایمیل futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk

Se desejar uma versão traduzida desta informação, por favor entre em contato com
futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

Haddii aad rabto nuqul dukumeenti ah oo la turjumay fadlan la xidhiidh futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

Si desea una versión traducida de esta información, póngase en contacto con futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk.

ናይዚ ሓበሬታ ፍሉይ ወይ ዝተተርጎመ ስሪት ምስ እትደልዩ፡ በጃኹም ብ futuregrenfellsupport@rbkc.gov.uk ርኽቡና።

Overview

In July 2026, the Independent Scrutiny Function held a community session to reflect on the first year of the Community Support programme.

The session explored:

- what residents felt had worked well
- what had made accessing support more difficult
- what the wider council could learn from the programme
- what residents wanted to see in the Year 1 annual report
- what should be prioritised as the programme develops

This document summarises the key themes raised during the session, bringing together common messages, while recognising that people have different experiences and perspectives.

What residents felt helped the programme work well

Residents shared positive feedback about the Grenfell Partnership Team's approach, seeing this as distinct from their experience of wider council services. Key features of this are:

- consistent, patient relationships with staff who take time to listen and understand individual circumstances
- face-to-face contact, particularly for those who find council systems difficult to navigate
- practical support that helps resolve real-life issues, rather than offering standardised solutions
- clear and accessible communication about what support is available and how to access it
- flexibility in how support is delivered, including adapting when something is not working
- giving residents more choice and control over the types of support that contribute to their recovery
- being open and realistic about what the programme can and cannot influence

Residents also recognised that the Grenfell Partnerships Team had been set up differently from many other council services, which had allowed it to develop a more responsive and community-focused approach over time.

Where residents felt could improve

While residents were positive about the GPT's approach, they also identified areas where the programme could become more flexible and inclusive.

Residents highlighted the following challenges:

- **Eligibility boundaries:** Some people felt the postcode eligibility criteria were too rigid and excluded residents who had been closely affected by the Grenfell Tower fire.
- **Flexibility of support:** Residents felt predefined activities or forms of support would not meet everyone's needs. They wanted greater autonomy and flexibility in how community activity funding is used.
- **Range of community activities:** People asked for more activities for older residents, including arts, social and wellbeing opportunities.
- **Investment in local spaces:** Residents raised the importance of continued investment in community venues, libraries, leisure facilities and other spaces that help reduce isolation.
- **Managing expectations:** Residents wanted communications to explain more clearly what the programme is intended to achieve and which issues sit outside its remit.

Residents' experiences of the wider council

Residents drew a strong distinction between their experiences of the Grenfell Partnerships Team and their experiences of some other council services.

The main challenges raised about wider council services were:

Services not working together: Residents felt that different departments were not always communicating or coordinating effectively. This could lead to people repeating their circumstances or being passed between services.

Standardised rather than tailored support: Some residents felt they were offered solutions that did not reflect their individual circumstances. Housing, supported housing and housing allocations were highlighted as areas of concern.

The burden placed on residents: People described the emotional and practical toll of repeatedly telling the council what was not working. Residents wanted services to identify and address recurring issues more proactively.

Residents' experiences of the wider council (cont.)

Limited local visibility: Residents felt more council staff should spend time in North Kensington and understand the communities affected by their decisions.

Listening without visible action: There was a clear message that engagement needs to result in action. Residents wanted problems resolved earlier and clearer accountability where services fail.

What the wider council could learn

Residents believe the strengths of the Community Support programme should not sit in isolation. They felt that the approach taken by the Grenfell Partnerships Team and Grenfell Community Advocacy Team (particularly their emphasis on listening, flexibility and relationship-building) should inform how the wider council operates.

Residents described a gap between their experiences of the programme and their experiences of other services, and felt that bridging this gap should be a priority.

Suggested areas for action included:

- strengthening Grenfell-related induction and training for new and existing staff
- ensuring contractors and organisations working locally understand the Grenfell history and respect its continuing impact
- including relevant expectations in recruitment, contracts and tender processes
- creating more opportunities for council staff to visit the area and hear directly from residents
- sharing learning from the GPT and GCAT across departments
- identifying patterns in advocacy and housing cases
- explaining what action has been taken in response to recurring concerns

What the wider council could learn (cont.)

Residents emphasised that learning should lead to visible and practical change. They wanted to see clearer evidence that feedback is being acted on, and that lessons from the programme are shaping how services are designed and delivered across the council.

Accountability and community voice

Residents wanted clearer routes through which the community could influence council decisions and hold services accountable.

Residents raised the need for:

- **An ongoing community forum:** Some residents suggested a representative forum that could maintain dialogue with different council departments and coordinate community views.
- **Clarity about existing structures:** People wanted to understand whether forums such as the North Kensington Forum or Grenfell Assembly still existed and what role they currently play.*
- **Clearer accountability:** Residents wanted stronger mechanisms for challenging poor decisions or services and ensuring that concerns lead to consequences and improvement.
- **Political and organisational commitment:** People felt that lasting change requires commitment from across the council, rather than depending only on the efforts of the GPT or individual staff members.

*The council has updated us that a Grenfell Assembly was last held in February 2026 and there is a commitment to hold further meetings, although dates for the next sessions have not yet been scheduled. As the ISF we will encourage the Council to schedule an assembly meeting and ensure all community members are invited.

Wider concerns about the local area

The discussion went beyond the Community Support programme and reflected wider concerns about life in North Kensington.

Residents raised concerns about:

- the affordability of the area
- the loss of (affordable) local shops, markets and community facilities
- gentrification and local people feeling displaced
- safety and crime
- whether local development benefits existing residents
- being able to access essential services and facilities close to home

Residents wanted local people and their lived experiences to be central to decisions about the future of the area. Wellbeing, belonging and affordability should be treated as priorities.

What residents want from the annual report

Residents wanted the annual report to be honest, transparent and accessible. They were clear that it should not read as a public relations exercise or only present positive information. People wanted the report to explain:

- the overall size and reach of the programme
- how many people had accessed different forms of support
- demographic information, including who had and had not been reached
- how funding had been allocated and how much remained
- what had worked well and what had not
- what had changed as a result of residents' feedback
- how the report itself had been developed and by whom

Residents suggested using clear charts, graphs and honest case studies to make the information easier to understand and bring people's experiences to life.

There was support for producing both a detailed report and a shorter summary, recognising that people will want to engage with the information in different ways. Physical copies should also remain available for residents who prefer them.

Overall community message

Residents recognised the care, patience and commitment demonstrated by the Grenfell Partnerships Team and Grenfell Community Advocacy Team.

They particularly valued support that was:

- visible
- personal
- responsive
- flexible
- practical
- grounded in residents' circumstances

The strongest message was that these ways of working should not remain limited to the Grenfell Support programme.

Residents want a wider council that:

- understands the continuing impact of Grenfell
- works effectively across departments
- sees decisions from the perspective of residents' lives
- acts on feedback
- resolves problems earlier
- communicates honestly
- remains accountable for what happens next

How the ISF will use this feedback

The Independent Scrutiny Function will use the themes raised during the session to inform:

- the Community Support section of the Year 1 annual report
- scrutiny priorities for Year 2
- discussions with the GPT about future delivery
- work to share learning with the wider council

The ISF will also seek further information about the community forums and accountability structures raised during the discussion

Sharing your views and staying in touch

The summary reflects what we heard during the session, but the conversation does not end here. Residents, bereaved families and survivors can continue to share their views in the following ways:

Contact the Grenfell Partnerships Team

You can provide feedback about the programme or ask questions about the support available by emailing FutureGrenfellSupport@rbkc.gov.uk

Contact the Independent Scrutiny Function

You can share feedback directly with the ISF by emailing isf@involve.org.uk or calling 020 3745 4334

Take part in future scrutiny and reflection sessions

The ISF will continue to create opportunities for residents, bereaved families and survivors to reflect on how the programme is being delivered, discuss what is and is not working, and identify where change is needed. Details of future sessions and how to take part will be shared in advance through the Grenfell Partnerships Team.

You can be involved as much or as little as you choose, and this can change at different points depending on your interest and capacity. There is no obligation to participate, and your decision about whether to take part in scrutiny will not affect your ability to access support through the programme.