



Triple A Solutions RPEEPS Regulation  
Stakeholder Feedback  
Residential PEEPs Guidance

7<sup>th</sup> August 2025



[www.3asolutions.tech](http://www.3asolutions.tech)

# RPEEPS Regulation Stakeholder Feedback - Residential PEEPs Guidance

Section	Comment	Proposed change
You should add the paragraph number here.	Add any commentary or observations here. They should be clear and specific. You should follow any observations with a specific proposal.	CHANGES WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED WITHOUT A RELEVANT PROPOSAL. Be specific and ensure you reference the paragraph, line or sentence along with any text changes you feel are appropriate. For changes with a broader scope, provide as much detail as you can.
1.2	The Grenfell recommendation was specific:  "That the owner and manager of every high-rise residential building be required by law to prepare personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) for all residents whose ability to self-evacuate may be compromised (such as persons with reduced mobility or cognition)."  The Regulation and the guidance document fails to use the term PEEP and it is unclear the difference between a Personal Emergency Evacuation Plan (PEEP), a term well known in the industry, and an 'Emergency Evacuation Statement'.	Define the difference between a PEEP and an Emergency Evacuation Statement and explain the rational for changing the industry terminology which is referenced in all relevant guidance, which will require amending.  To save the costs for all organisations publishing guidance, state that the term 'Emergency Evacuation Statement' and PEEP are interchangeable.
1.1	The Introduction fails to highlight the requirements of the Fire Safety Order (FSO) Article 14(2)(b) that all persons must be able to evacuate the building as safely and as quickly as possible and that it does not exclude disabled people or unannounced, general needs residential accommodation. It also fails to reference all current guidance stating that PEEPs are required.  FSO Article 14: <a href="https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uk/si/2005/1541/article/14">https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uk/si/2005/1541/article/14</a> LFB Fire Safety Note: <a href="https://www.london-fire.gov.uk/media/mhennwd/gn_66_if_format.pdf">https://www.london-fire.gov.uk/media/mhennwd/gn_66_if_format.pdf</a> Fire Risk Assessment: Means of Escape for Disabled People: <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5e5401e90e0754d1dedf20/9446_Means_of_Escape_v2.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5e5401e90e0754d1dedf20/9446_Means_of_Escape_v2.pdf</a> Fire Risk Assessment: Sleeping Accommodation: <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5662d2f6be9a012ca94cb/9281_Sleeping_Accommodation_v2.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5662d2f6be9a012ca94cb/9281_Sleeping_Accommodation_v2.pdf</a> Simultaneous Evacuation Guidance - Fourth Edition: <a href="https://nfcc.org.uk/new-edition-of-the-simultaneous-evacuation-guidance-seg-published/">https://nfcc.org.uk/new-edition-of-the-simultaneous-evacuation-guidance-seg-published/</a>	Include reference to the existing legal requirement and reference the requirement of the following guidance and/or when these will be amended to reflect the new Regulation:  LFB Fire Safety Guidance Note: Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. Section 2 Action Required by the Responsible Person – no reference to excluding disabled residents from an RPs responsibility.  BS9991:24 Fire safety in the design, management and use of residential buildings – Code of practice, Section 50.2.  Fire Risk Assessment: Means of Escape for Disabled People, Section 1.1 Legal Overview.  Fire Risk Assessment: Sleeping Accommodation, Section 1.15 Help for disabled people with special needs.  Simultaneous Evacuation Guidance – Fourth Edition, Section 10 Evacuation Considerations for Vulnerable Persons - which refers to the statements made in Section 1.1 Legal Overview of the Fire Risk Assessment: Means of Escape for Disabled People.
1.3	No consultation was undertaken with Disabled People's Organisations prior to the draft Regulation being drafted as per the LinkedIn post by Ark Workplace in January 2025, see: <a href="https://www.dropbox.com/sc/fi/qdp2imwzts3kfkftgh/Draft-Fire-Safety-Regulation.png?rikey=pkvgj0z0815qhwfK5ns7vd4o&amp;st=m2bnqjc&amp;dl=0">https://www.dropbox.com/sc/fi/qdp2imwzts3kfkftgh/Draft-Fire-Safety-Regulation.png?rikey=pkvgj0z0815qhwfK5ns7vd4o&amp;st=m2bnqjc&amp;dl=0</a> .  This is in breach of Section 5.47 of EHRC's Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty.	Include the steps that have been taken in drafting the regulation to meet Section 5.7 of the Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty: England.
1.3	The reference to 'local initiatives' is disingenuous as meeting fire safety and evacuation of disabled and vulnerable people are well established protocols to remove discrimination for disabled people unable to respond to or evacuate in the event of a fire in line with the legal requirement of the FSO, which does not exclude disabled/vulnerable people, general needs, unannounced buildings from the requirements.	Amend the guidance to reflect that PEEPs in residential buildings have been embedded by many housing providers as standard process and procedures.
1.4(c)	PEEPs are well established protocols for removing discrimination and for meeting the legal requirements of the FSO.  All relevant guidance will need to be amended for consistency. This includes the BS 9991:2024 Fire safety in the design, management and use of residential buildings – Code of practice, Section 50.2 that states: "The duty holder should verify that a PEEP is in place for any residents, staff or frequent visitors who have been identified as requiring one."	Define the difference between a PEEP and an Emergency Evacuation Statement and explain the rational for changing the industry terminology which is referenced in all relevant guidance, which will require amending.  To save the costs for all organisations publishing guidance, which require amendments, state that the term 'Emergency Evacuation Statement' and PEEP are interchangeable.
1.5	Where there is a conflict, primary legislation prevails over subordinate Regulations: <b>Fire Safety Order</b> >Article 6: Inclusion of domestic premises resulting in increased areas to be enforced by increasing costs and resources for FRS inspection and Home Safety visits. >Article 8: Exclusion of duty to take general fire safety precautions where the disabled/vulnerable person is unable or refuses to pay to mitigate a hazard. >Article 14(2)(b): Exclude disabled/vulnerable residents from the requirement of being able to evacuate as quickly and as safely as possible.  The guidance only references the FSO and fails to reference other primary legislative conflicts, which include but are not limited to and will require amendment: <b>Equality Act 2010:</b> >Chapter 2: Removal of fire safety from prohibited conduct relating to discrimination. >Section 20(7): Exclusion of prohibition on charging for a reasonable adjustment for fire safety such as beacon fire alarms, assisted escape devices, additional fire protection and suitable mobility scooter charging points. <b>Housing Act 2004</b> >Article 8: Exclusion as a reason for enforcement action where the disabled/vulnerable is unable or refuses to pay to mitigate a hazard. >Article 10: Exclusion of hazards where the disabled/vulnerable person is unable or refuses to pay to mitigate the hazard.  <b>The Housing Health &amp; Rating System:</b> <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a799834ed915d0422069a0a/150940.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a799834ed915d0422069a0a/150940.pdf</a> >The Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS) requires landlords to reduce fire risks in homes by ensuring working smoke alarms, safe electrics, and clear escape routes. Local authorities can take enforcement action if serious risks are found. See: Sections 24 & 25	Highlight that primary legislation prevails where there is a conflict with regulation and include all the amendments and timescales of primary legislation, such as:  Fire Safety Order: Article 6, 8 and 14(2)(b) Equality Act 2010: Chapter 2 and Section 20(7) Housing Act 2004  Include proposed amendments of requirements of the Housing Health & Safety Rating System to resolve the conflicts to protect housing providers as a result of an inspection.  List the guidance documents references PEEPs and requiring amendment including but not limited to:  BS9991:24 Fire safety in the design, management and use of residential buildings – Code of practice, Section 50.2 – very specific about the requirements. Simultaneous Evacuation Guidance – Fourth Edition, Section 10 Evacuation Considerations for Vulnerable Persons - this cross-references the statements made in Section 1.1 Legal Overview of the Fire Risk Assessment: Means of Escape for Disabled persons guidance which the General Counsel considers inapplicable. Fire Risk Assessment: Sleeping Accommodation, Section 1.15 Help for disabled people with special needs – detailed guidance on the requirements
2.1	The restriction the application of the Regulation to buildings 18 metres plus and those 11+ metres with a simultaneous evacuation strategy in place is not understood. A resident unable to evacuate on the 13th floor of a 15 metre building is at the same risk as a person in a similar location in a building 18 metres plus.  N.B. There are no height restrictions on the requirements of Article 14(2)(b) that "in the event of danger, it must be possible for persons to evacuate the premises as quickly and as safely as possible". This includes disabled/vulnerable evacuation impaired residents in buildings with a stay put policy if a fire is in their flat or in the vicinity on fire.  The Local Government Association (LGA) EES+ Consultation Response states in response to Q1 that: "This duty to disabled residents applies in all blocks, not just those with simultaneous evacuation. Due to this existing duty for social landlords, the LGA believes that the Home Office, in order to meet its duty under Article 50 of the Fire Safety Order and provide appropriate guidance to social landlords, must produce guidance that covers duties under Equality Act 2010 as well as any fire regulations. We have shared with government details of Leading and Junior Counsel's opinion which explain the Part 3 Part 4 Equality Act legislation. The option in the Impact Assessment that suggests expanding the application of EES+ to all buildings over 18m as well as simultaneous evacuation buildings, remains problematic due to its reliance on height. As was expressed in the previous consultation on PEEPs, height is not a good indicator of risk for residents who cannot self-evacuate: a resident on the sixth floor who cannot self-evacuate is not at significantly lower risk in a 6-story block than in a 30-story block. Treating disabled residents differently in buildings of different height is likely to be unsustainable in the face of legal challenge under equality law. Height should not be a decisive factor in deciding whether a building should be mandated to enact EES+ - rather all buildings should be included.  If we do not mandate EES+ in buildings with stay-put policies, this legislation represents a step backwards in terms of regulation of the built environment. Given that PEEPs were previously a requirement in social housing but would not be replaced with EES+ under these proposals in this category of building, disabled residents would be left with less legal protection than before."	Provide the rational for restricting the regulation to height of building and evacuation strategy in line with the FSO and what the defence in law there will be under Equality Law.  Include a defence in law to negate the LGA's legal advice or include guidance that an evacuation plan is required for all evacuation impaired residents irrespective of the evacuation policy to enable them to move away from immediate danger if they are threatened by a fire.

## RPEEPS Regulation Stakeholder Feedback - Residential PEEPs Guidance

3.1	<p>The statement that 'relevant person' is someone for whom the domestic premises is their only or principal residence conflicts with the description of a 'relevant resident' in FSO Part 1, 2. Interpretation which states "relevant persons" means—</p> <p>(a) any person (including the responsible person) who is or may be lawfully on the premises; and</p> <p>(b) any person in the immediate vicinity of the premises who is at risk from a fire on the premises, applies to all people legally on the residential premises."</p> <p>As an example, in practice the guidance suggests that a disabled child with contact arrangements that split his/her time between parental homes or a visitor frequently staying with a family should be left without an evacuation plan.</p>	<p>Include in the guidance how the FSO will be amended to reflect the new interpretation of 'relevant person' and the timescales on how the FSO will be amended to resolve the conflict.</p>
3.2	<p>The statement that RP must use reasonable endeavours to identify relevant residents is open to a wide interpretation. N.B. Phase 2, Chapter 6 The Deceased of the Phase 2 Grenfell Tower Report details that RBKC/TO were fully aware that 15 of the 19 disabled resident who died were evacuation impaired.</p> <p>The LGA EEIS+ Response states that their EEIS+ response that:</p> <p>"The LGA recognises the importance of having appropriate systems and mechanisms in place to ensure people with disabilities can navigate challenges and are not placed at a disadvantage due to impairments. This underlines the importance of being proactive in terms of identifying people, which would also better fulfil the Equality Act considerations, as well as offering comprehensive support to people with a range of disabilities.</p> <p><b>Government guidance on this question is urgently required."</b></p> <p>See: <a href="https://www.local.gov.uk/parliament/briefings-and-responses/lga-eeis-consultation-response">https://www.local.gov.uk/parliament/briefings-and-responses/lga-eeis-consultation-response</a></p>	<p>Include guidance on the identification of disabled/vulnerable residents to include data mining of leaseholder and accessible parking applications, social care records etc.</p>
3.2 c	<p>The FSO makes no distinction on the requirements based on tenure and it is difficult to understand how the FSO can be amended without compromising fire safety for all residents and firefighters.</p>	<p>Include guidance on how the FSO will be amended without impacting on fire safety for all residents irrespective of their tenure or time spent in the building.</p>
3.3(a) & (b)	<p>Refer to comments in 3.1</p>	<p>Include in the guidance how the FSO will be amended to reflect the new interpretation of 'relevant person' and the timescales on how the FSO will be amended to resolve the conflict.</p>
4.1	<p>Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) is the term used for a person with a cognitive impairment who cannot consent to their care arrangements. Although DoLS are normally associated with care homes and hospitals, they are also implemented for residents in general needs and supported living environments.</p>	<p>Amend the guidance to provide information on the types and organisations who can be DoLS representatives. Provide guidance on this subject and highlight the role of Safeguarding Adult Boards (SABs)</p>
5	<p>The guidance states that a trusted person can engage on behalf of the disabled resident but fails to highlight the duty of care relating to cuckolding etc. There is also no reference to trusted persons in relation to children under the age of 18.</p>	<p>Provide guidance on prevention of cuckolding and trusted persons in relation to children under the age of 18.</p>
6.1	<p>This is a repeat of 3.2, please refer to comments in 3.2</p>	<p>Either remove this para or para 3.2</p>
6.4	<p>The duty is on the Responsible Person's (RP) to identify disabled and vulnerable relevant persons. Please refer to comments in para 3.2.</p>	<p>Refer to proposed change in 3.2</p>
7.3	<p>An RP would be extremely unwise not to mitigate a hazard that has been identified and it is difficult to identify a measure that would not be reasonable and proportionate.</p>	<p>Provide guidance on what mitigation could be seen as unreasonable or disproportionate.</p>
7.5/7.6	<p>Charging for a disabled person for a reasonable adjustment is prohibited under Equality Act 2010, Section 20(7).</p> <p>If the RP identifies a hazard but fails to mitigate the risk, the RP could be held accountable for unmitigated hazards in the event of a fire that causes injury or death to the disabled resident, other residents or firefighters. There is no other guidance that states that hazards rely on the resident paying for the mitigation of risks. An example is Section 6.15 of the Lacob Housing - Fire Safety which states that all hazards should be removed where it is practicable to do so and where they cannot be removed they should be reduced as far as possible.</p> <p>Hazards include overloaded sockets used for charging of mobility scooter, hearing impaired residents unable to hear an alarm; unsafe storage of oxygen cylinders/combustible incontinence pads; unable to afford an assisted escape device.</p> <p>Hazards will be formally documented but remain unmitigated if a disabled/vulnerable resident is unable or refuses to pay raises the following risks:</p> <p><b>Coroner's Inquest</b> following a fatality caused by a documented but unmitigated hazard with potential of referring the Responsible Person for criminal prosecution.</p> <p><b>Risks to the building, other residents and firefighters.</b></p> <p><b>Insurance:</b> Damage to the building resulting in insurance claims being refused.</p> <p><b>Claims for discrimination under the Equality Act 2010.</b> N.B. the upper band on the Vento scale £36,400 to £60,700 (the most serious cases) per claim, with the most exceptional cases capable of exceeding £60,700. See: <a href="https://www.crossandsolicitors.com/site/hr-hub/injury-to-feelings-awards-Vento-guidelines">https://www.crossandsolicitors.com/site/hr-hub/injury-to-feelings-awards-Vento-guidelines</a></p>	<p>The guidance must make it clear that all identified risk are mitigated irrespective of whether a resident can or is willing to pay or state which guidance documents will be amended to reflect the Regulation.</p> <p>The guidance must also make it clear which mitigation strategies would be considered a reasonable adjustment for a disabled person and which ones are not (e.g. additional electrical points for a mobility scooter or replacement of a dangerous cooker/fridge.) N.B The EHRC has advised a disabled resident that an assisted escape device (AED) could be seen by the courts as a reasonable adjustment.</p>
7.9	<p>An evacuation plan for a disabled or vulnerable person normally documents from when the person enters the common area therefore any amendment to the FSO to include domestic premises will have the unintended consequence of having to include the plan on how to exit the domestic premises, which does not currently apply.</p> <p>Although an amendment to remove conflicts between the Regulation and the FSO is relatively easy through the mechanism of the Fire Safety Act 2021, this is not the case for amendments to the Equality Act 2010 and the Housing Act 2004.</p>	<p>A timescale should be included as the assumption is that the primary legislation will be in place prior to the Regulation being in force otherwise the regulation will be unenforceable. Guidance must be given to the knock-on effect of including domestic premises to the FSO.</p>
7.11	<p>The guidance conflates PEEPs and PcFRAs, which have two different functions. The London Fire Brigade Fire Safety Guidance Note GN93 states that a PEEP and a PcFRA have two completely different functions, see: <a href="https://plumis.co.uk/sites/default/files/2022-03/GN_93_LFB.pdf">https://plumis.co.uk/sites/default/files/2022-03/GN_93_LFB.pdf</a>.</p> <p>Although a PcFRA is a welcome additional layer of protection for disabled and vulnerable relevant person, on its' own, it does not meet the Grenfell Tower Inquiry recommendation.</p> <p>Functions of a PcFRA &amp; a PEEP</p> <p>A PcFRA is a simple risk assessment process, completed with the residents, that considers their individual characteristics, behaviours and capabilities. This is to identify those that may have a 'higher risk' from fire, and to help consider what actions/control measures may need to be taken to reduce those risks to a reasonable level.</p> <p>whereas</p> <p>A PEEP is a documented plan of action agreed with residents of flats/rooms that have a mobility impairment or reduced capacity to self evacuate in the event of a fire.</p>	<p>Amend the guidance to include a clear definition of both PcFRAs and an emergency evacuation plan (PEEP) stating that on its' own a PcFRA does not meet the requirements of FSO Article 14(2)(b).</p>
7.15	<p>The guidance fails to highlight the requirements of FSO Article 21: Training which makes it a legal requirement that "The responsible person must ensure that his employees are provided with adequate safety training—</p> <p>(a) at the time when they are first employed; and</p> <p>(b) on their being exposed to new or increased risks because of—</p> <p>(i) their being transferred or given a change of responsibilities within the responsible person's undertaking;</p> <p>See: <a href="https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2005/1541/article/21">https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2005/1541/article/21</a></p>	<p>Highlight in the guidance the requirements of FSO Article 21: Training</p>

## RPEEPS Regulation Stakeholder Feedback - Residential PEEPs Guidance

7.17	There is no reference to the requirements of the FSO Article 21: Training, 1  See: <a href="https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukli/2005/1541/article/21">https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukli/2005/1541/article/21</a>	Include guidance on the necessity that employees undertaking PcFRAs include suitable and sufficient instruction and training on the appropriate precautions and actions to be taken by the employee in order to safeguard himself and other relevant persons on the premises.
7.17	The guidance states that a check should be made with insurance companies to determine who should carry out a PcFRA etc but fails to provide advice that an organisation should also check on the insurance companies approach regarding identified but unmitigated hazards that cause a fire resulting in an insurance claim.	Include in the guidance advice that organisations should confirm with their insurance companies that identified but unmitigated hazards causing a fire will not affect a claim.
7.18	Triple A Solutions have been developing strategies and PEEPs since 2009 that include volunteer assistance and was part of the Home Office working group discussing the use of volunteers in an evacuation. Section 9.3 of the NFCC Temporary Change to Simultaneous Evacuation 4th Edition recognises that residents can manage an evacuation and cross-references the Fire Risk Assessment: Means of Escape for Disabled People, Section 1.1 Legal Overview in Section 10.  See: NFCC Temporary Change to Temporary to Simultaneous Evacuation 4th Edition: <a href="https://www.fia.uk.com/news/national-fire-chiefs-council-nfcc-publish-4th-edition-of-the-simultaneous-evacuation-guidance.html">https://www.fia.uk.com/news/national-fire-chiefs-council-nfcc-publish-4th-edition-of-the-simultaneous-evacuation-guidance.html</a>  The statement on the use of volunteers contradicts the statements that it is the residents decision of what to do in the event of a fire.  There is a request for RPs to contact the National Resilience and Fire Safety Unit with details of new practices however although the toolkit provides examples of organisations developing PEEPs, these include Westminster Council, Waltham Forest, Lewes District and Eastbourne Borough Council – Homes First. These would be a good resource for MHCLG to understand the use of volunteers.	Provide guidance on the use of volunteers to include safeguarding and cuckolding. Include reference to referrals to Safeguarding Adult Boards (SARs).
7.22c	The Regulation excludes RP employing paid staff with the primary purpose of supporting evacuation under Residential PEEPs (such as a Waking Watch type arrangement). However, many buildings either already have these in place or employ staff as concierge.	Include reference to Health & safety at Work Act 1974 and the Management of Work Regulations 1999 for Waking watch personnel and employees undertaking the evacuation of 28.3% of disabled residents in social housing and 16.4% in privately owned buildings.
7.23	The Toolkit provides examples of PcFRAs but fails to provide any of an 'Emergency Evacuation Statement' despite the examples which include organisations who have implemented PEEPs. The lack of examples of the information that an Emergency Evacuation Statement' should contain will cause confusion and inconsistent information being provided to FRS.	Include a template for an Emergency Evacuation Statement in the toolkit.
7.25(b)	Applying the Residential PEEPs Social Housing Fund only to social housing renters introduces inequitable fire safety as the fund will exclude leaseholders and private renters residing in in-scope buildings.  The allocation of taxpayer funds to assist social housing providers in meeting their legal commitments for PEEPs raises substantial concerns about duty and accountability. This strategy jeopardises the accountability of housing providers, enabling them to evade their obligations by relying on government funds instead of fulfilling their legal responsibilities.  Implementing such a plan places supplementary administrative costs on civil servants, reallocating resources that could be more effectively employed elsewhere. Social housing providers possess a fundamental legal duty to guarantee the safety of all relevant persons, including vulnerable and disabled individuals, independent of financial incentives to comply with basic regulatory criteria.	Amend statement on Residential PEEPs Social Housing fund to include funding assistance for all residents of in-scope buildings.
7.25(d)	If the resident is required to pay for the cost, it is likely that the resident will purchase their own AEDs from the internet, which may be unsuitable for either or both the disabled person or the physical location. The risk is that an unsuitable device will block the means of escape route endangering other residents and access by fire fighters.  Please note: One size of AED does not fit all situations with an AED depending on the: • <b>Occupant (height, weight) and their impairment:</b> AEDs have occupant weight limits. E.G. A person with Tourette's/brain injury requires an AED to restrain limbs while a person with a spinal injury/osteoporosis requires additional support etc. • <b>Operator of the AED:</b> A friction-based AED requires the operator to be heavier than the occupant to control the AED on the stairs. If not, then a tracked AED with a braking system or a motorised AED is required. • <b>Physical environment:</b> Many AED will not turn the corner on landings or on certain stair surfaces with potential for blocking the escape route for all residents/firefighters.  Procurement of AEDs by organisations involve a formal procurement process, including: • Identification of a supplier with a range of devices. • Checks on quality (CE marking), insurance etc. • Training and maintenance provided as part of the procurement. • Supplier demonstration that the AED meets the requirement in full.  Many unregulated devices, new and second-hand, are available for purchase on the internet. Disabled/vulnerable residents required to fund their own AED will purchase their own much cheaper AEDs resulting in: • Organisations losing control over the provision, training and maintenance of AEDS; • Unsuitable devices for the occupant, operator or the physical environment blocking the escape route for all residents and fire-fighters.	Provide guidance to housing providers about the requirement for AEDs and the risks associated with a disabled person procuring their own AED.
7.25(e)	The guidance states that the resident has the right to decline to pay the costs in which case the measure may not be implemented. This leaves the RP having identified a hazard but not mitigated it - refer to earlier comments.  Equality Act 2010, Section 20(7) prohibits the charging of a disable person for reasonable adjustments associated with their impairment.	Provide guidance on when Section 20(7) of the Equality act 2010 will be amended to enable housing providers to charge for reasonable adjustments associated with fire safety.
7.26	The RP may consider that where costs should fall, considering what is reasonable and proportionate, may differ depending on the length of stay. This does not meet the requirements of Article 14(2)(b) and it is difficult to understand how the FSO can be amended to support this without legal challenges.  See: <a href="https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukli/2005/1541/article/14">https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukli/2005/1541/article/14</a>	Amend the wording in the guidance to meet the requirements of all primary legislation.
7.29	Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans (PEEPs) are an industry recognised term since the FSO came on to the statute books in 2007. The introduction of the term 'Emergency Evacuation Statement' means that all guidance with referencing PEEPs will have to be amended to reflect this, increasing costs for Government departments, organisations such as the NFCC/FIA/FPA and housing providers.	Provide guidance that the term 'Emergency Evacuation Statement' and PEEP are interchangeable.
7.30	Section 70: Schedule 4 of the Data (Use and Access) Act 2025 introduces a new legal basis for processing personal data under UK GDPR Article 6, allowing certain "recognised legitimate interests" such as safeguarding and emergency response without needing consent. Still requiring outdated consent requirements reduces the operational data available to FRS if residents refuse to share their information in a Premises Information Box.  See: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/data-use-and-access-act-2025-data-protection-and-privacy-changes">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/data-use-and-access-act-2025-data-protection-and-privacy-changes</a>  The reference to a measure only being implemented if the resident agrees to pay risks prosecution of the RP and the housing provider. In the event of an Inquiry after a Grenfell Tower type fire, it is difficult to see how anyone involved in drafting the Regulation or the guidance could justify this approach.	Amend the guidance to reflect the new legal basis for allowing processing of personal data under UK GDPR Article 6 for safeguarding and emergency response without needing consent.  Highlight the risks to RPs and housing providers of not implementing measures if the resident is unable or unwilling to pay.

## RPEEPS Regulation Stakeholder Feedback - Residential PEEPs Guidance

7.31	The fact that an RP has formally recorded unmitigated hazards leaves them open to prosecution in the event of injury or a fatality and unpaid insurance claims - see earlier comments.	Amend the guidance to state that it would be unwise for RPs not to mitigate hazards
7.33	The toolkit fails to provide information of the content of Emergency Statements - refer to earlier comments	Include information on the content of Emergency Evacuation Statements
9.1	Mobility impaired people often visit other flats in a building and will require an emergency evacuation statement for these locations within the building.	Include reference to this in the guidance and that a plan must be developed for all locations within the building that a disabled person might visit.
9.3	<p>The FRS will have this information in advance of all disabled persons in a building and will need to operationally plan for assisting them in the event of a total evacuation of the building. This transfers the duty of care for evacuation of disabled residents to the firefighters who will require training on how to evacuate the whole range of impairments. The FIA/NFCC Code of Practice for the Provision of Premises Information Boxes in Residential Buildings, Annex A 1.8 provides clear guidance on the requirements of PIB guidance, which do not match the statements made in this Code of Practice.</p> <p>This can be downloaded from: <a href="https://www.firesectorfederation.co.uk/code-of-practice-for-the-provision-of-premises-information-boxes-in-residential-buildings/">https://www.firesectorfederation.co.uk/code-of-practice-for-the-provision-of-premises-information-boxes-in-residential-buildings/</a></p> <p>FRS will require additional funding for operational staff to follow this guidance and they will have to train significant numbers of operational staff to effect the evacuation of all disabled residents from in-scope buildings.</p> <p>The Government has stated that 28.3% of residents in social housing and 16.4% in private housing fall under the scope of this Regulation. In the case of Grenfell Tower, it is worth noting that LFB should have assigned between 75 and 125 operational firefighters just to safely evacuate the disabled residents to follow this guidance.</p>	Review and amend this guidance so that it matches that in the PIB guidance.
9.4	Placing information regarding every disabled or vulnerable person in a building in a Premises Information Box risks the safety of the person in the event that the information falls into the wrong hands.	Include guidance that any information provided in a Premises information box should be coded so that it does not identify the location of disabled and vulnerable residents in the building in case the information falls into the wrong hands.
9.6 & 9.8	<p>Please refer comments relating to 7.30 regarding the requirement for consent involving safeguarding and emergency response in Section 70: Schedule 4 of the Data (Use and Access) Act 2025.</p> <p>See: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/data-use-and-access-act-2025-data-protection-and-privacy-changes">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/data-use-and-access-act-2025-data-protection-and-privacy-changes</a></p>	<p>Amend the guidance to reflect the new legal basis for allowing processing of personal data under Data (Use and Access) Act 2025 for safeguarding and emergency response without needing consent.</p> <p>Highlight the risks to RPs and housing providers of not implementing measures if the resident is unable or unwilling to pay.</p>
9.12	<p>Premises Information Boxes are a requirement of Regulation 4 of the Fire Safety (England) Regulations for all in-scope buildings.</p> <p>See: <a href="https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2022/547/regulation/4/made#:~:text=(4)%20The%20responsible%20person%20must,any%20changes%20to%20those%20requirements.">https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2022/547/regulation/4/made#:~:text=(4)%20The%20responsible%20person%20must,any%20changes%20to%20those%20requirements.</a></p>	Remove the wording "If a secure information box is not installed..." as these are a legal requirement under Regulation 4 for all in-scope buildings as referenced in 9.14 of this guidance.
9.13 & 9.14	Please refer comments relating to 7.30 regarding the requirement for consent involving safeguarding and emergency response in Section 70: Schedule 4 of the Data (Use and Access) Act 2025.	<p>Amend the guidance to reflect the new legal basis for allowing processing of personal data under Data (Use and Access) Act 2025 for safeguarding and emergency response without needing consent.</p> <p>Highlight the risks to RPs and housing providers of not implementing measures if the resident is unable or unwilling to pay.</p>
9.15	In the event of a fire, the local Fire and Rescue Service will fight the fire, and where necessary use the information provided on residents to assist their operational plan which may include the initiation of evacuation of parts or whole of the building or otherwise undertake the evacuation or rescue of relevant residents as required. This transfers the Duty of Care for the safe evacuation of all mobility impaired residents on to the Fire and Rescue Services which risks legal claims from both disabled residents and/or firefighters if injuries occur during an evacuation using unsuitable AEDs.	Amend the guidance to re-enforce the legal requirements of the FSO on the RP and clarify FRS responsibilities for evacuation.
10.4	<p>The example emergency evacuation plan does not match Section 5 of the NFCC Premises information Box Code of Practice, which states:</p> <p>EMERGENCY RESPONSE PACK (ERP)</p> <p>5.1 The PIB is a facility for fire-fighters and the content should be restricted to information relevant for the FRS during an incident. Unnecessary and unclear information could delay the FRS response. Building plans should be A3 size and be encapsulated or placed inside plastic wallets so that they can stand up to the rigors of use. There should be two sets of all plans.</p> <p>The Emergency Response Pack contains information that is required for the purpose of operational firefighting and rescue. Accordingly, the contents need to be "tailor made" for the building and residents in question, but should always comprise, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a log book for the purpose of recording events that occur in respect of the PIB system including emergency use, system updates etc;</li> <li>• an Off The Run' notice containing details of any fire-fighting fixed installations not available for use and/or unresolved fire safety issues;</li> <li>• a Summary of information useful to the Fire &amp; Rescue Service on arrival at an incident;</li> <li>• an Orientation plan, showing the location of the building in relation to surrounding buildings and other reference points (e.g. roads) and also water supplies;</li> <li>• a building layout plan showing the internal layout, including up to date floor plans;</li> <li>• a simple layout plan (if not provided in the Orientation plan) showing water supplies for firefighting including hydrants, emergency water supplies, wet riser supplies etc.;</li> <li>• simple layout plans showing facilities of particular relevance to operational firefighting and rescue including relevant information regarding any lift(s) intended for use by the FRS;</li> <li>• information on residents with mobility, cognitive or sensory impairment(s);</li> <li>• significant fire safety issues – any compartmentation, external wall system or other fire safety issues which may affect fire behaviour in the premises;</li> <li>• a description of the current evacuation strategy, e.g., stay put, simultaneous evacuation.</li> </ul>	Amend the example building emergency evacuation plan to reflect the NFCC Premises Information Box Code of Practice, Section 5 & Appendix A.
11.1	<p>FRS will be unable to enforce for even a serious hazard if a resident is unable/unwilling to pay and are only able to enforce the Regulation after the FSO has been extended to include domestic premises.</p> <p>The Enforcement Guidance will have to be updated to reflect the Regulation.</p> <p>See: <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a79a38de5274a684690b029/guidance1enforcement2005.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a79a38de5274a684690b029/guidance1enforcement2005.pdf</a></p>	Include guidance on how the FSO will be amended to include domestic premises without impacting existing legal requirements.
12	The Toolkit provides examples of PFRAs but fails to provide any of an 'Emergency Evacuation Statement' despite the examples which include organisations who have implemented PEEPs. The lack of an example of the information that an Emergency Evacuation Statement should contain will cause confusion and inconsistent information being provided to FRS.	Include a template for an Emergency Evacuation Statement in the toolkit.