



**NFCC**  
National Fire  
Chiefs Council

c/o 71-75 Shelton Street  
Covent Garden  
London  
WC2H 9JQ  
[www.nationalfirechiefs.org.uk](http://www.nationalfirechiefs.org.uk)

Sent to: [info.bru@finance-ni.gov.uk](mailto:info.bru@finance-ni.gov.uk)

22 September 2023

## **Consultation on Fire Safety Changes to the Local Building Regulations**

The National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) is pleased to respond to this consultation, published on 03<sup>rd</sup> July 2023, regarding Building Regulations changes in Northern Ireland. NFCC is the professional voice of the UK fire and rescue services (FRSs) and is comprised of a council of UK Chief Fire Officers. This response was collated by NFCC's Protection Reform Unit and Strategy and Policy team and was drafted in consultation with our members across the UK FRS. Our response reflects their expertise and competence on the subject matter.

NFCC supports the general direction of the consultation and is glad to see improvements to the local Building Regulations. We particularly welcome the proposal to require the fitting of smoke alarms in all habitable rooms in new build properties. This proposal would be a significant safety enhancement over what is required elsewhere in the UK, and NFCC strongly supports it. It is clear that the consultation represents a significant improvement to building safety in Northern Ireland, though there are several recommendations contained in our answers where we think the regulations need to be clearer or widened in scope in order to meet today's safety standards.

One example is the scope of the proposed Regulation 37A. The regulation applies to buildings when built or after a material change of use. NFCC sees no reason that this should not apply to any works covered by Building Regulations, including extensions or refurbishments. Furthermore, we strongly disagree with the proposed scope of Regulation 37A and do not believe that buildings under 11m containing flats should be exempt from it. The provision of a building's fire safety information is absolutely necessary to enable effective management and most of the information required by the regulation should already have been generated throughout the design and construction of the building. The information will

in most cases be readily available at minimal extra cost and will in many cases represent a cost saving as it will not need to be sought out at a later date. Height does not equal risk in these cases, and we recommend that the scope of Regulation 37A be reconsidered.

NFCC is also concerned regarding the scope of the proposed Regulation 37B. The application of Regulation 37B should also be extended to cover any significant works that are covered by Building Regulations (e.g., extensions and refurbishments) regardless of whether that work is considered a material change of use or not. It is NFCC's position that sprinkler systems should be mandatory in residential buildings over 11m where appropriate, all storage and warehouses, all schools, refurbished care homes, and new hospitals. This reflects calls that NFCC has made in England.

An additional concern is the suggestion of a transitional period for the Building Regulations proposed in the consultation. We strongly disagree with the implementation of any transitional period, especially for Regulations 37A and 37B. There is no evidence to demonstrate that a transitional period is required to provide the industry and sector at large enough time to adapt to changes, and developers will only use this period to 'game' the system if it is introduced.

NFCC specifies sprinklers in this consultation response while recognising that other forms of Automatic Fire Suppression Systems (AFSS) can be used if supported by robust testing protocols. This consultation appears to use the term "sprinkler technology" in places, and "AFSS" in others. Technical Booklet E (TBE) also uses the term "sprinklers" in places. We suggest that one term be used for consistency and clarity.

Much of the proposed TBE appears to have been lifted from England's Approved Document B (ADB). ADB has not been properly reviewed since 2006, which was almost two decades ago, and it is the belief of NFCC that the document is not fit for purpose in its current form. ADB has been amended and adjusted in a piecemeal and disjointed fashion and a holistic review is yet to be undertaken. Our concerns with ADB include (but are not limited to) the fact that it provides no consideration to the management of occupied buildings or the means of escape for disabled people. ADB does not work for a risk-based regime, and we would urge further consideration to be given to the parts of TBE that are based on this outdated document. The suggestions made in this consultation response reflect NFCC's position across the UK, and we have long called for the same amendments to equivalent guidance within ADB in England and Wales.

For these reasons, whilst NFCC does not wish to detract from the magnitude of the proposed change, we are reluctant to fully endorse the consultation proposals at this time. NFCC would support the changes on a conditional basis until such a time that ADB has been reviewed and any revisions published, at which point the Building Regulations in Northern Ireland should be examined again.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "N. Coombe". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "N" and a long, sweeping underline.

**Nick Coombe**  
Head of Protection  
National Fire Chiefs Council

## Respondent Information

**What is your name?**

Nick Coombe

**What is your email address?**

[Nicholas.coombe@nfcc.org.uk](mailto:Nicholas.coombe@nfcc.org.uk)

**Are you responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation?**

Organisation

**What is the name of your organisation?**

National Fire Chiefs Council

**The Department of Finance would like your permission to publish your consultation response. Please indicate if you wish your response to be treated as confidential.**

No

**We may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for the Department of Finance to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?**

Yes

## Part A (Interpretation and General)

**Question A1: Do you agree with the proposal to require a building which becomes a 'relevant premises' (as defined in the Fire and Rescue Services (NI) Order 2006) or a building containing one or more flats with a storey more than 11m above ground level, due to a material change of use, to be subject to the requirements of new regulation 37A?**

The Building Regulations are intended to ensure buildings are designed and constructed in a manner that can be occupied safely upon completion. Safe occupation is reliant on good building management, the operating and maintaining of buildings in a way that supports the original design intentions. To effectively manage a building, an understanding of the present fire safety measures is required, along with the assumptions, limitations, and expectations associated with them. Regardless of whether the building follows prescriptive design guidance or incorporates elements of fire engineering design, it is critical to the safety of people in and around the building that this information is communicated to the owner, occupier, and/or end user so that the building can be operated and managed correctly. Regulation 37A will enable this.

NFCC, therefore, supports the introduction of Regulation 37A and believes it should be applicable to all in-scope buildings when built or after a material change of use.

However, NFCC is of the view that the application of Regulation 37A should be extended to cover any works that are covered by Building Regulations (e.g., extensions and refurbishments) regardless of whether that work is considered a material change of use or not. Whilst there may be concerns that this may be unduly onerous, the amount of information that should be provided will be proportionate to the scope and the nature of the building work that has been completed. It should not be possible to carry out alterations to a building without providing information on those alterations to all persons with fire safety duties.

**Question A2: Do you agree with the proposal to require a building which becomes a building on the prescribed list of buildings in regulation 37B due to a material change of use, to be subject to the requirement of new regulation 37B?**

NFCC has consistently pushed for greater inclusion of sprinkler systems in new buildings due to their proven ability to keep people safe by controlling fire spread.

NFCC supports the application of Regulation 37B to buildings that will become prescribed buildings because of a material change of use. Whilst it is recognised that there may be certain limitations and challenges associated with converting existing buildings to residential buildings, this should not be reason enough to omit sprinkler systems. On the contrary, given that the buildings are already existing, there may be aspects of the construction that are not fully understood or may fall short of current best practices. Accordingly, the provision of sprinklers will provide reassurance that the development of fire will be limited.

Ultimately, the origins of a building should not be a factor in specifying minimum fire safety provisions. Regardless of whether a residential building is newly constructed, or it is a result of conversion from a previous use (e.g., an office), occupants should be provided with the same level of protection.

NFCC would like to highlight the possibility of building work being undertaken which includes adding stories to a building. This could result in buildings already containing flats or student accommodation not previously within the scope of Regulation 37B becoming buildings on the prescribed list, newly meeting the 11m height threshold. To ensure that the standard of fire protection for the occupants of the new accommodation is equivalent to what would be provided for a new building, sprinklers should be provided in both new and existing parts of such buildings.

NFCC is also of the view that the application of Regulation 37B should be extended to cover any works that are covered by Building Regulations (e.g., extensions and refurbishments) regardless of whether that work is considered a material change of use or not.

## **Part E (Fire Safety Information)**

**Question E1: Do you agree that as built ‘fire safety information’ should be required to be given under Building Regulations to those responsible for fire safety duties in a building not later than the date of completion of the work, or the date of occupation of the building or extension whichever is the earlier?**

While NFCC strongly supports the new fire safety information requirements, our experience in England shows that despite the requirement existing in legislation, the information is still not always passed to those who are responsible for managing fire safety.

The most important part of the requirement is that the information must be provided before the building is occupied and, in that regard, NFCC agrees with the proposal. Effective fire safety management needs to be in place from day one as new buildings face particular risks by default, such as new occupants who are unfamiliar with the building. Invariably, new buildings also undergo a period wherein snagging-related issues are identified, which could affect fire safety measures.

NFCC is concerned that the wording of this requirement could be seen as supporting occupation in buildings that have not been completed. Whilst there may be aspects of building work that continue after occupation (e.g., decoration or landscaping), buildings should not be occupied until all fire safety measures, upon which occupants rely, have been fully installed and commissioned.

**Question E2: Do you agree with the scope of buildings ('relevant premises' as defined under the FRSNIO and buildings containing one or more flats with a storey more than 11m above ground level) for the new regulation to apply to?**

NFCC strongly disagrees with the proposed scope and does not believe that buildings containing flats that don't meet the 11m threshold should be exempt from this regulation. The requirement should apply to buildings containing two or more flats, regardless of height.

The provision of a building's fire safety information is necessary to enable effective management and is relevant to all buildings from day one. It is proposed that in the case of buildings over 11m, persons with fire safety duties would be provided with this information. For buildings under this height, this proposal has the effect of putting the onus on the same person to seek this information out. Most of the information required by Regulation 37A should already have been generated throughout the course of the design and construction of the building. The onus should always be on those responsible for designing a building to share information required to manage that building safely.

The consultation includes no rationale for this proposed exemption and NFCC would be concerned if it was due to a perceived lower risk associated with buildings under this height. Height does not equal risk. Low-rise residential buildings (i.e., under 11m), particularly those that deviate from prescriptive design guidance and incorporate elements of fire engineering design, inherently require management considerations and expectations and it is critical that this information is provided to those with fire safety duties upon occupation.

**Question E3: Do you agree with the use of the term 'person carrying out the work' in the regulation or do you think a more specific individual should be cited in the regulation and hence responsible for providing this information?**

NFCC neither agrees nor disagrees with the use of the term 'person carrying out the work'.

We acknowledge that the term 'person carrying out the work' is already used within legislation to refer to other requirements of the Building Regulations. Furthermore, it is recognised that the wording of such a term needs to capture all scenarios and arrangements, and trying to be more specific may result in the creation of loopholes.

## **Part E (Automatic Fire Suppression Systems)**

**Question E4: Do you agree that a new prescriptive regulation requiring the provision of suitable automatic fire suppression systems in certain types of buildings should be introduced under regulation 37B?**

NFCC agrees. Experience has shown that where the "requirement" exists only within guidance, developers will almost always avoid including the required provision. Including it within regulations provides assurance that the benefits of sprinklers will be realised within in-scope buildings.

Regulation 37B states that in-scope buildings will be constructed with a 'suitable' AFSS. Whilst NFCC acknowledges that the use of the term AFSS is likely a deliberate attempt to avoid being too prescriptive, we also believe that sprinklers are the only suitable AFSS for buildings in the scope of Regulation 37B. It will be the role of TBE to provide further clarity on what constitutes suitable although this is not currently the case. See our answer to question TBE2.

NFCC also notes that the installation of sprinklers or any other AFSS in a residential building should cover the whole building, in accordance with the relevant British Standard, and not just a specific area or purpose group.

**Question E5: Do you agree with the scope of buildings as proposed for now under new regulation 37B?**

NFCC agrees that the proposed Regulation 37B should include residential buildings over 11m and residential care premises. However, we would like to see the scope of the regulation extended to include the below building types. These recommendations are in line with NFCC's Automatic Water Suppression Systems Policy Position Statement, due for publication soon, which campaigns for increased sprinkler provision throughout the UK.

**Storage and warehouses:**

All warehouses above 4,000 square metres should be added to the scope of Regulation 37B. These buildings typically have a high storage density, which can result in fires of such size that they are difficult or impossible for the FRS to access and conduct manual firefighting operations. We hold stark concerns about how fires in storage and warehouses can quickly spread and cause widespread damage, as well as closing nearby transport links. The disruption and destruction caused by these fires can result in a significant impact on the country's economy.

The mandatory installation of sprinklers in storage and warehouses should trigger at a threshold of 4,000 square metres as NFCC has found this to be the size limit after which it is difficult to undertake effective rescue. This could be supplemented by different thresholds for sprinkler installation depending on the type of material stored in a storage building or warehouse that will be below the threshold of 4,000 square metres.

**Schools:**

All new and refurbished schools should be added to the scope of Regulation 37B. Adding sprinklers to all school buildings is a cost-effective method to ensure the safety of property and more importantly the lives of students, teachers, and firefighters. This would bring the regulation into line with already existing requirements in Wales and Scotland.



## Refurbished residential care premises:

We welcome the inclusion of all new residential care premises within the scope of Regulation 37B but would like to see all refurbished residential care premises added to the scope, too. There have been several high-profile fires in care homes in recent years. In these cases, it was not possible for the FRS to fully mitigate the effects of serious fires that resulted in multiple life losses, injuries, and/or major property damage. In many of these cases, there were no sprinkler systems in place.

Specialised housing should also fall under Regulation 37B and thus be fitted with sprinkler systems, including supported living, sheltered housing, and extra care sheltered housing. The nature of the risk in specialised housing is similar to residential care premises and suffers from the same management and staffing issues. The reliance on management is a fundamental issue that should be considered when assessing the safety of residents within these premises for the purpose of new regulations.

## Hospitals:

Hospital buildings are at increased risk of fire due to a high concentration of people, patients with limited mobility, reliance on staff to assist with evacuation (some wards are not highly staffed during nighttime hours when people are more at risk due to sleeping), complex building layouts and the presence of combustible material including oxygen tanks and alcohol-based antiseptics.

Fires in these buildings would result in a significant loss to society and its ability to look after patients in our communities. A key protection measure that is demonstrated to mitigate these risks or impacts, and prevent multiple fatalities or injuries, is a sprinkler system. New hospitals should be included within the scope of Regulation 37B.

## Existing buildings:

In addition to the new buildings outlined above, NFCC also calls for the mandating of sprinklers in certain residential buildings. Whilst NFCC is clear that height does not equal risk, we have consistently called for a requirement to retrofit all existing residential buildings in England over 18m or seven storeys with sprinklers if served by a single staircase, along with existing residential buildings over 11m on a risk-assessed basis. Sprinklers can buy crucial additional time in firefighting operations and can help ensure that evacuations are not necessary in the first place, but importantly they also assist those that need to or wish to evacuate during a fire incident. Regulations should avoid any single point of failure in a building.

**Question E6: Do you agree with the height threshold of 11m for buildings containing one or more flats and purpose-built student accommodation as proposed under new regulation 37B?**

As explained above, NFCC agrees with the height threshold of 11m for new residential buildings and student accommodation.

**Question E7: Do you agree with the definition of residential care premises being adopted in building regulations for the application of new regulation 37B?**

NFCC agrees with the definition of residential care premises used for Regulation 37B. However, we would also like to see the regulations acknowledge the rise of specialised housing, which is subject to many of the same risks as residential care premises.

Additionally, NFCC reiterates the importance of retrofitting sprinklers into any existing residential care premises that undergo refurbishment.

**Question E8: Do you agree with a transitional period of 6 months?**

NFCC disagrees with any and all transitional periods. There is no evidence to demonstrate that a transitional period is required to provide the industry and sector at large enough time to adapt to changes.

Any further transitional period would provide the industry with enough time to 'game' the transition, following on from the experience of the Welsh Government's sprinkler mandate in residential accommodation which led to extensive prospective Building Regulations applications in order to beat the transition deadline. Premises were subsequently not built for several years afterward. We believe a transitional period will inevitably provide an opportunity for developers to build new buildings without sprinklers.

The release of this consultation provides enough indication that the Northern Irish Government intends to proceed with these changes, providing developers with the opportunity to prepare by designing buildings before the changes take place. A change of regulations will always have a starting date and therefore already has an inherent transitional period.

## **Amendment of Technical Booklet E**

**Question TBE1: Do you agree with the proposed guidance in Section 7 of the consultation version TBE for 'fire safety information'?**

It is noted that the proposed guidance in Section 7 of the consultation version of TBE represents a direct lift from the equivalent section of ADB which provides guidance on achieving Building Regulations compliance in England.

Whilst NFCC agrees with the guidance in so far as it captures the information that should be given to persons with fire safety duties upon completion of the building, we note the following observations:

- The section itself is split between the categories of essential information and additional information for complex buildings. Notwithstanding the fact that there is no definition of what constitutes a complex building, the information listed under both categories is largely identical.
- Regardless of whether fire safety measures such as alarm systems or smoke control systems are provided in simple buildings or complex buildings, persons responsible for managing the building need to understand why they have been provided, where they have been provided, and what they need to do to maintain them.
- For simplicity, NFCC would suggest that the information in Section 7 could be consolidated into a single list. As the guidance already sets out, the level of detail required will vary between buildings and will still need to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

NFCC reiterates that our proposed changes to TBE in this consultation response reflect the changes we would like to see to ADB in England and all associated regulations in the devolved governments.

**Question TBE2. Do you agree with the proposed guidance regarding sprinklers given in Section 8 of the consultation version of TBE?**

NFCC reiterates the observation that the proposed Regulation 37B only refers to suitable AFSS while the Section 8 guidance explicitly references sprinklers. Currently, NFCC believes that the only suitable AFSS for buildings in the scope of Regulation 37B are sprinklers. Section 8 currently makes no attempt to connect the requirements for suitable AFSS under Regulation 37B and the guidance on sprinklers presented in that section.

The issue around this is highlighted in Section 8.5 where it states that “... *Where required, sprinkler systems should be provided throughout the building... They should be designed and installed in accordance with the following... For residential buildings, the requirements of BS 9251...*”

There is no reference to any requirement for sprinklers in residential buildings in Regulation 37B, only AFSS. This will lead to confusion and should be addressed.

Furthermore, provision must be made to ensure that sprinkler protection extends to all parts of an in-scope building and that the sprinkler protection is appropriate to the building’s risk (for example, a commercial unit or car park underneath). Section 8.3 notes that where sprinklers are “a compensatory feature to address a specific risk or hazard, it may be acceptable to protect only part of a building.” NFCC does not agree. Although sprinklers can

ensure a fire is contained within a certain area, a risk that brings a building into the scope and triggers a sprinkler mandate can affect an entire building in an emergency. Guidance must address this risk.

**Question TBE3. Do you agree with the revised provisions for installation of smoke alarms in all habitable rooms as part of automatic fire detection in new dwellings?**

NFCC has long recommended the provision of automatic fire detection in all habitable rooms within dwellings.

Current requirements within Northern Ireland focus on providing automatic fire detection in the means of escape and the principal habitable room. Whilst the need for fire detection in circulation spaces such as hallways and landings is obvious, the rationale for only providing fire detection in the principal habitable room is less so. Now that newly built homes do not generally contain fireplaces, bedrooms contain many of the same fire risks as a living room, and increasing the coverage of automatic detection systems to include smoke detection in all habitable rooms will help protect people when they are at their most vulnerable (i.e. while sleeping). The proposed provisions are a significant safety enhancement over other areas of the UK and NFCC strongly supports them.

**Question TBE4: Do you agree with the new guidance in relation to fire alarm provision in dwellings subject to an extension and/or alteration work?**

As above, NFCC strongly supports the new guidance.

**Question TBE5: Do you agree with the amended guidance regarding smoke ventilation from the common escape routes in buildings containing one or more flats as inserted in TBE?**

NFCC partially agrees.

Smoke control systems control the spread or movement of smoke and fire gases during a fire inside a building. In residential buildings containing flats, the primary objective of smoke control systems is to limit the amount of smoke within the staircase closure thereby protecting the means of escape. They are essential to blocks of flats that have stay-put policies where occupants are not generally expected to evacuate in the early stages of a fire.

The existing version of TBE makes no provision for smoke control in blocks of flats beyond those required as part of a firefighting shaft, which is currently only required in residential buildings over 18m. The proposed amendments will therefore significantly increase the safety of both building occupants and responding firefighters in all new residential buildings.

The proposed guidance on smoke ventilation, which has been lifted from England's ADB, has remained unchanged since before the Grenfell Tower fire and is subject to review. Whilst NFCC does not wish to detract from the magnitude of the proposed change we are reluctant

to fully endorse these proposals at this time. NFCC would support the changes on a conditional basis, until such a time that ADB has been reviewed and any revisions published.

**Question TBE6. Do you agree with the proposed change in guidance to require all Purpose Group 5 buildings which have a storey 900m<sup>2</sup> or more in area at a height of 7.5m or more above fire and rescue service access level to have firefighting shaft provision?**

NFCC agrees with the proposals for firefighting shafts in Purpose Group 5 buildings that meet the above height/size thresholds. Purpose Group 5 buildings are classified for use as assembly and recreation spaces, a category that arguably covers the greatest range of building types. By their very nature, they are intended for members of the public and often in very large numbers. Accordingly, there is no discernible reason why these buildings should be provided with a lesser standard of firefighting facilities.

**Question TBE7: Do you agree with the amended guidance so that the maximum distance from any point on a storey to a fire main in a firefighting shaft is 60m and in addition, where sprinklers are not fitted, the distance should be a maximum of 45m to a fire main outlet in a protected shaft (not necessarily a firefighting shaft)?**

NFCC welcomes the proposed changes, which will increase the level of protection for firefighters in multistorey buildings by reducing the maximum hose-laying distances.

However, NFCC would like to see the wording of the proposed guidance in support of this change reviewed to ensure the intentions are fully understood. The wording of the guidance is predicated on the provision of sprinklers although this is not clearly communicated. NFCC suggests that paragraph 6.3B (a) be amended so that it starts "*Where sprinklers have been provided...*"

**Question TBE8: Do you agree with the amended guidance to set a storey height limit of 50m above fire service vehicle access level for provision of a dry fire mains?**

NFCC welcomes the reduction in the height threshold for buildings requiring wet risers from 60m to 50m. As well as improving the ability of fire and rescue pumping appliances to deliver a sufficient flow of water to the uppermost floors, it should also serve to reduce the time taken before firefighters are able to begin applying water to a fire.

**Question TBE9: Do you agree with the amended guidance so that a pump appliance can gain access, so that the effective hose penetration distance can reach to within 45m of all points within a dwellinghouse/flat? (for buildings not fitted with a fire main)**

NFCC welcomes the amendment to how hose laying distances are measured so that every point within a dwelling is within 45m of vehicle appliance access.

The guidance previously only imposed maximum hose laying distances to the door of a house or dwelling. Overall hose laying distances could therefore be significantly greater than this, particularly in larger flats and houses. The amended guidance more clearly establishes the maximum expected hose laying distances which will improve the ability of firefighters to respond effectively.

**Question TBE10: Do you agree with requiring an emergency evacuation alert system to be installed in buildings containing flats with a storey more than 18m above ground level?**

NFCC agrees that emergency evacuation alert systems are required in residential buildings over 18m. This would satisfy the recommendation in the Grenfell Tower Inquiry Phase 1 Report that all high-rise residential buildings (both those already in existence and those built in the future) be equipped with facilities for use by the fire and rescue services, enabling them to send an evacuation signal to the whole of (or a selected part of) the building.

**Question TBE11: Do you agree with the new requirement for wayfinding signage in buildings containing flats with a storey more than 11m above ground level?**

Whilst NFCC welcomes the introduction of wayfinding signage and believes that the provision of such signage will prove beneficial to occupants as well as firefighters, NFCC disagrees that the requirement should only apply to residential buildings over 11m.

The situations where wayfinding signage would be of benefit are not limited to buildings in excess of 11m. In any premises exceeding a single storey, there is an opportunity to become disorientated. Similarly, in any premises exceeding a single storey, firefighters may need to identify specific floors. This is especially the case where there are multiple exits on different floors (buildings on slopes), the use of different exits on different floors of flats (maisonettes for example), or where access from stairs does not cover every floor. Given that the cost per building of implementing this measure is likely to be low, it is our position to support the provision of wayfinding signage in all multi-occupied residential buildings.

NFCC notes that the requirement for wayfinding signage is limited to buildings over 11m in England and Wales, and in both we have called for similar changes.

**Question TBE12: Do you agree with the new requirement for a secure information box in buildings containing flats with a storey more than 11m above ground level?**

NFCC agrees with the proposals for secure information boxes (SIBs) to be provided.

However, whilst TBE will introduce a requirement to provide SIBs on new buildings, there is no separate regulatory requirement to ensure these boxes contain information relevant to responding firefighters. Whilst it is acknowledged that SIBs are not a new concept, and they are already used by some building and business owners to provide information to the FRS, there may be a need to introduce additional legislative requirements to do so.

A similar requirement to provide SIBs for new blocks of flats exists in England, however, this is supported by additional legislation that applies from occupation onward, which specifies the information that must be provided including floor and building plans, and information on the external walls.

NFCC welcomes reference to the use of the best practice guidance published by the Fire Industry Association, however, note that it only refers to sections 2 to 4. In the absence of any alternative guidance on the information that should be provided, TBE should advise that the guidance also sets out the information the FRS would expect to see stored within the SIB.

The provision of SIBs can assist firefighters in responding to incidents and NFCC suggests they are provided in all buildings irrespective of height or use.

## **Draft Regulatory Impact Assessment – Part E**

### **Question IA1: Do you agree with the assumptions, costs and impacts set out in the consultation stage RIA?**

The impact assessment does not seem to address why the consultation proposals have not gone further. This seems like a missed opportunity to quantify the economic impact of increasing the scope of the proposed regulations and justify the limits to the proposed change. Since there appears to be no economic justification for the limits on scope (particularly in relation to Regulations 37A and 37B), NFCC sees no reason why the scope should not be reviewed.

For example, in Annex B of the consultation's impact analysis, it is noted that legislating the mandatory provision of fire safety information has potential cost savings, reducing the cost burden of sourcing this information further into a building's life. NFCC agrees and would reiterate our stance that the requirement should apply to buildings containing two or more flats, regardless of height. There is no economic justification not to increase the scope of Regulation 37A.

## **General**

### **Question G1: Please set out any additional comments you have.**

NFCC has set out our general thoughts in the cover letter at the beginning of our consultation response.