

**Local Government and Communities Committee**  
**Supplementary submission from Rachel Gibson**  
**PE1719: Review of fire safety stay-put policy**

The clerk's notes suggest that the petitioner has asked for research into the stay-put policy. This is an error. The research referred to is that mentioned and documented by Kevin Stewart in Annexe E of his papers. The clerk notes that the Petitions Committee wrote to several agencies including the National Fire Chiefs Council.

In their response NFCC stated they would not consider reviewing the stay-put policy on the basis of argument but would agree to government funded academic research. As the subject of the petition relates entirely to evacuation strategy in existing high-rise buildings, or rather the lack of it, then it may be assumed that the subject of the research was to ascertain if the stay-put policy was sufficient on its own. The petitioner's position now is that if the research Kevin Stewart refers to is along those lines then that would be a satisfactory point on which to close the petition.

In his notes the clerk refers to the petitioner arguing for 'fairness' for existing buildings given that legislation gives new building evacuation sounders. The petitioner is not arguing on the grounds of fairness but on the grounds of equal rights.

In his notes the clerk points out that the Grenfell Inquiry made no suggestion regarding the stay-put policy; however, the Inquiry did recommend that all high-rise buildings, existing ones included, should have an evacuation strategy, which is exactly the basis of the petition.