Have your say on the Remediation Bill

The Public Bill Committee examining the Building Safety (Remediation of Unsafe Cladding etc) Bill has published a Call for Evidence. Write to them to let them know what has happened to you and what needs to change to make homes fully safe and sellable. This will help shape the Government's response to the building safety crisis.

How to use this guide

The seven parts of the Bill listed in the Call for Evidence are set out below. Each gives a brief explanation and our thoughts alongside prompts to help you respond. These are suggestions, so choose the parts relevant to you.

How and when to submit

Email your evidence to scrutiny@parliament.uk as soon as possible. The Committee starts on Thursday 12 November 2026 and is expected to finish by 5pm on Tuesday 8 December. It could finish earlier and cannot accept evidence once it has finished.

We suggest this email subject: Written evidence – Building Safety (Remediation of Unsafe Cladding etc) Bill – [your name].

Attach a short Word document headed "Written evidence submitted by [your name]". A page or two can be enough.

Put private contact details in your covering email, not the evidence document.

Start your written evidence with a short introduction: say whether you are a leaseholder or shared owner, where your building is located, its height, and the current position. If you represent a residents' group, say so.

Summarise your main points, then use the relevant part headings below and number your paragraphs.

For each point, explain what happened, how it affected you and what you want to change. Give dates and costs – whether what you've paid already or estimate you'll have to pay – where possible. Use your own words and distinguish what you know from what you have been told.

Before you send

- Check dates and figures. Identify any report or letter you rely on by date and title. Explain what your example shows about the changes needed; avoid sending your whole correspondence history.
- Most evidence is published online and can remain publicly searchable. Leave out your flat number, private contact details and sensitive information you do not want published. Keep other people's personal information out of your account.
- If you want anonymity or confidentiality, contact scrutiny@parliament.uk before sending sensitive material. Explain why and ask what is possible. The Committee decides. If your evidence concerns ongoing court proceedings, ask Committee staff first.

- Wait until the Committee has published your evidence before sharing the submission publicly. Email scrutiny@parliament.uk if you need help with the format or an adjustment to take part.

Finish with your main request

For example: “Our works have been delayed since [date], leaving us [impact]. I want firm deadlines and Government intervention when those responsible fail to act, so our homes are made fully safe and sellable without further costs.”

Use your circumstances to show why wider change is needed. If an issue you face fits more than one part, put it where it makes most sense and avoid repeating it.

If you cannot see how the Bill would resolve your situation, say that and explain why!

Breakdown of the parts of the Remediation Bill

Part 1: Duty to remediate

This part concerns duties to assess and address external wall fire risks, enforcement and intervention where those responsible fail to act.

A legal duty is overdue, but focusing on external walls cannot resolve the whole crisis. Government must fund remediation of non-cladding safety defects upfront through grant schemes and ensure independent scrutiny across all remediation programmes.

Developer-contract buildings need equivalent independent scrutiny, including assessments concluding that no remediation is needed. Government must publish audit coverage and findings, enforce milestones and take over stalled remediation where necessary, recovering costs from the developer.

PAS 9980 assesses external wall fire risks, not whole-building safety. Assessments must understand fully how these risks interact with internal fire safety and structural safety.

Assessments must establish what was actually built, and audits must check the supporting evidence. Panels that appear separate from outside may conceal a continuous combustible layer. Where a safety conclusion depends on concealed construction, appropriate intrusive investigation is needed.

Any “Backstop” must act quickly to get works underway and completed, with clear deadlines, upfront funding in full and safeguards against additional costs falling on leaseholders. It must not become another lengthy process following years of inaction.

- How long have you waited? Give examples of missed dates, stalled work, repeated assessments or disputes over who must act or pay. Explain the effect on your life, health or ability to sell.
- Would internal fire safety or structural defects remain unresolved after external wall works?
- Have you experienced conflicting reports, unverified assumptions or changes to proposed works? Explain the consequences.
- If a developer is responsible, is there a reliable plan and completion date? What happened when commitments were missed?

Changes you could ask for: enforceable deadlines; independent assessments and audits at all buildings that challenge assumptions and check evidence, including decisions to retain combustible materials; independent resolution of conflicting reports; a consistent whole-

building remediation standard; upfront funding for necessary safety work; and robust Government intervention when developers fail to deliver.

Part 2: Mandatory register of medium rise buildings

This part would create a compulsory register for medium-rise residential buildings.

We support identifying unsafe buildings and making them fully safe, but remain unconvinced that a new compulsory register is necessary or proportionate. Government must first demonstrate why existing Homes England and government information cannot achieve this, and how registration would accelerate remediation rather than create another layer of administration and costs for leaseholders.

The proposal risks repeating avoidable failures of the high-rise regime: missing records, unclear requirements, constrained professional capacity and substantial charges passed to leaseholders. Information that officials assume should be available may require specialist investigation to establish. Describing these costs as “industry costs” obscures who ultimately pays.

Government must assess the full costs honestly, including investigations, professional advice and management fees, showing likely bills per flat. Existing information must be reused, with safeguards against unnecessary assessments, duplicate commissions and excessive charges – including where a developer or funding scheme is already responsible.

Any new requirements must be clear, supported by a tested system and sufficient professional capacity, and allow realistic time to comply. Leaseholders must help shape safeguards that prevent excessive charging; being able to dispute a bill afterwards is not enough.

- Has missing information prevented your building being assessed or accessing funding, or have other barriers caused the delays?
- Have you faced unnecessary or repeated assessments, registration or freeholder / management charges for compliance with the high-rise regime? Explain what was charged, what it covered and whether the work was already someone else’s responsibility.

Changes you could ask for: a register that is not a one-size-fits-all approach. Government to demonstrate why a new compulsory register is needed, examine less burdensome alternatives using existing information, and prioritise identifying and fixing unsafe buildings without summarily imposing unnecessary administration or costs on all leaseholders in medium-rise buildings.

Part 3: Information about building ownership

This part would help regulators obtain information about building ownership, including who ultimately owns or controls it.

Regulators should be able to establish who owns and controls a building and pursue those responsible. These powers address an ownership transparency gap left unresolved by the Building Safety Act 2022. They must lead to action, prevent responsibility being avoided through complex ownership arrangements and give residents clear information without making them pay for lengthy investigations.

- Has it been difficult to identify or contact your freeholder or the organisation responsible for work? Have changes of ownership or complex company structures caused delay?

Changes you could ask for: transparent ownership and effective action against those responsible, without further cost or delay for residents, leaseholders and shared owners.

Part 4: Duty to cooperate to enforce building safety

This part would require councils, fire and rescue authorities and the Building Safety Regulator to cooperate.

Cooperation is necessary, but formalising local arrangements will not resolve fragmented responsibility on its own. Our concerns about Local Remediation Acceleration Plans persist: delivery must follow consistent national standards, involve residents meaningfully and provide clear routes for escalation and Government intervention. Local plans must not become another administrative layer or a means of shifting responsibility onto unsupported volunteer directors.

The cooperation framework extends beyond cladding to other fire safety risks, but leaves a gap for structural risks unrelated to fire. Government must ensure coordinated action across all serious building safety defects, with a named lead, properly resourced regulators and funded arrangements for evacuation, prolonged displacement and returning home.

- Have you been passed between organisations or received conflicting advice? Give a short example of who you approached and what happened.
- Have regulators dealt with cladding, internal fire safety and structural problems separately, leaving gaps or uncertainty about who must act?
- If your building was evacuated or an urgent defect found, was it clear who was leading the response and arranging support?

Changes you could ask for: a named lead, clear response times and consistent national arrangements for remediation and displacement.

Part 5: Liability for cladding products

This part aims to make it easier to recover remediation costs from cladding manufacturers.

Nearly five years after Michael Gove said manufacturers must pay instead of leaseholders, Government has acknowledged that the Building Safety Act 2022's cladding-product recovery provisions have not worked "as intended". This Bill must correct those failures and deliver recovery in practice.

Money recovered must reach the people or funds that bore the costs, including leaseholders who have already paid. Residents, leaseholders and shared owners must not wait for lengthy disputes over products, installation or liability: Government must ensure work is funded first, then pursue recovery centrally.

- Have disputes about recovering money delayed safety work or reimbursement? Have residents had to fund legal action or been told recovery would be too difficult or expensive?

Changes you could ask for: fund works first, recover costs centrally and reimburse those who have already paid.

Part 6: Amending earlier legislation

This part changes existing building safety and housing laws, including arrangements for unoccupied buildings and buildings with a tribunal-appointed manager.

This Part corrects further gaps in the Building Safety Act 2022 and other legislation. Those corrections must produce a workable system, rather than another layer of complexity for residents and volunteer directors.

Government must demonstrate that the revised arrangements provide effective routes to resolve serious defects, including at empty and evacuated buildings. It must also clarify overlapping duties and cost protections, so an assessment or safety measure cannot fall through gaps between different legal categories.

Volunteer directors must have practical support and a funded route to compliance, rather than responsibility for failures or delays beyond their control.

- If you have had to leave your home, has the building's unoccupied status made it harder to get work, funding or regulatory help? Describe the support, accommodation costs and uncertainty about returning.
- Have existing legal routes failed to secure action or payment? If a tribunal-appointed manager is involved, explain any obstacles. You do not need to identify the legal provision.

Changes you could ask for: workable legal routes for occupied and evacuated buildings, funded support and clear responsibility for resolving defects, meaningful support for volunteer directors.

Part 7: Leaseholder protections

This part includes protection against passing certain costs to leaseholders and provisions for buildings managed by leaseholders.

We welcome the announced extension of the ownership threshold from three to six and support for collectively owned buildings, following sustained campaigning. These changes must deliver effective protection in practice without leaving the other excluded leaseholders and shared owners, including non-qualifying leaseholders and those in buildings under 11 metres behind.

Protection must address the full financial harm: remediation, assessments, professional and management charges, insurance, interim measures and displacement. Government must prevent avoidable costs being passed on, resolve gaps between different protections and ensure reimbursement for people who have already been forced to pay.

- What have you paid, been billed or been told you may have to pay? Separate paid costs from demands and estimates. Include remediation, insurance increases, waking watch, alarms, assessments, management and legal fees where relevant.
- Have you been excluded from protection or funding because of your leaseholder status or the building's ownership arrangements? Explain what you were told and the consequences.

- If you are a shared owner, state your ownership share and describe the rent, mortgage and service charges you face, including during displacement. Have safety issues prevented you selling? If you have asked your housing association to buy back your share or home, what response have you received?
- If residents own or manage the building, what work, costs or responsibilities fall on volunteer directors? What professional and financial support is missing?

Changes you could ask for: protection for all affected leaseholders and shared owners, at all heights, covering both remediation and the wider financial harm.