

Number: WG19036



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

www.cymru.gov.uk

Welsh Government

Consultation – summary of responses

2012 Consultation on Changes to the Building Regulations in Wales Part L (Conservation of fuel and power)

July 2013

2012 Consultation on Changes to the Building Regulations in Wales Part L (Conservation of fuel and power)

Consultation – summary of responses

Part 1

- #01- Institution of Civil Engineers Wales Cymru**
- #08 - Ceredigion County Council**
- #10 - Portakabin Ltd**
- #11 - CA Group Limited**
- #12 - Metal Cladding and Roofing Manufacturers Association (MCRMA)**
- #13 - Building Control City and County of Swansea**
- #19 - i-Prophets Energy Services**
- #20 - NHBC**
- #21 - Redrow Homes Ltd**
- #23 - Aircrete Products Association**
- #24 - Concrete Block Association**
- #25 - Eco-Futures**
- #28 - Design Commission for Wales**
- #29 - Celotex Limited**
- #31 - Eto-energy+architecture**
- #32 - Farmers' Union of Wales**
- #35 - Calor Gas Ltd**
- #36 - GBSPM Ltd**
- #37 - Pilkington UK Ltd**
- #38 - Modern Masonry Alliance**

49. If the checklist was taken forward, who should be involved in its development?

Comments

A broad range of industry interests with a particular emphasis on those with practical experience of onsite construction.

50. Would any other approach be likely to prove more effective instead (such as a PAS⁸ type approach).

Yes No Don't know

Comments

We understand that DCLG are in discussion with the (UK) Zero Carbon Hub about undertaking work on this topic and we would hope that its recommendations can be adopted in Wales as well as in England. We consider that the problem has to be better understood than it is at present and that the range of issues needs to be ranked and prioritised for attention. Each item will then need to be reviewed in detail.

Please see the NHBC Foundation report 'Low and zero carbon homes: understanding the performance challenge' available at:

51a. Would it be preferable for buildings of a domestic nature to be able to achieve compliance through applying the recipe in AD L1A, in acknowledgement of the domestic nature of such buildings, rather than demonstrating compliance with AD L2A?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

51b. What are the arguments for and against this approach?

Comments

The principal argument is for simplicity, particularly since much of this work is likely to be carried out by SME builders guided by SME designers and consultants.

⁸ A PAS is a Publically Available Specification, and the PAS would set out a quality assurance approach.

48. If such a checklist was developed, what should it cover?

Comments

The key aspects of construction relating to thermal performance. E.g the specified type and dimensions of all materials especially insulation are used, checking of seals for airtightness (around service pipes etc), continuity of insulation and overlaps to prevent thermal bridging.

49. If the checklist was taken forward, who should be involved in its development?

Comments

Designers, builders, building control and supplier input.

50. Would any other approach be likely to prove more effective instead (such as a PAS¹⁰ type approach).

Yes No Don't know

Comments

Until such time as the perceived problem of design v as built gap is proven, it is difficult to assess what is needed.

51a. Would it be preferable for buildings of a domestic nature to be able to achieve compliance through applying the recipe in AD L1A, in acknowledgement of the domestic nature of such buildings, rather than demonstrating compliance with AD L2A?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

51b. What are the arguments for and against this approach?

Comments

It would simply design and allow some further standardisation.

¹⁰ A PAS is a Publicly Available Specification, and the PAS would set out a quality assurance approach.

