

2012 consultation on changes to the Building Regulations in Wales

Part L (Conservation of fuel and power)

Consultation Response Form

Your name: Paul Rose

Organisation (if applicable): Oil Firing Technical
Association Ltd. (OFTEC)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- (i) Are the views expressed on this consultation an official response from the organisation you represent or your own personal views?

Organisational Personal Views

- (ii) Are your views expressed on this consultation in connection with your membership or support of any group? If yes please state name of group:

Yes No

Name of group:

OFTEC is a trade association for the oil firing heating industry. OFTEC is also licenced under DCLG to operate a competent persons scheme for oil technicians

(iii) Please tick the one box that best describes your organisation:

<p>Builders/Developers:</p> <p>Builder / Main contractor: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Builder/ Small builder: (extensions/repairs/maintenance, etc) <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Installer/ special sub-contractor <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Commercial developer <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>House builder <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Property Management:</p> <p>Housing association (registered social landlord) <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Residential landlord, private sector <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Commercial <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Public sector <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Building occupier:</p> <p>Home owner <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Tenant (residential) <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Building Control Bodies:</p> <p>Local authority building control <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Approved Inspector <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Commercial Building <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>Energy Sector <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Fire and Rescue Authority <input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p>Designers/Engineers/Surveyors:</p> <p>Architect <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Civil/Structural engineer <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Building services engineer <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Surveyor <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Specific Interest:</p> <p>Competent person scheme operator <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>National representative or trade body <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Professional body or institution <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Research/ academic organisation <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Manufacturer/ Supply Chain <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Other (<i>please specify</i>)</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>

(iv) Please tick the *one* box which best describes the size of your or your organisation's business?

- Micro – typically 0 to 9 full-time or equivalent employees (incl. sole traders)
- Small – typically 10 to 49 full-time or equivalent employees
- Medium – typically 50 to 249 full-time or equivalent employees
- Large – typically 250+ full-time or equivalent employees
- None of the above (please specify)

(vi) Are you or your organisation a member of a competent person scheme?

Yes No

Name of scheme:

OFTEC operates a competent persons scheme licenced under DCLG

(vii) Would you be happy for us to contact you again in relation to this consultation?Yes No

WG will process any personal information that you provide us with in accordance with the data protection principles in the Data Protection Act 1998. In particular, we shall protect all responses containing personal information by means of all appropriate technical security measures and ensure that they are only accessible to those with an operational need to see them. You should, however, be aware that as a public body, the Welsh Government is subject to the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, and may receive requests for all responses to this consultation. If such requests are received we shall take all steps to anonymise responses that we disclose, by stripping them of the specifically personal data – name and e-mail address – you supply in responding to this consultation. If, however, you consider that any of the responses that you provide to this survey would be likely to identify you irrespective of the removal of your overt personal data, then we should be grateful if you would indicate that, and the likely reasons, in your response, for example in the relevant comments box.

Questions:**New homes**

1. Do you agree with the Government's preference for a CO₂ saving of 40% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions compared to Part L 2010.

No change to 2010 40% CO₂ saving 25% CO₂ saving Something else (please explain below) Don't know

Comments

2. Do you agree with the proposal for an 'aggregate' approach to CO₂ target setting for new homes in 2015? The CO₂ target for any individual dwelling varies depending on the ease with which the building can achieve the target, with the overall required CO₂ saving achieved when aggregated over the build mix.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

3. Do you agree with the proposal for a compliant option based on a consistent recipe of elemental specifications for fabric, services plus an additional CO₂ saving equivalent to an amount of photovoltaic (PV). Please justify your choice.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

P.V should not be the only permissible renewable option for CO2 savings. Alternative renewable technologies should be permitted providing an equivalent calculated performance is achieved.

4. The main difference between the recipes is the required system efficiency for each fuel, which is appropriate for the heating system type. By adopting this approach to different fuel types, there is no need for a separate fuel factor. Do you agree with the proposed approach?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

5. For the CO₂ savings proposed, are the recipe specifications a sensible way of achieving them? Please justify your choice.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

Comments as per Question 3.

6. In approaching the selection of the amount of PV to be installed on dwellings, do you prefer?

Fixed percentage of building foundation area

Proportion of gross internal floor area with a practical cap

Don't know

Comments

7. Do you agree that the limits on design flexibility 'backstop' values for fabric elements in new homes should be changed from the current reasonable provision in the technical guidance to become mandatory?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

8. Do you agree with the changes to the 'backstop' values proposed? Please explain your decision.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

9. Do you have any other comments on the proposed changes to Approved Document L1A or the domestic National Calculation Methodology? Please make it clear which issue each comment relates to by identifying the relevant paragraph number.

Comments

10. The Impact Assessment makes a number of assumptions on fabric/services/ renewables costs, new build rates, phase-in rates, learning rates, etc for new homes. Do you think these assumptions are fair and reasonable? Please justify your views.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

11. Overall, do you think the impact assessment is a fair and reasonable assessment of the potential costs and benefits of the proposed options for new homes? Please justify your view and provide alternative evidence if necessary.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

New non-domestic buildings

12. Do you agree with the proposal for 2013 for non-domestic buildings to explicitly regulate energy efficiency separately from low carbon technologies through the assessment of primary energy consumption (PEC)? Does PEC seem like a reasonable basis for standard setting?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

13. Which package of fabric and services should be selected: 7% or 10%? Please give reasons for your choice.

7%

10%

Don't know

Comments

14. Do you foresee any particular issues for certain categories of building to meet the TPEC or TER?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

15. Which approach should be utilized to incorporate the contribution of low carbon technologies into the setting of the Target Emission Rate (TER), for non domestic buildings?

- Fixed carbon reduction (in kg.CO₂/m²/year)
- Percentage of roof area of PV
- Other
- Don't know

Please give reasons for your choice

A fixed carbon reduction will be easy to calculate and will influence technology choice

16. The proposals explain the Government's preference for a 20% aggregate improvement in CO₂ performance standards for new non-domestic buildings from October 2013. Which option do you prefer and why?

- No change
- Target A: 10% aggregate improvement (1% PV)
- Target B: 11% aggregate improvement (No PV)
- Target C: 20% aggregate improvement (5% PV)
- Don't know

Please give reasons for your choice

17. Do the proposed 2013 notional buildings as set out in the changes to the National Calculation Methodology seem like a reasonable basis for standards setting? Please provide comments on the method used to develop the notional buildings and particular elements of one or more of the notional buildings, if relevant.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

18. Do you think that a further recipe should be created for buildings under 250m² and aligned with the proposed domestic recipe? Are there particular reasons why smaller buildings find compliance with the non-domestic recipes difficult? Please justify your views.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

19. Although we recognise that some buildings may need to be serviced in a particular way for legitimate functional or environmental reasons, should Part L incentivise a lower carbon servicing strategy (as with the current Energy Performance Certificate methodology), by basing the notional building on mixed-mode ventilation?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

20. Do you have any other comments on the proposed changes to Approved Document L2A or the non-domestic National Calculation Methodology? Please make it clear which issue each comment relates to by identifying the relevant paragraph number.

Comments

21. The Impact Assessment makes a number of assumptions on the costs of fabric/services/renewables, new build rates, etc for new non-domestic buildings. Do you think these assumptions are fair and reasonable? Please justify your views.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

22. Overall, do you think the impact assessment is a fair and reasonable assessment of the potential costs and benefits of the proposed options for new non-domestic buildings?

Please justify your view and provide alternative evidence if necessary.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

Cumulative impact of policies

23. Overall, do you think the assessment of the impact on development is broadly fair and reasonable? Please justify your view and provide alternative evidence if necessary.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

National Planning Policy Review

24. What role should planning play in facilitating higher carbon standards? Should it focus on facilitating site wide energy opportunities that will be needed as we move towards zero or near zero carbon buildings?

Views

25. What are the implications from future (and regular) changes to the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM on the implementation of the policy?

Views

26. Are the costs of assessment and certification now disproportionate to the costs and benefits of achieving a minimum sustainable buildings standard level?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

27. What should be the role of local planning authorities in setting local standards above and beyond Building Regulations? How can we ensure there is a level playing field of standards across Wales?

Views

28. What do you see as the positive/negative impacts of removing Part B of the policy expecting buildings to be certified against Code/BREEAM?

Views

29. Is there a better, alternative, way to rewards and secure sustainable buildings (above the regulatory minimum) other than using national planning policy? What opportunities are there for future changes to Building Regulations?

Views

30. To what extent are duplication of standard and approval systems an issue? Would the removal of the PfSB policy assist in reducing duplication?

Views

31. What opportunities are there for higher standards to be delivered on strategic sites identified as part of the Local Development Plan?

Views

Existing buildings

32. Do you agree with the proposal to raise performance standards for domestic replacement windows? Please explain your answer.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

33. Do you agree with the proposal to raise performance standards for domestic extensions? Please explain your answer.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

New build structures do lend themselves to higher performance standards than improvements to existing structures

34. Do you agree with the proposal to raise performance standards for non-domestic extensions? Please explain your answer.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

35. Do you agree that the exemption for conservatories or porches should be removed where an individual room heat or air conditioning unit is installed? How effective would this change be in limiting energy use/emissions, or are there other ways by which energy performance might be improved where conservatories or porches are installed?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

36. Do you agree with the proposal to require consequential improvements upon extensions or increases in habitable space in existing homes below 1000m²? Please explain your view.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

The cost of consequential improvements may deter building owners from making improvements. Thus, retaining inefficient building services and high CO2 emissions

37. The consultation explains that the regulatory requirement for consequential improvements upon domestic extensions or increases in habitable space would be limited to a list of measures comprising a minimum standard of loft insulation, hot water cylinder insulation and the installation of cavity wall insulation.

Do you agree with this list of measures?

Should this list be different (please explain below)?

Another approach (please explain below)

Don't know

Comments

Comments as per question 36

38. What effect do you think the requirements for consequential improvements may have on the demand for repair, maintenance and improvement activity? Please use evidence to explain your answer.

Increase demand

Reduce demand

No effect

Don't know

Comments

39. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce consequential improvements upon extensions or increases in habitable space in non-domestic buildings under 1000m²? Please explain your view.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

Comment as per question 36

40. The consultation proposes that for non-domestic buildings, any measure from list which is used to generate Green Deal assessments, the list in SBEM used to generate Energy Performance Certificate recommendations and the existing list of typical consequential improvement measures from Approved Document L2B should be eligible to be a consequential improvement. Do you agree?

Yes

No

Prefer a different list (please specify)

Don't know

Comments

41. Do you agree that there should not be major problems in extending the requirement for consequential improvements for the building control process? If you do foresee issues, what are they and how might these be addressed?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

42. Do you have any other comments on the proposed changes to Approved Document L1B? Please make it clear which issue each comment relates to by identifying the relevant paragraph number.

Comments

43. Do you have any other comments on the proposed changes to Approved Document L2B? Please make it clear which issue each comment relates to by identifying the relevant paragraph number.

Comments

44. Do you think that the Impact Assessment is a fair and reasonable assessment of the potential costs and benefits of raising the performance standards for replacement domestic windows and domestic/non-domestic extensions? Please justify your view and provide alternative evidence if necessary.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

45. Overall, do you think the impact assessment is a fair and reasonable assessment of the potential costs and benefits of the proposed options for consequential improvements in existing homes? Please justify your view and provide alternative evidence if necessary.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

46. Overall, do you think the impact assessment is a fair and reasonable assessment of the potential costs and benefits of the proposed options for consequential improvements in existing non-domestic buildings? Please justify your view and provide alternative evidence if necessary.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

Compliance and Performance

47. For new dwellings, Welsh Government is proposing to develop a compliance checklist. Do you think such a checklist would be used sufficiently to warrant its development?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

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

Comments

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

Comments

50. Would any other approach be likely to prove more effective instead (such as a PAS¹ type approach).

Yes No Don't know

¹ A PAS is a Publicly Available Specification, and the PAS would set out a quality assurance approach.

Comments

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

52. Additional views and suggestions for addressing compliance and performance issues in new non domestic buildings would be welcome.

Comments

53. Is the newly formatted ADL1B easier to understand and use?

Yes No Don't know

Comments

54. Are there any further amendments to the newly formatted ADL1B that you would recommend? If so, please provide details.

Yes No Don't know

Comments

55. How do the consultation proposals impact on the work of Local Authorities and Approved Inspectors? Please give positive and negative impacts.

Comments

56. We have asked a number of specific questions. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them:

Please enter here:

The issues below are identical to the responses made to the "England" consultation earlier this year

If you have any comments on the proposed changes to the Domestic Building Services Compliance Guide that are not covered in the questions above please add them here. Please make it clear which issue each comment relates to by identifying the relevant paragraph number.

Comments:

The consultation document - "Proposed Changes to technical guidance" page 191 gives information on the proposed changes to the DBSCG *Page 16 table 1, 1.0 efficiency* - reference to "oversize radiators" should be changed to "correctly sized radiators for the low flow temperature".

Consideration should be given to including in the DBSCG a requirement for a primary water filter to be fitted to the hydronic heating system. This would improve the overall energy efficiency of the heating system.

The consultation document - "Proposed Changes to technical guidance" page 192 gives information on the proposed changes to the DBSCG for temperature control of space heating. In the revised text there is a note "ii" which makes reference to the "reference rooms".

(Cont'd)

This should be changed to "reference room(s)" to indicate there may be one or more reference rooms. There may only be one room thermostat on the system. We observe that note "i" ends with the word "or" and a room thermostat is not specifically stated as a requirement in "ii" (although it is inferred). Therefore then the proposal would appear to suggest a roomstat is not required on any zone. This was not the intention of the proposal. We request the wording should be changed to exactly match the wording regarding oil "Temperature control of space heating" in the 2008 Domestic Heating Guide. This is clearly the intention of this consultation because the comments box in the consultation document "Proposed Changes to technical guidance" page 192" relating to this change says "Revert to the 2008 guidance ...". We believe the 2008 guidance on this topic is more precise (clear) than the text proposed in the 2012 consultation.

The consultation document - "Proposed Changes to technical guidance" page 198 - Component "hot water cylinder". In the minimum standard column the first 3 paragraph of text should all have "is required" added *to their last sentence*

If you have any comments on the proposed changes to the Non Domestic Building Services Compliance Guide that are not covered in the questions above please add them here. Please make it clear which issue each comment relates to by identifying the relevant paragraph number.

No comments

If you have any other comments on the proposals or suggestions on possible changes to Part L of the Building Regulations, please make them here:

No comments

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here: