

Simplified arrangements for the production of CO₂
emission rate calculations for new buildings under the
Building Regulations 2000 – Consultation

Summary of responses



Simplified arrangements for the production of CO₂
emission rate calculations for new buildings under the
Building Regulations 2000 – Consultation

Summary of responses

Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 020 7944 4400
Website: www.communities.gov.uk

© Crown Copyright, 2008

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp, or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU

e-mail: licensing@opsi.gov.uk

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Communities and Local Government Publications
PO Box 236
Wetherby
West Yorkshire
LS23 7NB
Tel: 08701 226 236
Fax: 08701 226 237
Textphone: 08701 207 405
Email: communities@capita.co.uk
Online via the Communities and Local Government website: www.communities.gov.uk

75% recycled

This is printed on
75% recycled paper

September 2008

Ref Number: 088005534

ISBN: 978-1-4098-0489-5

Contents

Summary	4
Section 1 Numerical analysis of responses	5
Section 2 Analysis of responses by question	6

Summary

The consultation attracted only a very low level of response, mainly from building control bodies (local authorities and approved inspectors) and professional bodies (architects, engineers). Section 1 below gives a numerical analysis of the responses.

Overall there was a high level of support for all the proposals, in particular for the proposed legislative changes (Questions 1 to 4). The level of support for the proposed changes to the accreditation standards and National Occupational Standards (Questions 5 and 6) was slightly lower but still high at about 80 per cent.

Where a respondent answered neither 'yes' or 'no' but included a comment on the question concerned the analysis of the responses to each question at section B below treated it a 'no'.

The number of comments made in addition to answering 'yes' or 'no' to a particular question was very small. For example, one respondent answered 'no' to all of the questions but without giving any comment by way of explanation.

Section 1

Numerical analysis of responses

Total number of responses by organisation type (% of responses)

Organisation type	Local authority	AI Corporate	AI Individual	Developers	Trade Body	Prof Body	Builder	Other	Total
	8(47)	1(6)		1(6)		6(35)		1(6)	17 (100)

Number of responses by question and organisation type

Organisation type	Local authority	AI Corporate	AI Individual	Developers	Trade Body	Prof Body	Builder	Other	Total
Q1	8	1		1		6		1	17
Q2	8	1		1		6		1	17
Q3	8	1		1		6		1	17
Q4	8	1		1		6		1	17
Q5	8	1		1		6		1	17
Q6	8	1		1		6		1	17
Q7	8	1		1		6		1	17
Q8	7	1		-		5		1	14

Percentage of responses by question and organisation type

Organisation type	Local authority	AI Corporate	AI Individual	Developers	Trade Body	Prof Body	Builder	Other	Total
Q1	47	6		6		35		6	100
Q2	47	6		6		35		6	100
Q3	47	6		6		35		6	100
Q4	47	6		6		35		6	100
Q5	47	6		6		35		6	100
Q6	47	6		6		35		6	100
Q7	47	6		6		35		6	100
Q8	50	7		-		36		7	100

Section 2

Analysis of responses by question

Question 1

Do you agree that it would be sensible and practicable to amend regulation 20D (and regulation 12D in the Approved Inspectors Regulations) to allow BCBs to accept as evidence of compliance with regulation 17C a certificate that the requirements in relation to the TER and DER/BER will be satisfied if a building is constructed in accordance with accompanying specifications, issued by anyone who is a member of an accreditation scheme approved under regulation 17F?

Responses

Yes

No of responses: 16

Percentage of responses: 94

No

No of responses: 1

Percentage of responses: 6

Analysis of comments made

There was very high support for this proposal. One comment was that it recognised the importance of compliance with regulation 17C of the Building Regulations and that regulation 17C reports would be subject to the same quality assurance procedures as the production of energy performance certificates. It would also create a more level playing field amongst energy assessors than the previous arrangements.

One respondent suggested that energy assessors could be made responsible for other aspects of compliance with regulation 17C.

It was also suggested that the regulations should make it clear that whoever issued a certificate should be accredited for the type of building for which the certificate was issued.

A local authority respondent expressed concern that builders do not always pass to energy assessors changes made to the specifications during the building process and that therefore energy assessors should undertake a site visit.

Question 2:

Do you agree that all accreditation schemes authorised under regulation 17F for new buildings should be required to ensure that their members are able to undertake the calculations necessary to demonstrate compliance with regulation 17C?

Responses

Yes

No of responses: 16

Percentage of responses: 94

No

No of responses: 1

Percentage of responses: 6

Analysis of comments made

There was very high support for this proposal.

One respondent commented that there should be different levels of accreditation to allow those who wish to undertake calculations only in respect of dwellings to operate in this way. Another stated that it should be clearer to what types of building the accreditation related.

Another respondent suggested that if the regulation 17C CO₂ emission rate calculations were carried out by someone who was not a member of an approved energy the building control body should also have to be given all the input data on which the calculations were based.

Question 3

Are you content that the latest date on which information needed to demonstrate compliance with Regulation 17C and the notice that an EPC has been given to the owner should be amended as set out in paragraph 3.9 and 3.10 above?

Responses

Yes

No of responses: 16

Percentage of responses: 94

No

No of responses: 1

Percentage of responses: 6

Analysis of comments made

There was a very high level of support for this proposal as it would serve to reduce confusion.

One respondent suggested that because some buildings are occupied before completion the latest date should be the date of occupation. The same respondent did, however, recognise that this suggestion would be impracticable where buildings were completed but then not occupied for some time.

Question 4

Do you agree that we should require BCBs to be given the unique reference number of EPCs lodged on the EPC register to enable them more easily to check the veracity of the notice attesting the giving of a certificate?

Responses

Yes

No of responses: 17

Percentage of responses: 100

No

No of responses: 0

Percentage of responses: 0

Analysis of comments made

There was full support for this proposal. One comment stated that it should reduce the risk of building control bodies not checking that an energy performance had been issued as checking would be much quicker and simpler.

Another respondent commented that there could still be difficulties in some cases in respect of entries for buildings in new developments where there were often name changes before the final addressing of the building was in place.

One local authority respondent suggested that building control bodies be given the full energy performance certificate as well.

Question 5

Are you content with the accreditation standards for new dwellings and those for buildings other than dwellings to be changed as highlighted to incorporate 17C functions to require Energy Assessors to be accredited for these functions as well as for EPCs?

Responses

Yes

No of responses: 14

Percentage of responses: 82

No

No of responses: 3

Percentage of responses: 18

Analysis of comments made

There was a high level of support for the amended draft accreditation standards.

One respondent commented that no changes were needed for on construction energy assessors, and that the accreditation standards for buildings other than dwellings should be split into one set of standards for new buildings and another for existing buildings.

A local authority respondent felt that energy assessors need only be accredited for the type of buildings for which they carried out calculations.

Another respondent considered that no extra training or testing of energy assessors would be needed to meet the amended standards. It also asked for early publication of the calculation methodology.

Question 6

Are you content with the proposed highlighted changes to the National Occupational Standards to embed regulation 17C functions within them? If not, what changes do you propose?

Responses

Yes

No of responses: 13

Percentage of responses: 76

No

No of responses: 4

Percentage of responses: 24

Analysis of comments made

There was a high level of support for this proposal.

One respondent suggested splitting the National Occupational Standards for assessors undertaking CO₂ emission rate calculations on buildings other than dwellings into a set of standards for new buildings and a set for existing buildings.

Another respondent suggested a number of helpful minor drafting changes to the standards for the purposes of clarity.

Question 7

Do you consider that a six month transitional period is sufficient for Energy Assessors to upgrade their competences to be able to carry out regulation 17C calculations?

Responses

Yes

No of responses: 14

Percentage of responses: 82

No

No of responses: 3

Percentage of responses: 18

Analysis of comments made

A majority of respondents who commented felt that a transitional period was not needed as energy assessors already possessed the necessary competences. One felt that this was true for dwellings but for buildings other than dwellings the period might be needed.

Two of the 'no' responses were as a result of considering that no transitional period was necessary. No respondent replied that a longer period would be necessary.

Question 8

Do you consider that the draft Impact Assessment presents a fair representation of the costs and benefits? Can you supply any information to help develop the Impact Assessment further?

Responses

Yes

No of responses: 10

Percentage of responses: 71

No

No of responses: 4

Percentage of responses: 29

Analysis of comments made

A number of respondents agreed that the proposals would mean a reduction in the administrative burden on energy assessors and building control bodies and raise the overall compliance level and that any costs would be more than outweighed by savings. None, however, included any quantitative information.

One respondent queried whether the proposals had been prompted by approved accreditation schemes for the financial benefit of the schemes.

Another queried whether there would be additional costs in applying quality assurance procedures to regulation 17C calculations over those already incurred for production of energy performance certificate calculations.

ISBN: 978-1-4098-0489-5

ISBN 978-1-4098-0489-5



9 781409 804895