

Ofgem

Dear Sirs,

I refer to the Ofgem consultation paper EEC 2005-2008 and as a manufacturer of the insulation product Wall-Reform would like to make a few comments.

The u-value of 0.35 mentioned in clause 7.33 page 46 is the new regulations for new build. Whilst I understand this is the ideal, even the majority of cavity wall properties when insulated could not achieve this, let alone solid wall properties.

If you are pursuing this ideal, does that mean cavity wall insulation currently acceptable, will no longer be acceptable for the EEC unless they also achieve this standard?

It is far better to vastly improve the solid wall dwelling standard of insulation, even if it does not reach the stringent standards than to have none at all.

The intention of producing Wall-Reform is to offer a more economical method of insulating solid wall properties particularly as the fuel poor mainly reside in such dwellings and none are currently being insulated.

In a project carried out at Hexham, one of the residents described the property after the application of Wall-Reform as 'like living in an igloo'. That's where the greatest test lies. If people feel warmer in their homes from a system that is nationally available, is it not better to use this than once again leave the most vulnerable in our society with no insulation at all due to the cost of existing methods?

In a press release dated 12/3/03 entitled 'Fatal Health Risks of Cold Homes' it comments

'Cold, damp thermally inefficient houses which people cannot afford to heat sufficiently to protect their health are a peculiarly British public health scandal and an affront to human rights.'

We have been attempting to have Wall-Reform made acceptable for EEC grants for some time now and would be grateful for your consideration of the above for the inclusion of Wall-Reform in the new EEC measures the before making a decision that will affect the lives of millions of vulnerable people.

Many thanks for your consideration and we look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

G.Melvin