

CIGA Consultation response to questions

Question 2:

a) Do you agree with our proposal that a wall with a section of cavity narrower than 40mm cannot be insulated? Please provide reasons for your answer.

Yes, although the future validity of this test is dependent on no innovative solutions gaining a relevant technical approval.

b) Do you agree with our proposal that a wall which adjoins a wall which cannot be insulated also 'cannot be insulated'? Please provide reasons for your answer.

The underlying technical approvals of Systems define the extent to which partial filling is permissible.

c) Are there any other scenarios where a cavity wall cannot be insulated? Please provide reasons for your answer.

Other reasons might include i) an unsuitable construction for which no Systems/products had been approved or no Guarantees were available or ii) Pre-existing defects that it was not possible to rectify.

d) For compliance purposes, how can suppliers demonstrate that a cavity wall cannot be insulated?

Building on established admin procedures we would suggest a Chartered Surveyors or Structural Engineers report.

e) Do you have any further comments or suggestions relating to this policy area?

Generally the underlying reason why a cavity cannot be insulated is related to Building Regulations compliance evidenced by the relevant technical approvals. Therefore to reflect this and allow for technical innovation logical suitability should be referenced to those technical approvals.

Question 7:

a) Do you agree it is more appropriate to assess quality of installation and the accuracy of scores separately?

Yes

b) Do you agree with the proposed reactive monitoring process described in paragraphs 1.45 to 1.56 of Appendix 1? Do you think the monitoring rates are appropriate?

Yes we are in favour of any proposals that incentivise, and potentially value, quality.

c) Do you agree that technical monitoring agents should have certain qualifications as explained in paragraph 1.15 of Appendix 1? Can you suggest which qualifications are most appropriate for different categories of measure?

In principle we agree and in the case of CWI agents should have experience of the assessment and installation of CWI.

d) Are the qualifications listed in paragraph 1.16 of Appendix 1 appropriate for score monitoring agents? Are there any other qualifications that you would suggest?

No Comment

e) Do you agree with the proposed timescales for remedial works and re-scoring to be conducted outlined in paragraphs 1.58 and 1.59 of Appendix 1?

In the case of type 1 technical failures related to fabric measures 3 months is too long and could result in problems, for example water penetration through unfilled injection points. Therefore we would favour 1 month.

f) Do you have any further comments or suggestions relating to this policy area?