

LABC Services

137 Lupus Street, London, SW1V 3HE

Tel: 020 7641 8737

Fax: 020 7641 8739

E-mail: info@labc-services.co.uk

Inside This Issue:

- A Message from the Chief Executive
- The Fire Column
- AFPOL 2004/05 Figure
- Supermarket Sweep
- Royal Society of Arts 2006 Onians Fellowship
- New Higher Education Graduate Common Learning Outcomes
- Requirement Part G – Hot Water Storage



Dear Colleagues,

We have received a number of phone calls at Lupus Street regarding this year's National Built In Quality Awards. CMP Information is organising the event on behalf of LABC, therefore, if you have any queries please contact one of the following people, who will be happy to assist:

For enquiries regarding the night of the event (20th October), including bookings, please contact [Jen Clarke on 020 8755 4441](tel:02087554441).

For all other enquiries regarding the Quality Awards, please contact [Lucy Bond on 020 7560 4099](tel:02075604099).

This information, along with a complete list of finalists, will be available shortly on the LABC Services website under the "National Built in Quality Awards" heading. Thank you.



From the Chief Executive

I thought it might be of some interest if each month I reported to you what I had been doing on your behalf. Feedback on this will be welcome, positive or otherwise!

I must start with the decisions taken on 23rd June at The De Vere Belfry to set up the new company trading as LABC and to begin the steps of transferring the assets of the existing organisations to it. This was a truly historic occasion, and one which will set us on course for the exciting future ahead. I am delighted I was able to join the organisation in time to participate in this.

I guess that in all months, except perhaps for August, I shall have a fair few meetings to attend, and July was no exception. Among the meetings I had this month were two with my former colleagues in ODPM: one on working more closely together in the future, and the other on the implementation of Part L and the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive, including the related training implications; with the Valuation Office on improving the collection of property-based taxes, and how building control might help; with the NICEIC on working closely together; with Bland Bankart on company insurance matters; with the LGA on how LABC might help them in their role; with McMillan Scott on our relationship with them; and most recently with the Federation of Master Builders on how we might expand our partnership with them, including how we might help them in their application to TrustMark.

Along with the DSA President, Kevin Dawson, I was very pleased to be invited to the Welsh AGM in Llandridnod Wells on 8th July. It was very interesting to hear the Welsh perspective on how we were going about reforming the organisation, and we had a lively debate with some of the officers the night before. Kevin and I attach great importance to developing and expanding contacts with the Regions, and I look forward to reporting on other such meetings in subsequent editions of *Team Talk*.

Again with Kevin, I attended a meeting of the Building Control Initiative - our liaison body with approved inspectors - in Milton Keynes on 14th July. Much time was spent on refining further an initial notice protocol, which I hope can be finalised before too long. The group meets again on 27th October.

The Legislation Working Group met in Birmingham on 5th July under Trevor Haynes' chairmanship. New terms of reference were agreed, subsequently endorsed by the Board, and progress being made with a number of initiatives discussed. A report will be made to the Council of Representatives in Wigan on 13th September.

For many years I have been a strong supporter of local authority building quality awards and, therefore, it has been a particular pleasure this month both to participate in the judging of our National Built in Quality Awards, to be presented at Grosvenor House, London on 20th October, and to attend the Camden awards ceremony on 30th June. As well as being able to share in the success of some splendid individual winners in the unique setting of the German Gymnasium at Kings Cross, it was especially welcome to hear the speech from the Leader of Camden Council praising the work of her Building Control Department. Such awards have the merit not only of celebrating good building work, but also of raising our profile with councillors and the wider community, and I would encourage all authorities and regions which do not yet do so to consider organising such events.

From the Chief Executive (cont)

Much of my time in the next month will be spent in developing our future business plan, and we had a useful first meeting of the group advising me on this on 6th July. We meet again on 8th August. What we recommend on the future role of Business Development Directors will be influenced by the responses to the questionnaire issued earlier this month, where so far we have had in the region of 80 replies. So if you are one of those who has not yet done so, please do so NOW!

The Boards of both the new company and LABC Services met on 20th July, the latter principally to hear and discuss a report from the auditors on last year's accounts. All in good order I am pleased to report, and a credit to Doug Basen and Gayle Crossley and all those involved in compiling the accounts. The meeting of the new company Board could only be a "shadow" one since registration of the company has yet to be completed (gathering signatures from all round the country is an interesting exercise!), but even so there was a lot of useful debate on moving matters forward. It is hoped that the first "official" meeting of the Board can take place on 16th August, to enable some important financial resolutions to be passed.

Finally, I am pleased to report that LABC Services has now entered into two agreements with Brian Bannister, formally of McMillan Scott, but now running his own company. Brian will be helping us expand on our current portfolio of products, services and partnerships as well as taking over certain tasks previously undertaken by Ray Richardson in respect of the annual convention and other training events. Please assist him all you can.

I guess a good many of you will be taking holidays this month, so I wish you a good time and a return to work refreshed for the exciting year ahead.

-Paul Everall
Chief Executive

Sprinklers instead of protected routes?

In recent years there has been speculation regarding the use of sprinklers in lieu of protected stairway enclosures, particularly in the case of dwelling houses. This article seeks to separate the fact from the fiction and deliver a clear opinion based upon scientific fact whether sprinklers can provide an appropriate level of protection in place of a protected route.

Where did the idea come from?

It is unclear where the idea to use sprinklers in place of protected routes originated. I can really only list the documented references where the idea is supported.

1. Health Technical Memorandum 88 permits an open stairway in a house where sprinklers are fitted in a building occupied by persons with learning difficulties. (This document is not currently cited in Approved document B - although the previous version is - which does not mention sprinklers).
2. The Local Government Association in their document 'Automatic Fire Sprinklers - a toolkit for domestic premises' state that 'relaxations can be permitted to allow open stairways an inner rooms with sleeping risk where sprinklers are fitted'.
3. In the USA open plan dwellings are permitted where sprinklers are fitted.
4. Some sprinkler installers are supporting the idea. A particular sprinkler installer states on their website that sprinklers can allow the omission of protected routes.

In the case of 1 and 2 no reason or references are given in these documents to explain why sprinklers are considered to be effective. I have consulted the Local Government Association and they have said:

'The guidance was written before the BRE research was published, and has not been updated since, so does not take the research into account. The examples given in the toolkit were included to show that local authorities have altered Building regs if sprinklers are fitted rather than as specific guidance ... if we republish the toolkit we will make sure that we remove the two examples you highlight as they are clearly not appropriate ones to highlight.'



In the case of 4, I contacted the sprinkler installer referred to and they stated their use of sprinklers were in combination with smoke ventilation (Although this is not mentioned on their website).

As for USA perspective this is a complex issue as there are cultural and historic issues which appear to have led to the use of sprinklers. This will be discussed later in the article.

How could sprinklers assist means of escape?

The guidance of Approved Document B and BS 5588: Part 1 both recommend that dwelling houses over two storeys be provided with a protected stairway delivering to a final exit.

The Fire Column (continued)

This effectively means an open plan staircase delivering into the ground floor living room is not possible in a house exceeding two stories.

There are two problems which occupants of a house face when escaping from an upper floor through a ground floor living room containing a fire - smoke and heat. Both these phenomena will incapacitate the occupants. Smoke produces a cocktail of substances, which cause irritation, unconsciousness and death. Heat will create a condition, which will range from intense skin pain resulting in burns to heat exposure; which will prevent a person from escaping and ultimately cause death.

Sprinklers are very effective in preventing the build up of heat. Normally most of the heat which occupants are exposed to is transported by way of the smoke, which forms in a layer at ceiling level from the smoke plume produced by the fire. Sprinklers have a cooling effect, which reduces the heat in the smoke layer to temperatures which do not cause extreme discomfort. However it is smoke, which causes most people to die in fire conditions or afterwards due to the effect of smoke inhalation. Sprinklers would be effective if they were able to prevent the build-up of toxic smoke products for the period in which escape needs to take place.

Research

In 2004 the Building Research Establishment (BRE) at the request of the ODPM set out to investigate this problem by carrying out realistic fire tests in sprinklered and unsprinklered situations [1]. Human survival in smoke conditions (tenability) was determined by using work previously done by David Purser. Smoke toxicity is determined by a number of factors, which have been effectively simplified into a calculation, which represents the combined cocktail of toxic elements. This is known as the Fractional Effective Dose (FED). Experiments had previously been conducted which determined that a FED of 1 would render a fit healthy adult unconscious [2]. As David Purser points out, not all of our population are fit and healthy or adult and fire safety design should allow for 'essentially all occupants to survive uninjured' [3].

Therefore a scaling down of the FED value needs to be considered. PD 7974: Part 6 states that a FED of 0.3 will enable 90% of the population to survive. FED of 0.1 will enable essentially all occupants to survive. The choice of which FED level is acceptable comes down to what we hope our means of escape strategy will achieve. With protected routes we do not assume 10% of our population will die so FED 0.1 would appear to be the most appropriate level of acceptance and it also complies with David Pursers advice that essentially all occupants will survive including elderly, children and those subject to heart conditions or asthma.

Escape time

This comprises three elements. Time to detection, pre-movement time and escape time. Of the three, pre-movement time is the longest. This is the time between the sounding of the alarm and the time taken for the family to move towards the exit. In a domestic house 5-10 minutes is expected where a well maintained smoke detection system is installed [4]. Time to detection is somewhere in the region of 1 - 4 minutes depending upon the type of fire [1]. The time to escape is then added, and this depends upon the mobility of occupants.

The results from the BRE research showed that the toxicity build-up in a sprinkler controlled fire to FED 0.1 was faster than even the pre-movement times for occupants of a domestic house. An interesting observation from the results is that in some cases the toxicity build up to FED 0.1 was the same for an unsprinkler-controlled fire as a sprinkler controlled fire (see table below).

The Fire Column (continued)

Speed of Toxicity build-up to FED 0.1 in room sprinklered and unsprinklered (Slower is better)		
Type of fire	Un-sprinklered room	Sprinklered room
TV	Slower	Faster
Sofa	Marginally Slower	Marginally faster
Bed	Faster	Slower
Table	About the same	
Chip pan	About the same	

The results of the research for a television fire in an open lounge is summarised in the report:-
'The conditions in the lounge became untenable but remained tenable throughout the rest of the house'. The visibility remained tenable in the bedroom and loft only.' [1]

The time to reach unconsciousness at FED 1 (For fit healthy adults) was between 5 min 51 seconds – 10 mins 33 seconds. Which is quicker than the pre-movement time. When FED 0.1 is considered as tenable conditions for all occupants, the time is reduced even further (e.g. 3 min 30 sec for a table fire) and only in the case of the bed fire was the toxicity level kept below FED 0.1 for the time needed for escape.

The USA perspective

The USA situation is not easy to interpret. Their decision to use sprinklers may be more related to cultural differences and the development of their fire safety strategy. Until the 1990's fire deaths in the USA were around twice those in the UK. Fifty percent of the USA fire deaths were remote from the room of fire origin. Compared to thirty five percent in the UK [5]. This may suggest the use of protected routes was successful in the UK. Whatever the basis for the decision to use sprinklers in place of protected routes it appears that they have carried out no actual research work in this area. All the research work carried out regarding sprinklers in the USA has been aimed at understanding their effectiveness in controlling fire growth not for assessing the role sprinklers may play in reducing the build-up of smoke toxicity.

Recently the National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA) have reported that two persons have died in a house completely sprinklered, where the system was properly operating [7]. Despite this the USA remain confident that they have improved their fire deaths by the use of sprinklers. However if protected routes were not the normal means of protection, sprinklers would show an improvement, even if some deaths occur. This is where the historic and cultural differences arise.

There certainly is no evidence from the USA to support the use of sprinklers in lieu of protected routes in the UK.

Myth and reality

In supporting the use of sprinklers it is often quoted that protected routes in dwellings are not effective because occupants leave the fire doors open. If sprinklers will allow a percentage of occupants to survive this must be better. This is an interesting point of view and does have some degree of logic, until you analyse the facts. The BRE research looked at the toxicity in a protected route when a fire door was left open. The results were surprising.

The Fire Column (continued)

Sprinklers performed well with heat, keeping the temperature within acceptable limits throughout their time of activation. The open door kept the temperature down below tenability limits for 15 minutes. However with sprinklers and no protected route occupants would be incapacitated from smoke, 50 seconds earlier than if they were in a protected route with an open fire door. This shows that even an open door will provide better protection than sprinklers. (I am not however advocating leaving doors open – just comparing the performance).

It is also often quoted that no one has died in a building containing sprinklers. However it is important to consider whether the sprinklers were actually responsible for the result or just happen to be present. In London the statutory requirements for sprinklers are for tall or large volume buildings, which inherently have a high standard of physical means of escape protection comprising lobbied staircases delivering to protected final exits. A true test would be their use in a building containing no protected routes and as previously mentioned we have an example where the NFPA reported that two persons died in a house completely sprinklered, where the system was properly operating [7].

Conclusion

Sprinklers have the ability to reduce the heat output from a fire by containing its growth, however the main problem for means of escape is smoke. Sprinklers have been shown to reduce overall smoke toxicity, however for the critical period when persons need to escape this reduction is not sufficient to maintain tenable conditions. In some cases the time for smoke toxicity to reach a critical level is not very different from an unsprinklered fire. Therefore sprinklers are not a suitable alternative to a protected route.

The BRE research has however revealed that sprinklers when combined with protected routes in dwellings gives better protection to the protected route by reducing the toxicity of smoke in the protected route and therefore may allow the protected route to be used for longer. A possible solution where an alternative means of escape is difficult to achieve in a dwelling?

References

- [1] Effectiveness of sprinklers in residential premises: Project report number 204505. Section 5: Experimental programme; February 2004; Dr Corinne Williams and Dr Stuart Campbell. (February 2004).
- [2] The society of fire protection engineer's handbook; third edition; Section 2; Chapter 6; Toxicity assessment of Combustion products; David A. Purser (2002).
- [3] Page 2-90 of the above.
- [4] BS 7974: Part 6 Human Factors
- [5] Page 2-84 of ref [2]
- [6] Theme: Fire – Spacious American flats by Miller Hannah, Gary Daniels, Kevin Leahy and Terry Watson – Architect Journal focus July 2003 p7.
- [7] Fire Protection Engineering (Magazine) Number 25; What have we learned about the benefits and costs of residential Fire Sprinkler Legislation. p 25.

W/E RATIO – AFPOL 2004/05

Thanks to the twenty Outer London Boroughs we now have our latest AFPOL figure, as follows:

2004/05 AFPOL = £396

This is up from last year's figure, which was £366.

The Average Fee per Project for Outer London (AFPOL) is the datum used in the Workload/Establishment Ratio (W/E Ratio) which is referred to in the Quality and Performance Matrix (QPM).

The W/E Ratio was first introduced in the 1994 **Level of Service Document** and expanded upon in the 1999 revision, available from LDSA Publications, PO Box 15, London SW6 3TU. This particular edition goes into detail on how the formula works and the variables to be considered, and how to deal with them, when applying this formula.

The easiest method, however, is to use the **CD ROM** calculator disk which was included in the QPM Booklet, distributed to each authority in 2003/04, and which automatically calculates your result after inputting 2 or 3 basic figures.

The purpose of the W/E Ratio is to give an indicative (not prescriptive) position of how well an authority is geared up to deal with its workload, and to help compare one authority with another when it comes to performance, ie, it is an indicator as to whether an authority is adequately or over or under-resourced, or appears better placed than another to handle its workload, and which could be one factor to explain comparatively better or worse performance.

*-Adrian Prest
Business Initiatives Manager
LABC/DSA*

Supermarket Sweep **(and a few Marketing Reminders)**



ASDA and TESCO have revised and are further revising their procurement procedures and, during the last two months, the National Business Development Team has visited or contacted almost all of the framework contractors and architects who work on their schemes to outline the benefits of using LABC. It is hoped that this initiative will increase the LABC share of the work of these important clients under the new arrangements and work on a few schemes has already been promised.

There is further work to do to secure more Sainsburys schemes but the Morrisons' partnership with Bradford continues to flourish!

Details of the above, and all other contacts are contained in the National Customer Database together with the diaries of all the Business Development Directors and a wealth of other vital marketing information, including the full contact details for more than 4,000 companies.

If you haven't already registered for the database, which is accessed via the "Marketing Area" in the Members Area of the LABC Services website, now is the time! To safeguard the security of the system, your Head of Building Control will also have to authorise your registration. If you need any advice on registration or use of the system, please contact Neela at Lupus Street or your Business Development Director at the following link http://www.labc-services.co.uk/contactus/default.asp?editorial_id=15146

As a reminder, the LABC Marketing Manual is also in the Members Area of the website and available for use by all LABC staff. It is not exciting reading, but it could prove useful when preparing a marketing plan or considering any other aspect of the marketing or the promotion of your service.

It is also a useful resource that you may wish to use as part of the induction training of new staff or the in-house marketing training of existing staff.

Why not go to the LABC Services Members Area and select Marketing Area, then LABC Marketing Manual from the blue menu now to browse the sections of the manual and find out what's in it so that you will know when and how you may wish to use it in the future!

To seek assistance with securing a Supermarket or other major scheme, or to request a visit or to discuss any aspect of marketing, please do not hesitate to contact your Business Development Director.

-Phil Harrison
National Business Development Director

Latent Gold Team Expands



We are pleased to announce that Bridget Elliott has joined the Latent Gold team within Bland Bankart. Bridget has been providing occasional support to the team recently and has accepted a position within the team created to cope with increasing demand.

Since Bland Bankart and LABC Services launched Latent Gold it is estimated that the number of commercial buildings benefiting from Latent Gold type insurance has increased 400%. The increased demand coupled with the continued efforts to promote Latent Gold to lawyers, insurance brokers, contractors, architects and other professionals has necessitated an expansion of the team.

There is much work to do as publicity continues to surround various projects suffering from defects that could have been covered by Latent Gold. Recently the press has covered:

- 1) Clissold Leisure Centre – a building covered in our article in April's edition of *Team Talk*. The local authority involved has recently awarded a £6m repair contract for repairs to avoid demolition of the £32m building. Legal costs are reportedly in excess of £1.5m and rising whilst the contractor involved, Gleasons, have subsequently pulled out of Building.
- 2) Disney Store Distribution Warehouse – Disney are suing a property developer after a concrete floor suffered “severe widespread and persistent cracking”. Disney claim the floor is “seriously defective” and that only a complete overhaul will be sufficient. The cost of repair and subsequent disruption is thought to be around £8.4m. The legal bill is unknown.
- 3) Lafarge Cement – A rogue group of workers supplied poor quality cement to hundreds of customers from the Lafarge plant in the South West. It is thought the concrete may deteriorate over time and it is unknown how many buildings may be affected.

Whilst Latent Gold cannot prevent the defects occurring, the resulting problems, disputes and costs can all be dramatically reduced or even avoided all together, in addition to the building repairs being paid for by insurers.

Latent Gold cannot be provided without LABC inspections being undertaken and therefore, business for Latent Gold is business for LABC. All we need to do is make sure our mutual customers are aware of the availability of such protection.

Further information can be obtained from Mark Jackson on 0116 204 3056 or e-mail at mark.jackson@blandbankart.co.uk.

THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF ARTS 2006 ONIANS FELLOWSHIP

Dear Colleagues,

I have recently been elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts (RSA), and as such, I have received details of this Fellowship. It may be of interest to readers of Team Talk, or to someone working for you, so I am drawing it to your attention.

The RSA's 2006 Onians Fellowship – which will be the last Onians Fellowship – is now open for applications. Do you know of anyone who might be interested in applying? If so, could we ask you to draw this message to their attention and direct them to the website:

<http://www.thersa.org/onians/frameset.asp?> Equally, we should appreciate your suggestions as to people or bodies who could help us publicise the Fellowship.

The Fellowship was set up in 2000 in memory of the Society's late Chairman, Dick Onians (1940-1999). Worth up to £30,000, its purpose is to enable the successful applicant to take time out to develop an innovative and marketable idea for the benefit of society. Dick's belief in young people will influence the selection, although people of any age are welcome to apply. Formal qualifications are not necessary.

The theme for the 2006 award is once again Enterprise and Entrepreneurship. Applications are invited from those with proposals designed to encourage the creation of new businesses from new ideas, or to develop an entrepreneurial environment better able to help young people establish their own businesses. In addition, special emphasis will be placed on protecting the environment, relieving transport problems and improving the rural economy. Proposals should lead to a practical end product or service, and provide an opportunity for the applicant to acquire new skills. The Fellowship is not available for academic research.

More details and an application form can be found on the website. Applications (by e-mail to onians@rsa.org.uk) must be received no later than 23.00 hours (British Summer Time) on 30 September 2005.

*-Paul Everall
Chief Executive*



NEW HIGHER EDUCATION GRADUATE COMMON LEARNING OUTCOMES

In 1997 the Common Learning Outcomes covering built environment Higher Education programmes were signed up to by the major professional bodies. Through consultation with the professional bodies and academia, a revised set of these has now been developed to reflect the changing needs of the industry.

The construction and built environment sector recognises that improvement in construction practice can only be truly effective when all stakeholders work together and recognise the distinctiveness of all professionals within the industry.

The new set of Graduate Common Learning Outcomes (GCLOS) provides a valuable benchmark for construction and built environment graduates. The criteria within the GCLOS set out the personal skills and levels of technical and professional awareness that new graduates should have achieved as they embark upon their professional careers.

The following professional bodies have already officially signed up to the new GCLOS:

BIAT (British Institute of Architectural Technologists)
CIBSE (Chartered Institute of Building Services Engineers)
CIOB (Chartered Institute of Building)
ICES (Institution of Civil Engineering Surveyors)
KI (Landscape Institute)
RIBA (Royal Institute of British Architects)

Courses which are accredited or validated by these professional bodies will be designated a 'CIC endorsed course' and may use the CIC logo. Further details on the accredited courses can be obtained directly from the relevant professional body.

A copy of the full Higher Education Graduate Common Learning Outcomes can be found at www.cic.org.

Requirement Part G3 Hot Water Storage

**By José Anon, Principal Surveyor
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea**

Building Regulations Schedule 1 Part G3 deals with unvented hot water storage systems (UVHWSS) because unless installed correctly the cylinder could explode, or cause danger from hot water discharge.

What are unvented hot water storage systems?

These are systems relying on storage cylinders fed directly from cold water mains and which do not incorporate a vent pipe to relieve excess built-up pressure to atmosphere. The pressure for the hot water system is derived from mains pressure supply rather than pressure from a cold-water storage tank.

What are the requirements for the installation?

A hot water storage system, which does not incorporate a vent pipe to atmosphere, may only be installed by a person competent to do so and precautions shall be made to:

- (a) prevent the temperature of the water at any time exceeding 100°C and,
- (b) to ensure that the hot water discharged from safety devices is safely conveyed to where it is visible but will not cause danger to persons in or about the building.

What information do I have to provide when submitting an application?

Under Regulations 13 and 14 of the Building Regulations 2000, persons submitting a Building Notice or Full Plans with a Local Authority must, where the work involves the provision of an UVHWSS provide a statement which specifies:

- the name, make model and type of hot water storage system to be installed
- the name of the body, if any, which has approved or certified that the system is capable of performing in a way which satisfies the requirements of paragraph G3 of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations
- the name of the body, if any, which has issued any current registered operative identity card to the installer or proposed installer of the system.

It should be noted that The Water Supply (Water Fittings) Regulations 1999 also apply to such installations.

Who can be considered a competent person?

“Competent” persons should possess a current Registered Operative identity card for the installation of UVHWSS issued by organisations such as the Institute of Plumbing or the Construction Industry Training Board, following assessment by a recognised training body.

What requirements apply to the water heater?

UVHWSS should consist of a proprietary package or unit approved by a member body of the European Organisation for Technical Approvals or a certification body having National Accreditation Council for Certification Bodies (NACCB) accreditation and testing or have a proven independent assessment demonstrating compliance with EOTA or NACCB verification and performance.

What safety devices are required?

The Regulations require the package or unit to be fitted with:

- a non self-resetting thermal cut-out. Indirect units must be wired to a motorised valve or some other device to shut off the flow to the primary heater (heat exchanger).
- One or more temperature or combined temperature and pressure relief valves. These need to be located directly on the vessel so that stored water does not exceed 100°C in the event of failure of the electrical controls.

What are the requirements for the installation?

Hot water discharged from the safety devices must be conveyed visibly and safely away from the unit without endangering persons in or about the building. The package or unit is normally supplied with a tundish, which provides a visible indication of water discharging from the safety valves. The tundish needs to be within 500 mm. of the safety valves and in the same compartment as the vessel. The discharge pipe from the tundish should be at least one size larger than the pipe to the tundish and needs to terminate in a safe place without risk to the people near the discharge. Systems with units that do not have an internal air gap must be fitted with an external expansion vessel, preferably on the cold water feed. Diagram 1 in Approved Document G shows typical discharge pipe arrangement and Table 1 in Approved Document G shows minimum dimensions for, and how to size, the pipe from the tundish to a safe discharge point.

How do I integrate this type of system into my heating design?

UVHWSS can be direct i.e. heated by electric immersion heaters or gas burners, and indirect i.e. heated by a central heating boiler through a heating system. Combination units consisting of a boiler and unvented storage vessel are also available.

The photograph shows an incorrectly installed UVHWSS

Q1: What vital fitting is missing?

Q2: What are the circled devices called?

Answers on page 16.



Rotherham Metropolitan Council

Choose DataSpace

Rotherham Metropolitan Council have chosen to use DataSpace Technical Document Management software across both Building Control and Planning departments.

DataSpace for Submit-a-plan and **DataSpace for Planning** are to be used by both Building Control and Planning Departments to receive and manage both paper and electronic applications made on Submit-a-plan.com and the Planning Portal respectively.

“We chose to use Resolution’s DataSpace Technical Document Management System across both Building Control and Planning departments as it was the only solution that met and exceeded all our requirements. The DataSpace range of products will allow the authority to work more dynamically and efficiently while providing even greater service to our customers.”

**-Keith Hirst, Building Control Manager
Rotherham Metropolitan Council**

Paper Applications

DataSpace Capture Pro was chosen to scan and index all daily paper applications into the system. DataSpace Capture Pro automatically reads text from a drawing such as the drawing title that is used to populate search fields in the system, allowing drawings to be instantly shared and retrieved. In addition written application forms can be scanned and added to the system, avoiding the manual input of data. Once scanned, applications can be processed and stored electronically and the applications can be tracked online just as though it was an original website application.

Public Access

PlanNet Public Access is being implemented as part of the solution at Rotherham so that the general public can search for and access application details online including all drawings. Historic applications can also be made available online.

Online Payment

Online payment for applications made on Submit-a-plan.com is also being implemented. The online payment system will integrate with Rotherham’s own payment engine, ensuring that payment and is made direct to the authority and payment received before the application is processed.

To learn more about online applications and the benefits of DataSpace for both Building Control and Planning then please contact **Steven Mabbutt** at Resolution by e-mail steven.mabbutt@resolutionltd.com or by calling **01242 260505**.





... as do 73% of LABC members

Introducing you to CIS, the leading online construction information service brought to you by the IHS and NBS partnership, in association with the LABC.

The CIS team of dedicated information professionals continually monitor the construction industry, selecting, classifying and abstracting relevant documents to ensure that our customers have access to a comprehensive up to date service.

CIS is the only service to offer online access to the most widely used technical reference in the construction industry – the Building Regulations Approved Documents and link you through to the leading construction publications, the renowned Architects Journal, Construction News and New Civil Engineer.

CIS customers also get access to Specify-it, the online collection of construction component and equipment information with over 800,000 pages of full text from more than 90,000 catalogues and over 30,000 FastrackCAD drawings.

For more information on CIS and all its benefits, email amber.kennedy@ihsti.com today!

CIS

The single source of up to date information for professionals
 technical data • product and supplier information • regulations and standards • legislation • advisory information
 Wiloughby Road, Bexknell, Berkshire RG12 3DW UK t +44 (0) 1344 404434 f +44 (0) 1344 424971 e marketing@ihsti.com www.ihsti.com



Answers for Requirement Part G3 Hot Water Storage Article Questions (from page 14)

Q1: What vital fitting is missing?

A1: The vital fitting missing is the tundish.

Q2: What are the circled devices called?

A2: The circled devices are; top – pressure relief valve; bottom – temperature relief valve.