

Response ID ANON-QUCS-FXYT-7

Submitted to Review of Approved Document A: Structure - call for evidence
Submitted on 2025-04-08 20:08:27

Introduction

Aim of the call for evidence

About you

Name

Please tell us your name:
rhodri williams

Position (if applicable)

Add position (if applicable):
technical director

Organisation (if applicable)

Add organisation (if applicable) :
Home Builders Federation

Address (including postcode)

Add the address:

HBF House
27 Broadwall
Southwark
London
SE1 9PL

Email address

Add the email address:
rhodri.williams@hbf.co.uk

Telephone number

Add number:
07742401594

Please state whether you are responding as an individual or the organisation stated above

Organisation

Please indicate whether you are responding to this call for evidence as a:

Other interested party (please specify)

If you chose other, please specify:
trade body association

Call for evidence questions

Section 1: Codes, standards and references for all building types

No

Add comment:

No

Add comment:

Section 2: Sizes of structural elements for certain residential buildings and other small buildings of traditional construction

Yes

Add comment:

Section 2A: Basic requirements for stability

No

Add comment:

Section 2B: Sizes of certain timber members in floors and roofs for dwellings. Areas at risk from house longhorn beetle

No

Add comment:

Section 2C: Thickness of walls in certain small buildings

No

Add comment:

No

Add comment:

Section 2D: Proportions for masonry chimneys above the roof surface

No

Add comment:

Section 2E: Foundations of plain concrete

No

Add comment:

Section 3: Wall Cladding

Yes

Add comment:

Section 4: Roof covering

No

Add comment:

With changes to other parts of approved documents and the introduction of the Future Homes standard, there may be an opportunity to recognise the more likely introduction of features such as solar panels becoming more prevalent on roof coverings in the years ahead. However solar panels when 'inline' or 'built in' are likely to be lighter than the equivalent concrete or clay roof tiles therefore reducing the imposed load onto the roof structure. As long as acknowledgement is made in the truss design to counter the presence of solar panels or roof tiles, there should be adequate strength already provided within the structure and the wording of the existing AD sufficiently written. Solar Panels on roof coverings have been present for over 30 years on various schemes.

Modern Methods of Construction (MMCs)

Yes

Add comment:

Some elements of MMC may need some further consideration within ADA. However in the example given above on aerated concrete roofs, it is not the presence of aerated concrete that has caused the structural integrity issue. It is more the condition of roof coverings, water and moisture ingress into the roof causing subsequent damage. This could be said for the failure of normal timber trusses, if sufficient water damages cause rot and decay to the point of collapse. The matter above is down to inspection, maintenance and upkeep of roof coverings protecting the structure below in which case, this principle would apply to all roof coverings not just aerated concrete. Aerated concrete is also used in concrete blocks forming inner structural walls. The same vertical failure could exist where water ingress over time impedes its structural integrity if allowed to go unnoticed or unchecked.

Some elements of off site MMC may require building control inspection and third party certification (if required) ahead of being fitted and installed on site if under those circumstances normal building control and site inspection isn't able to be made in the traditional sense due to their assembly being made offsite. In some circumstances MMC's may be in a finished or completed state such that internal elements and components of structural importance aren't able to be inspected or seen. In these circumstances offsite inspection or assurance during the manufacturing process may need to be considered.

No

Add comment:

Design Checking

Yes

Add comment:

Additional clear guidance may be useful in certain areas of ADA for greater clarity if it were to help design and construction and provide a clearer understanding on how to correctly comply with the functional requirements of the building regulations and not produce greater ambiguity.

Competence of Structural Engineers

Yes

Add comment:

Providing clarity on who is deemed to be appropriately qualified to undertake designs and design assessments could be useful for inclusion within the updated AD if clarity and ambiguity is avoided. Qualifications, experience and the correct approach to assessment review could be considered for inclusion.

Other Issues

Yes

Add comment:

With changes to standards and regulations elsewhere in approved documents and elsewhere in government policy, it is likely that new buildings coming forward under Part L Approved Documents are not likely to include Gas as a service utility in residential schemes of the future. The withdrawal of gas as an explosive element within construction is a significant factor in the reduction of risk to disproportionate collapse, structural failure and explosion. It may be useful therefore to take account of this when considering structural calculations, loadings, tie in strengths and the performance of buildings of the future. There may be opportunities to consider more modern methods of construction and lighter weight construction or materials if the structural integrity can still be demonstrated without the risk of explosion and catastrophic damage.

No

Add comment:

If you would like to include diagrams as part of your response, please use the file upload feature below.

Please upload your diagrams here. :

No file uploaded

HSE Confidentiality and GDPR statements