Technology Strategy Board
Driving Innovation

Retrofit for the Future

Project final report

Cover note

This report was prepared by the collaborative project team for this Retrofit for the Future project, to provide fuller context on their experiences and the particulars of their retrofit's specification, construction and occupation.

The authors were encouraged to include honest, transparent and constructive comment, garnered from multiple perspectives across their team. All views are taken to be an accurate account from the time.

There may have been further modifications to the property after this report was produced. It is therefore possible that a small minority of statements will no longer be valid.

Although minor modifications have been made to this report by the Technology Strategy Board, these were only to ensure the privacy of individuals, including the residents, and compliance with the Data Protection Act.

This report may contain links to other websites, such as for project partners or the retrofit project. The Technology Strategy Board is not responsible for the content of those websites.

This report has already proven to be a valuable source of information for the technical and cost analysis reports published by the Technology Strategy Board which are available at: www.retrofitanalysis.org

Retrofit for the Future Project Final Report

Project number: ZA428E
Property number: TSB053

Author - Raven Housing

The work reported here has been funded by the Technology Strategy Board under the Small Business Research Initiative (SBRI) under the Retrofit for the Future programme. This project is one of nearly 90 projects funded under the programme. Further information on the programme can be found at: www.innovateuk.org/retrofit

Technology Strategy Board
Driving Innovation

SBRI
Government challenges.
Ideas from business.
Innovative solutions.

Final Report

Project information

- **ZA reference number:** ZA428E
- **Location of property:** RH1 Redhill
- **Lead participant details:** Raven Housing, Raven House, 29 Linkfield Lane, Redhill, Surrey RH1 1SS, 01737 272550, www.ravenht.org.uk
- **Date report issued:** April 2011

Contents

1. Project details and directory 4
2. Occupants 5
3. Dates 7
4. Pre-retrofit property 8
5. Design 9
6. Construction 12
7. Commissioning and occupancy 14
8. Wash-up meeting 15
9. Doing it again 15
10. Business benefits 18
11. Additional Information 19

1. Project details and directory

Role	Organisation	Contact Details
HA	Raven Housing	Address:
HA	Raven Housing	Address: Raven House, 29 Linkfield Lane, Redhill, Surrey RH1 1SS Tel: 01737 272550 Website: www.ravenht.org.uk
Architect	PRP Architects	Address:10 Lindsey Street London EC1A 9HP Tel: 020 7653 1200 / 0845 634 3614 Website: www.prparchitects.co.uk/
Main contractor	Wates Living Space	Address: Wates House, Station Approach, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 7SWTel: 01372 861000
Sub-contractor – electric	Nathan Dew Ltd	
Sub-contractor - heating	Nathan Dew Ltd	
PV installer	Viridian Solar	
Supplier - windows	Janex	

2. Occupants

The occupants are a family of 7 (2 adults and 5 children) and occupied the property before, during and after the works to the property had been completed.

Prior to the works being undertaken the residents were practising some sustainable lifestyle activities such as recycling and turning the lights off but were not aware of the technologies we were proposing to install to the property which included a photovoltaic system, a solar thermal system, ground source heat pump, LED lighting, insulation and a heat recovery unit. In addition the residents were not aware of how these technologies could have an impact on the property they were occupying and the benefits they would receive as a result. However the residents were positive and excited about the prospect of having a range of technologies that could support them to lead a more sustainable lifestyle and potentially save them money long term.

During the works the residents were made more aware of the types of technologies that were being installed. The project involved a significant range of works to the property and time delays were incurred which impacted on the residents in terms of room usage, dust and some noise. As this project was new and Raven Housing Trust and Wates had not embarked on a project of this nature before there was a lot of learning relating to the project which could reduce the impact on the residents in the future.

Post completion the residents have experienced some of the benefits of the technologies though this is still in the early stages and the defects period has only just been completed. The residents have found the works to the property quite intrusive and the prolonged timescale has added to this anxiety due to some defects having to be resolved.

However, benefits they have experienced have included the ground source heat pump heating system working correctly and the solar hot water system and ground source heating system supplying hot water for a family of 7. The residents have also had their energy tariff changed (they were previously on a high tariff) which in these early stages has led to a slightly lower energy bill and with the monitoring we expect this to reduce further. Lifestyle activities have also seemed to change slightly. A monitoring tool was installed in the property which allowed the residents to monitor their electricity use. This has made the residents far more aware of the energy and money they are using and has resulted in them buying an eco kettle, ensuring appliances are being turned off and turning off the heating when it is not needed.

Please state the make-up of occupants before and after the retrofit:

Age band	Number before retrofit	Number after retrofit
Under 5 years	0	0
5-16 years	5	5
17-21 years	0	0
22-50 years	2	2
51-65 years	0	0

Over 65 years	0	0
Please state if (yes/no):	Before retrofit	After retrofit
Married couple / partners	Yes	Yes
Couple / partners with children	Yes	Yes
Any disabled persons	No	No

3. Dates

Event	Date
Project start date (when was the first proposal discussed or agreed) Initial project meeting with Hills/VHT.	30.03.10
Planning application submitted (if appropriate)	19.05.10
Planning permission granted (if appropriate)	19.07.10
Building Regulations application submitted (if appropriate)	24.09.10 Building Notice submitted
Building Regulations approval granted (if appropriate)	Acknowledged 27.09.10
Contract for work let / signed	
Occupants moved out (state if they remained or property was empty)	Tenants in occupation during build
Start on site	27.09.10
Completion of retrofit	17.12.10
Occupants moved in	Tenants in occupation during build
Monitoring system commissioned and operating properly	Microwatt installation incomplete
Building defects corrected	
Building services and controls operating correctly	
Programmed completion date (delayed by delay procuring triple glazed window fixing brackets - see above)	19.11.10

4. Pre-retrofit property

The proposed house is a 3 bed semi-detached property on a residential estate in South Merstham, Surrey. It was constructed in the post-war period between 1940 and 1960 and is of traditional brick built cavity construction typical of houses of this period. The roof is of traditional timber pitched construction with tiled roof covering. The ground floor is of solid concrete construction and currently has no insulation installed. The wall cavities have been insulated as part of RHT's maintenance programme and the loft currently has approx. 100mm of mineral wool insulation. The original windows were previously replaced with double glazed UPVC installed in 2001 with trickle ventilators in the window head.

Many of these properties still exist with the majority having little in the way of energy efficiency improvements other than roof insulation, heating upgrades and in some cases, window replacement, installed under the Decent Homes programme in England and Wales.

The property was one of many properties selected in the South Merstham, Surrey area. Properties were selected on the basis that they had had minimum works installed to date, were possibly suitable for the suggested works and had a low SAP score. Tenants occupying these properties were then written to ask if they would be interested in taking part in the project. Subsequently tenants who responded were interviewed to establish if the residents would be fully on board with the project and to carry out a site survey of the property. The final property was then selected. Raven were keen to retrofit two properties but this came over the budget allowed for the TSB project so only one property was selected.

5. Design

The range of measures that could be considered for the end of terrace house were constrained by a requirement to avoid decanting tenants - particularly as it was further constrained by a high occupancy with 7 persons.

Key innovations include both process and products of retrofit. The process innovation includes the use of air-tightness testing at feasibility stage to baseline the performance of the existing building. This quality control activity provides evidence on which to base recommendations for the investment in retrofit measures. The design process will have further innovation through the collaborative development of the detailed design by the professional design team including the constructor, as practiced regularly in other industries that seek to achieve low defect rates in high volume work. This is a relatively innovative approach in the UK and is based on experience of achieving Passivhaus levels of performance and of techniques employed in upskilling of the delivery team in low energy housing programmes including the EU CONCERTO programme in the UK and elsewhere. The use of TRISCO 3-d cold bridge modelling will also be a novelty. Early use of the model in earnest has brought to light certain limitations of the test procedures of recently issued UK guidance.

The range of technical innovation includes the application of external insulation together with a new, planning compliant brick-slip finish that closely matches the adjacent brickwork of neighbouring property.

The installation of a solar thermal hot water system is no longer truly innovative in the UK, however, its use in recharging the ground bore heat pump system is likely to provide an annual balance of ground temperatures. This recharge is likely to reduce the risk of freezing that can accompany a unidirectional heat flow from the ground in a conventional ground bore heat pump system. In addition, the solar thermal collector array will provide additional benefit to the hot water demands of the larger than average family (occupancy 7 persons). A split array is also likely to be used in a novel valve-less way utilising switched pumps.

The installation of an advanced, high efficiency MVHR mechanical ventilation and heat recovery unit (>90% eff with low power dc rare earth motors) with summertime bypass is innovative in social housing when retrofitting properties and is intended to maintain and improve air quality to a fully occupied house that is in use 24/7.

If the proposals for the retrofit changed or, as in some cases, the property changed, please explain these changes and the background that led to the change.

Consultant Change
Phases 1 and 2 were undertaken with Inbuilt as the energy consultant. Inbuilt were replaced by PRP after the phase 2 application. The project itself needed to be reworked as the original modelling and underlying assumptions and measures were unclear. PRP have endeavoured to keep to the spirit of the phase 2 application by retaining the key elements of the retrofit, in particular the GSHP / Solar thermal recharge system and MVHR. The

insulation has been upgraded in order to continue to meet the declared CO_2 emission and primary energy targets.

Single Property
The phase 2 application mentions a second property. This second property was abandoned from the project at the end of phase 1 in order to concentrate on a single property to greater effect and due to the second property works costs coming over the grant cap.

Some white goods different
The original proposal included A++ 'white goods'. It was found that this specification is not commonly (or indeed at all) available for some product types. The highest energy specification products available within the budget were chosen, in some cases such as the washer/drier this was A+ rated only.

Solar Doorbell
Introduced as an enhancement post phase 2 application and subsequently omitted as no suitable product could be located.

Trisco 3D modelling
This was omitted from the development of the final design as PRP currently has no facility for this.

Monitoring
For a short period during the final project development the environmental monitoring was ordered from EST. This occurred during a period of Microwatt lack of clarity coinciding with a sales push from EST. The monitoring reverted to Microwatt as when including renewables their offering was considerably cheaper.

Orsis equipment is being used to monitor the utilities (gas, electricity and water).

Water Saving Brassware
Low flow taps, a low flow shower and two dual flush WC cisterns were introduced to the project in order to enhance the environmental performance of the property. The new building regulations part L 2010 now demand water use restrictions.

LED Lighting
High performance LED lighting has been installed in place of CFLs as LEDs are more efficient and longer lasting on the first floor only due to limited budget.

Triple Glazing Throughout
The phase 2 application allowed for triple glazing only on the north facing side of the property, this was found to be insufficient to achieve the stated CO_2 emission and primary energy target. Triple glazing has been installed throughout the property.

Sloping Ceiling Insulation
The property has dropped eaves as a construction feature. This means that the perimeter has an area of sloping ceiling. This has been insulated to reduce heat loss through the element.

250W PV
During the finalising of the design it was decided to install 250Wp of PV to the property in order to offset any additional electricity consumption from pumps used for the GSHP / solar thermal recharge system. Funding for this will come from the Feed-in-Tariff as the provision was not part of the TSB funding.

Solar Provider
The phase 2 application mentions Baxi as a supplier of solar thermal panels, this supplier has been replaced by Viridian Solar as the panels are better suited to the in-roof installation which will avoid roof strengthening.

Key differences between the retrofit as designed and as built:

Zone control not installed
During the course of the project it was discovered by the contractor that to install zone control would require completely re-plumbing almost the entire central heating system. A simple room 'stat, programmer and TRV control system was retained. Although this will have had a slight detrimental effect on the CO_2 emission reductions the targets should still be met.

6. Construction

Procurement –The project negotiated with a framework partner.

Contract type – NEC3 Option A

Contract structure –Management contractor with trades sub-contracted

Subcontractors – 10 Subcontractors were used with the trades including: Multi-traders, Electricians, Scaffolders, Heat Pump engineers, window fitters, roofers and solar panel installers, Energy and building performance monitoring specialist.

Specialist installers – Technologies which involved specialist installers included installation of External wall insulation, heat pump, solar and pv panels and energy monitoring equipment.

Specialist equipment suppliers – Specialist equipment included: heat pump, solar and pv panels, whole house ventilation system, energy monitoring equipment. These were in the main procured through a partnering arrangement as the specialist contractors were involved at the start of the project in an advisory role.

Site supervision – Wates had a Site Manager / Resident Liaison officer who was permanently on site.

Role of architect/design team – Retained to supervise/oversee construction and also to sign off works. Architect also acted in the capacity of Contract Administrator.

Lessons learned

Drilling for Ground Source Heat Pump

Two methods of drilling have been used on the project. The first and preferred option was the truck mounted hydraulic push system which had a number of advantages including the neatness of the hole created in the ground and the non-existence of spoil after the drilling. However due to inclement weather and the softening of the ground as a result, this method had to be changed for reasons which included, the truck being too heavy to stand on the garden of the property, difficulty with manoeuvrability of the truck whilst in the garden and the possibility of damage to existing buried services. The second method of drilling which was the alternative to the first was the use of a drilling rig. The advantages of using this system were that it fitted well within the garden, it allowed the drilling of one borehole as against the four by the hydraulic system. The inherent disadvantages with this system included the noise of the rig during drilling, the considerable amount of spoil dug up, the large amount of water required for the drilling and the unpredictability of the progress of the drilling process due to the impact of various ground conditions on the drilling equipment.

Whole House Ventilation System

The loft space was found as the best place to install the heat exchanger for the whole house ventilation system. It is important to consider that with limited head height in the loft space which will be further reduced due to added insulation, engineers carrying out their biennial checks and maintenance on the heat exchanger might find it a considerably tight space to work in.

Ducting for Whole House Ventilation System
Running of ventilation ducts requires very careful attention as it can be intrusive and obstructive to existing room layout and furniture. The siting of the ventilation ducts on this project was in the main dictated by the joist run.

Windows
In order for the triple glazed windows to sit forward of their existing position and within the insulation on the building, galvanised brackets were designed by a structural engineer which was meant to hold the windows in that forward position. The result of using these brackets was a considerable disturbance to the window reveals. On future projects consideration should be given to using an alternative bracket such as a gallows bracket

Radiators
Re-sizing of the radiators has resulted in extensive internal decorations. Colours could not be matched.

Heat Exchanger
The heat exchanger which is the interface between the solar thermal panels and the ground source heat pump needs to be appropriately sized in order that the re-charge is controlled so as to not increase the brine temperature in the ground unduly.

External Works
External works were affected by adverse weather conditions.

Boiler
De-commissioning of the boiler needs to coincide with commissioning of solar thermal system. This will ensure that the period that the residents need to use their emersion heater is minimised.

Resident Liaison
A fine balance needs to be found in the amount and type of information given to residents. It is important that residents are given adequate information about works to their home. They need to understand from a pragmatic point of view, the challenges that can occur on such construction projects without it resulting in unnecessary stress for them. Consideration should be given to decanting residents where there is extensive internal decorations to be carried out.

7. Commissioning and occupancy

Commissioning

MVHR

The MVHR was commissioned from a manufacturer supplied instruction booklet. The tenant later turned off the MVHR as it was reportedly blowing cold air at a high rate into some of the rooms, as well as to save electricity (see Real Time Display below).

On inspection by a representative of the manufacturer it was found that the MVHR unit was set to the highest settings on all fans, this was approximately corrected to more suitable settings for the property with a later visit to properly commission the unit.

DHW

The tenant was found to have been using the immersion heater for DHW production far more than necessary during part of the winter quarter. This was discovered after high electricity bills were reported.

Real Time Display

Some of the circuits that are monitored by the real time display were incorrectly labelled leading to mis-information on the display. This probably contributed to the issues identified above.

Handover process, information or training

The residents have fully engaged in the real time display which has helped them understand the technologies energy use and their own energy use when using appliances in the home. This has led to changes such as purchasing an eco kettle and turning off their appliances when not in use.

An information leaflet was provided to the residents to explain how the technologies work and instructions on how the systems need to be used. It has been challenging to create the correct information from the many manuals provided by the suppliers into a comprehensive clear and simple guide for the tenants.

Installers have been on site to show the tenants, Raven staff and Wates how the systems need to be managed for optimum use for the solar thermal system, ground source heat pump and heat recovery unit.

8. Wash-up meeting

A meeting was held on the 18 March 2011 with the project team members from:

- Wates Living Space
- Viridian
- Econic
- PRP Architects Ltd
- Greenwood
- Raven Housing Trust

Defects and issues were covered in this meeting and the launch discussed. The actions and outcomes of this meeting are covered throughout this report.

9. Doing it again

Definitely do again

Wall Insulation
Deep Sills (moving windows forward into new external insulation)
Secure products early on to minimise delay on the rest of the project
Undertake research into potential suppliers early on
Waste water heat recovery (although attributing savings would be better)
All thermal bridging measures
Carry out a geotechnical survey before drilling commences for ground source heat, as ground conditions affected project timelines.

Definitely not do again

Working with the tenants in situ throughout such a whole house retrofit project was very stressful for the tenants and contractors alike. However if some of the products had been sourced earlier the disruption to the tenants would have been minimised.

In a non Retrofit for the Future scenario (i.e. in future roll-out) replacing a gas central heating system with an electric system. Heat pump technology is insufficiently mature to replace high efficiency gas systems at present.

Reduction of costs

Restrict the use of Aerogel (or other premium insulation products such as Vacuum Insulated Panels – VIP)- to areas where space is valuable
LED bulbs rather than whole fittings
Leasing or borrowing monitoring equipment
Replacing windows at a maintenance point or reglazing rather than replacing relatively young double glazing with very expensive triple glazing.

Improvement of the design process

Design process improvements

Allowance for external calculation of savings outside SAP / PHPP - individual heat recovery

ventilation, multiple appendix Q measures; time and temperature TRVs, more integration with construction team in terms of practicality of measures and explanation of scope of works.

Methodology to include tenant behaviour; especially the likelihood of taking up in comfort increases potential savings.

Use of 'greener' products where possible

Modelling to actual tenants and usage patterns to help manage expectations.
A simple method for calculating thermal bridging, or rules of thumb for existing typical construction techniques, would improve this aspect of the design process. We chose to use the SAP default value both before and after improvement since it is difficult to calculate for the existing case and is likely to be poor. Although we have included measures to counter thermal bridging we have perhaps simply corrected for increased thermal bridging due to better surrounding u-values.

Improvement of the construction process

Construction process improvements

Toolbox talks
More during construction visits to supervise construction
Restriction of sub-contractors (and or closer management of sub-contractors by whole team - including design team) to work more efficiently and reduce defects.
Keeping Decent Homes improvements more clearly separate from retrofit improvements financially.
Single organisation responsible for integrated system provision (e.g. heat distribution, heating system, and controls)

Improvement of the commissioning and occupancy process

Commissioning improvements

Tenant advice sessions / training similar to that undertaken by RELISH as well as the monthly meetings to talk about how they are progressing on their energy use which will be booked in with the residents once defects are completed.

Training of tenant / landlord liaison staff in the retrofit process, the systems installed and their efficient operation and maintenance

What, in your view, would be key to making replication at this scale successful?

A mechanism for decanting tenants at times of intense retrofit activity alongside a programme of managing expectations to achieve the greatest satisfaction for the occupants possible with the improvement works and the process.

Market and Policy certainty so that contractors and supply chains can gear up to undertake the millions of necessary retrofits.

Term agreements for contractors with larger landlords in order to extend the usual range of property services to include whole house retrofit.

Whole house plans for every property with identified trigger points for intervention e.g. when roof works are necessary take the opportunity to install rooftop solar technology; when a property becomes empty take the opportunity to complete the whole house retrofit - where a landlord has a typical 4% void rate potentially all properties could be retrofitted over 25 years without having to decant any resident.

10. Business benefits

What lessons have been learned that will benefit the participants' businesses in terms of innovation, efficiency or increased opportunities?

The benefit for Wates has been to gain knowledge and experience on this pilot scheme, enabling the company to better assess future tender opportunities for similar or larger works and projects.

PRP have consolidated their reputation in the retrofit field and have participated in several multi-property (10-30) retrofit programmes as well as production of Retrofit Guides. It is expected that this sector will extend and expand over the next 5 years and that PRP will continue to develop in this area, with increasing demand.

Raven hopes that this project will help them in the future to be awarded other funding for projects of a similar nature and further partnership opportunities.

How many business leads and opportunities has the project helped stimulated for participants?

Raven: To date this has not helped stimulate business leads or opportunities.

What value of retrofit business do you expect as a result of the project over the next 5 years?

Raven: This would be too difficult to predict.

11. Additional Information

Aerogel insulation
During the course of the project the manufacturers of the Aerogel insulation significantly increased the price of the product as well as increasing lead-in time estimates. The project team had already secured an adequate supply (in anticipation of long-lead in times, and in the desire to complete the project as quickly as possible). Without this, considerable project delay could have occurred.

Windows
A number of window manufacturers needed to be investigated in order to be certain of supply of windows that fit the design criteria and landlords requirements. There are very few manufacturers that can genuinely provide windows with the required whole opening U-value required for the project.

Windows
Very high performance windows are often manufactured without trickle vents (as they are detrimental to the thermal performance of the window frames, and since they are likely to be used in Passive House performance standard dwellings with very low air permeability and MVHR) in retrofit projects where high levels of air tightness are difficult to guarantee and where MVHR is not specified. A ventilation strategy of distributed whole house MEV can comply with Part F building regulations only with airtightness and dwelling volume ratios sufficient to allow the fans to move enough air.

Residents in Situ During Works
Avoid undertaking intensive works with tenants in situ wherever possible.

Measures Costs
Additional costs of measures over traditional materials / technologies should be used for economic feasibility calculations rather than full costs. So the difference (in price and performance) between standard building regulations compliant double glazing and high performance triple glazing.
Materials choice for longevity.

Materials Choice
Choice of materials should not be dictated by conservatism within design, contractor or maintenance teams. The choice of uPVC windows is typically dictated by the landlord's maintenance teams (not in this case). It would be far better to educate these teams to maintain wooden or composite windows that can have a whole building lifecycle (rather than potentially as little as 15 years for uPVC

Communication
Clearer communication between the subcontractors and the tenants/landlord in terms of understanding the systems and how they work in layman terms. Information tended to be too technical and not geared for a non technical audience. Improved communication between the subcontrcators and the main contrcator – subcontractors in some instances turned up on

site with no previous arrangement.

The project was the first that Raven has undertaken as a whole house retrofit project. The main learning has been the experience of the impact of the works on the tenants and how in future we can better manage the tenants expectations and adapt the works to reduce impact e.g. better lead in times for the supply of systems/components and a better understanding of how the technologies work.

Funding
Greater advantage of funding opportunities - in this project it was been better to remove PV from the TSB funding to allow the FiT to be claimed, however there is still be a risk attached to this since it could still be refused on the grounds of having already received Government funding.

Other
Building regulations part F System 3 ventilation might include heat recovery.

eTRVs- time and temperature programmable TRVs to emulate zone control may be a better way to achieve better controllability for the resident than complicated (and sometimes abandoned or poorly commissioned) full zone control systems.

A whole house plan identified with trigger points for compatible potential improvements to be undertaken over a 25 year period with replacement items such as windows and boilers being made at natural cyclical replacement times. (i.e. instead of applying a whole house approach in one go the suggestion is delivering the upgrade through this approach via programme of works but identifying all the elements in one go.
Less reliance on maximum rooftop solar technologies at the outset, with provision to practical maximum (rather than amount to reach target) included in whole house lifetime plan. This is less relevant to this project, since maximising the solar thermal output to create a surplus for the GSHP recharge was a key element of the project.

Tenant reaction to the retrofit process is unpredictable and one outcome of this project is a greater understanding of tenant expectation management.

'Hidden' advantages of works such as lessening summer overheating - faster wash times from A++ washing machines, better lighting quality from LED lights, need to be identified and communicated to residents and landlords.

Clearer demarcation of responsibilities (i.e. subcontractors responsible for testing ground conditions for GSHP push fit suitability)

Lack of product for solar doorbell a disappointment.

A simple to install, effective solid floor insulation product is needed (in this case the team made the decision that since the project had to maintain the residents in situ to not go with the solid floor insulation. We didn’t install under floor heating as well for that reason. It would be ideal to have the solid floor insulation but this is currently not practical).

The issue of potentially claiming funding from the Feed in Tariff (or in the future the RHI) needs to be considered. The FiT for this project demanded that funding for the PV be separated from the main project. For new build the HCA have only recently made clear the boundary between their funding and the FiT. There is too much risk in this area to be able to guarantee funding for renewable energy by deciding early on to arrange funding in any particular way.

There are not many monitoring organisations that can undertake utility, environmental, and renewable monitoring at a reasonable cost. Difficulties/poor customer service has been experienced with contractors to ensure the monitoring is up and running correctly.

A mechanism for provision of energy efficient appliances to tenants. Social landlords do not typically provide tenants with appliances and the provision of these in this project revealed a number of issues of responsibility.

A referable guide to energy efficient appliances. Procurement of the required A++ rated appliances was surprisingly difficult considering that the energy rating of appliances is a long established scheme.