



Future of Building Control Implementation Plan Impact Assessment

Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 020 7944 4400
Website: www.communities.gov.uk

© Crown Copyright, 2009

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp, or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU

e-mail: licensing@opsi.gov.uk

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Communities and Local Government Publications
Tel: 030 0123 1124
Fax: 030 0123 1125

Email: product@communities.gsi.gov.uk
Online via the Communities and Local Government website:
www.communities.gov.uk

September 2009

Product Code: 09SB05982/IA

ISBN: 978 1 4089 1843 4

Summary: Intervention and options

Department /Agency: Communities and Local Government	Title: Impact assessment of the Building Regulations Periodic Review Programme	
Stage: Final	Version: 2	Date: 30 June 2009
Related Publications: Economic analysis of changes to the Building Control Procedures (2008), Future of Building Control Consultation Paper (March 2008), Summary of Responses (October 2008)		

Available to view or download at:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/publications/all/>

Contact for enquiries: Paula Higgins

Telephone: 020 7944 5746

What is the problem under consideration? Why is Government intervention necessary?

Stakeholders have told us that the current piecemeal approach to updating and reviewing the Building Regulations and its supporting guidance is hindering compliance. Contractors find it difficult to keep pace with the constantly evolving regulations; long lead times in the construction industry mean regulations are sometimes updated before previous changes have been fully applied. The frequency of revisions also reduces the ability of builders to engage in forward planning, as a result of uncertainties about what will be revised and when.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

To reform the process for updating and revising the Building Regulations so it is not done in such an ad-hoc manner, and that the changes are effectively communicated to all stakeholders so they are in a position to be able to comply. To make the process more efficient, thereby reducing the burden on business by having to react to constant change, and to better prepare the Building Control profession to ensure compliance.

What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.

- A. Do nothing
- B. Periodic review every two years (with no change to one issue within two cycles)
- C. Periodic review every three years (with no change to one issue within two cycles)
- D. Periodic review every five years

Option C is the option we intend to implement. Although the cost savings are greatest in option D, the risk is high that Government will need to break the forward plan and thus reduce and possibly eliminate its benefits.

When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects?

2015/2016. Two to three years after completion of the first periodic review cycle (2010-2013).

Ministerial sign-off For final proposal/implementation stage impact assessments:

I have read the impact assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible minister:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'F. Anchi', is positioned below the text 'Signed by the responsible minister:'. The signature is written in a cursive style.

Date: 1 July 2009

Summary: Analysis and evidence

Policy Option: C	Description: Periodic system: every three years (with no change to one issue within two cycles)
-------------------------	--

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'	
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs		
	£			
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)			
	£ 0		Total Cost (PV)	£ 0
<p>Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'</p> <p>The Department, Building Control and Industry: small risk of 'in-between' reviews occurring because of outside events; small adjustment costs to adapt to new periodic system.</p>				

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'	
	One-off	Yrs		
	£			
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)			
	£ 1.1m		Total Benefit (PV)	£ 22m
<p>Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'</p> <p>Higher compliance, better consistency across the body of the Building Regulations, better regulations by more inclusive policy making.</p>				

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV)	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)
2005	13	£ 20.9m to £23.1m	£ 22m

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?			England and Wales		
On what date will the policy be implemented?			1 Jan 2010		
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?			Communities and Local Government		
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?			£ 0		
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?			Yes		
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			No		
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?			£		
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?			£		
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?			No		
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)		Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?		No	No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)

(Increase - Decrease)

Increase of £ 0

Decrease of £ 1.7m

Net Impact £ -1.1m

Key:

Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices

(Net) Present Value

Summary: Analysis and evidence

Policy Option: B	Description: Periodic system: every two years (with no change to one issue within two cycles)
-------------------------	--

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'	
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs		
	£			
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)			
	£ 0		Total Cost (PV)	£ 0
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'				
The Department, Building Control and Industry: small risk of 'in-between' reviews occurring because of outside events; small adjustment costs to adapt to new periodic system.				

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'	
	One-off	Yrs		
	£			
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)			
	£ 0.9m		Total Benefit (PV)	£ 16.6m
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'				
Higher compliance, better consistency across the body of the Building Regulations, better regulations by more inclusive policy making.				

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

A complete review cycle (including time for consultation) takes approximately 2 1/2 years. This option may cause confusion as overlaps will occur between the review cycles.

Price Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit Range (NPV)	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate)
2005	13	£ 15.8m to £17.43m	£ 16.6m

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?			England and Wales		
On what date will the policy be implemented?			1 Jan 2010		
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?			Communities and Local Government		
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?			£ 0		
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?			Yes		
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			No		
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?			£ 0		
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?			£ 0		
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?			No		
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)		Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?		No	No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)

(Increase - Decrease)

Increase of £ 0

Decrease of £ 1.3m

Net Impact £ -0.9m

Key:

Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices

(Net) Present Value

Summary: Analysis and evidence

Policy Option: D

Description: Periodic system: every five years

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs	
	£		
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)		
	£ 0		Total Cost (PV) £ 0
<p>Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'</p> <p>The Department, Building Control and Industry: small risk of 'in-between' reviews occurring because of outside events; small adjustment costs to adapt to new periodic system.</p>			

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'
	One-off	Yrs	
	£		
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)		
	£ 1.4m		Total Benefit (PV) £27.2m
<p>Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'</p> <p>Higher compliance, better consistency across the body of the Building Regulations, better regulations by more inclusive policy making.</p>			

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks

As a result of a longer cycle there is more risk of Government having to break the Review cycle with an 'in-between' review thus reducing and potentially eliminating the benefits of the new system.

Price Base Year 2005	Time Period Years 13	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £25.8m to £28.6m	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £27.2m
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?				England and Wales	
On what date will the policy be implemented?				1 Jan 2010	
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?				Communities and Local Government	
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?				£	
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?				Yes	
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?				No	
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?				£ 0	
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?				£ 0	
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?				No	
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)		Micro	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?		No	No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)

(Increase - Decrease)

Increase of £ 0

Decrease of £ 2.1m

Net Impact £ -1.4m

Key:

Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices

(Net) Present Value

Introduction

At present, different 'Parts' of the Building Regulations are reviewed in a piecemeal process with, on average, three parts being reviewed each year. As a general rule, these amended 'Parts' are subject to an implementation review three years after they come into force, which tends to produce further suggestions for changes.

The Future of Building Control, research and through discussions with stakeholders in the industry (e.g. builders and building control bodies (BCBs)) showed that many believe that the Building Regulations change too frequently. As a result, contractors find it difficult to keep pace with the constantly evolving regulations; long lead times in the construction industry mean regulations are sometimes updated before previous changes have been fully applied. These frequent changes could have an adverse impact on compliance, particularly on smaller businesses who do not have the means to keep on top of constant change, although we do not know to what extent.

Nearly two-thirds of building control and construction professionals interviewed said that a lack of overall strategy and direction makes it difficult for them to plan their own activities over a reasonable period of, say five years.

Accordingly, the rationale for intervention in this instance is improving efficiency. Resources are currently wasted in reacting to reviews and keeping up with regulations that change frequently without proper consideration of their implementation. This may also give rise to an information asymmetry whereby the new regulations are not properly disseminated, leading to non-compliance and subsequent externalities (i.e. not complying with Part L on the environment).

The policy objective is to reform the process for updating and revising the Building Regulations so that it is not done in such an ad-hoc manner, and that the results of any reforms are effectively communicated to all stakeholders and they are in a position to be able to comply.

Options considered

The following options of having a periodic review are being considered at (B) two-year, (C) three-year or (D) five-year intervals and against the (A) do nothing option. Within each review phase there would be clear planned pauses of six months between the publication and implementation of amendments. For options B and C there would be no change to one particular issue within two cycles. Option D is the preferred option by industry and building control bodies, who believe that a shorter period would not reap the full benefits.

To reflect industry's position we have proposed a two cycle rule for option B and C which we believe will meet their concerns. This will mean that a particular issue will not be reviewed for at least four or six years, depending on the chosen option.

The Government would still retain the right to make any essential amendments which may be required between the reviews in order to respond to critical issues and to implement EU legal obligations by the date set by the EU.

On the basis of the economic analysis conducted by Europe Economics¹, it is clear that the biggest cost savings would be made the longer the review cycle is. Yet the longer the cycle is, the more at risk Government is to break the review cycle with an 'in-between' review, thus reducing and possibly eliminating the benefits sought in the new system. Therefore it is crucial that the length of the cycle is something that the Government can commit itself to working within

¹ *Economic analysis of changes to the Building Control procedures*, March 2008
www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/economicanalysisbuildingcontrol

and with this in mind, option C is the preferred option. One could argue that this delivers more than what industry wanted (five years) as there will be no change to each Part every six years.

How the system works

These options relate to the procedures by which the Building Regulations are reviewed, and not to changes in the content or requirements of the Building Regulations. Separate impact assessments will analyse the actual technical changes to the regulations as part of the periodic review process.

On average, there are three reviews of the Building Regulations each year. These are partial reviews and only deal with selected Parts (e.g. noise, energy efficiency, structure). Sometimes the Parts are chosen owing to a particular issue that has arisen, other times they are chosen because of a rolling review. The review is carried out by staff at this Department, who, in turn are assisted by a specialist Working Group made up of local authorities and industry representatives.

Under the proposed revision option, these partial annual reviews will be consolidated into one major review that occurs periodically at fixed intervals, i.e. a periodic review. The issues to be reviewed would be clearly set out in a Forward Plan document. This fixed review would not be a complete review of the Building Regulations, but it would be much more comprehensive than the current partial reviews and take into account different Parts. It will also ensure consistency across the regulations.

This review process would still require the same amount of input but from a wider range of specialists. The time reserved for consultation would remain the same. The costs of actually carrying out the review, most of which fall to this Department, are specifically:

- the staff (numbers and working hours) involved in the review of the Building Regulations
- the number of private contractors involved in the review of the Building Regulations; and
- other costs incurred as part of a review, eg advertising and training (including industry and building control)

This option affects all people involved in the Building Regulations and building control, though some more directly than others. In the most direct sense, this Department's staff involved in reviewing are affected, as are any private contractors who are contracted to carry out subsidiary work. The Building Regulations affect both local authorities and Approved Inspectors and so they would also be affected by any change in the way reviews are carried out and implemented. All parts of the construction industry will also be affected since the new rules ultimately fall to them to abide by.

Baseline used for the quantification of some of the benefits and costs

Europe Economics calculated the average resources needed to review a single Part of the Building Regulations, taking into account that the content of some Parts is more detailed and subsequently their reviews are more resource-intensive than others.

- four staff per review (one Grade 7, three SEOs), who spend a year on the review
- one private contractor per review at a cost of £120,000 per annum
- one working group per review at a cost of £4,000 per annum
- advertising cost of £100,000 per annum
- training costs of £3.5m for construction firms and £0.56m for BCBs, per annum

The above assumptions refer to one review period needing one combined man-year of work (excluding time reserved for consultation and EU notification). The above costs are assumed to be typical for revision of one Part - obviously the total cost of revision would be larger the

greater the number of revisions in a given year. On average, there are three such reviews each year and this has been used as a modelling assumption.

Options

For the options Europe Economics assumed that the number of staff involved in a fixed review period would be ten (two Grade 7s, eight SEOs), for three-quarters of the year of review and two staff in non-review years (two SEOs) for one-fifth of the year. Four private contractors would be required in the year of review and one in non-review years. The working group remains the same, except it is only convened in the year of review.

The fixed review itself takes one year of work (excluding consultation time) but there is preparatory/monitoring work that occurs in the intervening years, such as preparing the Forward Plan. It has been assumed that no other reviews of the Building Regulations take place under this option.

Overall benefits and costs

It is clear that there are efficiency savings from the move to a regular review. The cost falls as the fixed review period is extended, i.e. a five-year fixed review costs less than a three-year fixed review. This reflects the way the economic impact is modelled and explained later, with the costs arising per review, meaning that the more reviews, the higher the costs.

It is also reasonable to think that there are other benefits and costs associated with a move to periodic review. The benefits and costs will be the same for each option, but may decrease or increase in size.

Other non-monetary benefits include:

- Higher compliance with the Building Regulations. This is because at present the regulations are frequently changed making it hard for builders to continually keep abreast of new developments, and consequently they may end up non-compliant (through ignorance rather than design). Having one major review would focus attention on new revisions and, along with an associated advertising and training campaign, one might expect to see compliance rise. A standard standstill period between when the regulations are approved and when they come into force may also have a positive influence on compliance. We can assume that compliance would be higher for option D (five years) over the shorter review options of two and three years.
- More consistency across the Parts. Certain issues, for instance, design of stairwells, are covered by more than one Part. Stakeholders have told us that the guidance for some of the Parts is, in places, contradictory. This is because the Parts are updated in different years, although in some cases closely knitted Parts (e.g. Part L and F) are reviewed together. This benefit would stay the same for all the options considered (options B-D).
- Reduction in costs of compliance since industry and building control are better prepared and trained. The pressure on BCBs and industry arising from the constant changes to the regulations would be alleviated. We can assume that the cost savings would be higher the longer between the review cycles (i.e. five years over two years).
- More substantial involvement and participation from industry. Forward-looking plans and higher profile reviews should encourage a wider cross-section of industry to become more involved in the consultation and review process, which should ultimately make for better regulations. Currently, only specialised parts of industry will get involved in the Parts that ultimately affect them, and lots of little reviews do little to

encourage small builders to participate. This impact may be maximised in the shorter review cycles (option B and C) as industry gets used to being regularly called on to participate.

Costs

There will be costs associated with the commitment of a regular fixed review. Government will lose some of its ability to revise regulations on an ad-hoc basis. This flexibility has ensured that Government can respond quickly to political priorities and urgent problems.

The longer the time is between the review periods (option D - five years) increases the possibility of the regulations not staying current and reflecting practice and knowledge - which would be a lost opportunity to reflect technological change.

The Government would still retain the right to make any essential amendments that may be required. For example, the Government is required to implement EU legal obligations by the date set by the EU, so amendments which are due to EU legal obligations will fall outside this commitment.

It is quite conceivable that the cost savings would be reduced substantially if 'essential amendments' occurred regularly, for industry and Building Control would not have the time to prepare for change and the reputation of Government would be at risk from going back on its commitment. For option (D - five years), we believe this is such a serious risk that we do not think this option is desirable. It is possible, and indeed probable, that a review would not happen in the lifetime of one parliament which would not be acceptable.

Explanation of the economic analysis

The table at the end summarises the results of the economic analysis undertaken by Europe Economics for options A-D. Please refer to the Europe Economics report for the full analysis². The analysis assumes that the periodic fixed review is equivalent to three individual reviews of Parts of the Building Regulations and that there are no other reviews outside the specified period.

As the table shows, on the assumption that there are no other reviews outside the specified period, the five-year fixed review yields the greatest financial benefits relative to the existing system, although the deviation in yearly averages between the three review periods is under £1m.

The major cost savings come via a reduction in 'other costs'. These costs are made up of private contractors' costs (i.e. to conduct research such as impact assessments), the expenses of the Working Group (although these are minimal), advertising costs and training costs. Under the fixed review options, it has been assumed that advertising continues in all years to keep awareness consistently high. Training costs for builders to understand and implement the revised Building Regulations occur mostly in the year of the review, although there is some leakage into non-review years. Using existing data, private contractor costs have been scaled up to reflect the fact that a fixed review will involve greater input than an individual review of one Part.

The total figure also contains a cost saving related to the reduced time involved in reviewing the Building Regulations. This is consistent with how costs are calculated for administrative burdens. Strictly speaking, there would not be a realised financial gain because a change in time involved does not mean there will be a corresponding reduction in staff numbers, as the resources will be reallocated to other tasks.

² www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/economicanalysisbuildingcontrol

However, to be consistent with existing methodologies, the time cost savings have been retained in the analysis³. In any case, one notes that the staff costs (i.e. this Department's staff) remain a small proportion of the total cost. Indeed, they do not fluctuate significantly from one option to the other. Europe Economics assumes that staff will continue to be involved in reviews in non-review years as there will inevitably be some staff time involved in preparatory and monitoring work done in non-review years.

³ And have done so for the other options.

Assessment of fixed review: benefits relative to 'do nothing' (2008-2020)		
Option	Total NPV	Yearly average
A. Do nothing		
Total aggregate cost of reviewing the Building Regulations under current continuous review, for the period 2008-2020, converted to a Net Present Value	£47.4m	£3.6m
<i>Of which</i>		
<i>Total cost to public sector (including this Department's staff costs, advertising, contractor costs and BCB training)</i>	£13.8m	£1.1m
<i>Total cost to private sector (including training costs)</i>	£33.7m	£2.6m
B. Fixed review - two years		
Total cost of reviewing the Building Regulations under a Fixed Review	£30.8m	£2.4m
<i>Of which</i>		
<i>Total cost to public sector (including this Department's staff costs, advertising, contractor costs and BCB training)</i>	£8.2m	£0.6m
<i>Total cost to private sector (including training costs)</i>	£22.6m	£1.7m
Economic benefits (quantitative and qualitative)		
Total cost saving to baseline (including public and private)	-£16.6m	-£1.3m
Benefit to industry from less frequent changes, allowing industry to adapt to changes and plan for changes in advance		
Economic costs (qualitative)		
Opportunity cost of losing ability to revise regulations as and when revisions are needed (new EU obligations may require more frequent revisions, which may mean revisions outside review period and an associated increase in costs)		
C. Fixed review - three years		
Total cost of reviewing the Building Regulations under a Fixed Review	£25.4m	£2.0m
<i>Of which</i>		
<i>Total cost to public sector (including this Department's staff costs, advertising, contractor costs and BCB training)</i>	£6.5m	£0.5m
<i>Total cost to private sector (including training costs)</i>	£18.9m	£1.5m
Economic benefits (quantitative and qualitative)		
Total cost saving to baseline (including public and private)	-£22.0m	-£1.7m
Benefit to industry from less frequent changes, allowing industry to adapt to changes and plan for changes in advance		
Economic costs (qualitative)		
Opportunity cost of losing ability to revise regulations as and when revisions are needed (new EU obligations may require more frequent revisions, which may mean revisions outside review period and an associated increase in costs)		
D. Fixed review - five years		
Total cost of reviewing the Building Regulations under a Fixed Review	£20.3m	£1.6m
<i>Of which</i>		
<i>Total cost to public sector (including this Department's staff costs, advertising, contractor costs and BCB training)</i>	£4.9m	£0.4m
<i>Total cost to private sector (including training costs)</i>	£15.4m	£1.2m
Economic benefits (quantitative and qualitative)		
Total cost saving to baseline (including public and private)	-£27.2m	-£2.1m
Benefit to industry from less frequent changes, allowing industry to		

adapt to changes and plan for changes in advance

Economic costs (qualitative)

Opportunity cost of losing ability to revise regulations as and when revisions are needed (new EU obligations may require more frequent revisions, which may mean revisions outside review period and an associated increase in costs)

Specific impact tests

We have considered the potential impacts of this proposal using the specific impact checklist and our analysis is set out below.

Competition assessment

The relevant market is the market for building control. This is a national market in England and Wales with the product being services for clients (generally the construction industry) to approve, inspect and undertake various actions under building control. Clients have a choice of using either local authorities or Approved Inspectors, and although they follow slightly different regulatory frameworks there exists a high degree of competition between them.

There are also indirectly affected markets such as the construction industry (architects, surveyors, engineers, developers and builders) which must meet the Building Regulations.

We do not have any reason to believe that there will be any significant competition impacts with this proposal.

Small firms impact test

It is clear that this test is relevant as small construction firms (including sole traders), which account for a large proportion of construction firms, will be affected by the proposed changes. Almost all local authorities have fewer than 250 employees in building control, and many Approved Inspectors also fall into this category.

Implementing a fixed review cycle should benefit all involved (i.e. building control and construction firms) as it becomes clearer what Part of the regulations is being changed and when it will change. It is relatively more costly for small firms to absorb training and familiarisation costs than it is for larger firms, therefore, this benefit may have a larger impact in small firms, as the option moves away from ad-hoc individual reviews to more structured revision occurring periodically.

Sustainable development, carbon assessment and other environment

There is anecdotal evidence that compliance with the non-health critical parts of the regulations is lower than the traditional elements. It is also true that the energy efficiency aspects of the regulations (Part L) have been changed frequently in the last years which may also be a reason for lower compliance. Therefore, by moving to a fixed review cycle we anticipate that compliance with the environmental and energy aspects of the regulations will increase.

Health impact assessment

If a fixed review results in higher compliance with the Building Regulations, then there may be secondary health benefits to living and working in buildings that meet the requirements on hygiene, toxic substances, drainage and moisture, for example. More energy efficient buildings may also result in warmer buildings at a lower cost which could have a positive impact on those affected by fuel poverty.

Disability equality

If a fixed review results in higher compliance with the Building Regulations, and in particular with those Parts that are seen to be optional or less important, then more buildings will meet the requirements on access to and within buildings.

Legal aid, race equality, gender equality, human rights and rural proofing

We have considered the potential impacts of this proposal on legal aid, race equality, gender equality, human rights and rural proofing and completed the screening part of the equality impact assessment. We do not believe that there will be any effect.

Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	Yes	No
Small Firms Impact Test	Yes	No
Legal Aid	Yes	No
Sustainable Development	Yes	No
Carbon Assessment	Yes	No
Other Environment	Yes	No
Health Impact Assessment	Yes	No
Race Equality	Yes	No
Disability Equality	Yes	No
Gender Equality	Yes	No
Human Rights	Yes	No
Rural Proofing	Yes	No