



BRITISH FLUE AND CHIMNEY MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Henley Road, Medmenham,
Marlow, Bucks SL7 2ER
Tel: (01491) 578674 Fax: (01491) 575024
Email: info@feta.co.uk
Internet Home Page: <http://www.feta.co.uk/>

ref: document/BFCMA/rend..
25 March, 1998

BFCMA INFORMATION PAPER 1

RENDERING A NEW CHIMNEY

We have come across a situation where a building control officer at one of the local authorities has allowed a new chimney to be built with the flue "parged" or "rendered" rather than lined using approved flue liners. It appears from discussion with the customer that this is not the first instance where this has been allowed – at least one other is definitely known about.

When challenged on this matter the building control officer has stated in writing.

"There is no obligation to adopt any particular solution in the Document [ADJ], if it is possible to meet the relevant requirement in some other way Each Building Control Officer will use his judgement to satisfy himself that the work that has been carried out meets the 'relevant requirements'. This may or may not be, by following the guidance in the approved document".

There are two questions which BFCMA Management Committee were asked to clarify.

1. Where does the responsibility lie if a Building Control Officer allows a method of construction to proceed that results in a building failure in subsequent years.
2. Is there any requirement that the product or systems he approves should be able to be demonstrated to meet the requirements of the Building Regulations (in this case J2 and J3).

The position from the BFCMA Management Committee is as follows:

The days when brick chimneys were parged, to seal them from air leaks spoiling the draught, ended with the 1965 Building Regulations. The management of the Building Regulations is now governed by DETR (Department of the Environment and Regions).

Although the quote in writing by the Building Control Officer to the effect that "it is possible to meet the relevant requirement in some other way" is correct, the spirit of this clause is not being met by him. The intention of the clause was to allow innovative products, which would not otherwise be allowed even though they had been tested by an approved body.

The BFCMA President has been in contact with Mr. Ted King at the DETR who is responsible to the Minister of the Environment for Building Regulations. He confirmed to the President that his Department's advice would be that pargetting is inferior and unsatisfactory. If the Building Control Officer wanted to liase with Ted King he would advise him of this fact.