



NRC Publications Archive Archives des publications du CNRC

Letters to the editor

Haysom, J. C.

This publication could be one of several versions: author's original, accepted manuscript or the publisher's version. /
La version de cette publication peut être l'une des suivantes : la version prépublication de l'auteur, la version
acceptée du manuscrit ou la version de l'éditeur.

Publisher's version / Version de l'éditeur:

Solplan Review, 47, p. 9, 1992-10

NRC Publications Record / Notice d'Archives des publications de CNRC:

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/view/object/?id=a997739f-03d1-48b1-b03c-ca2e7dabb65f>
<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/voir/objet/?id=a997739f-03d1-48b1-b03c-ca2e7dabb65f>

Access and use of this website and the material on it are subject to the Terms and Conditions set forth at

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/copyright>

READ THESE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE USING THIS WEBSITE.

L'accès à ce site Web et l'utilisation de son contenu sont assujettis aux conditions présentées dans le site

<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/droits>

LISEZ CES CONDITIONS ATTENTIVEMENT AVANT D'UTILISER CE SITE WEB.

Questions? Contact the NRC Publications Archive team at

PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca. If you wish to email the authors directly, please see the first page of the publication for their contact information.

Vous avez des questions? Nous pouvons vous aider. Pour communiquer directement avec un auteur, consultez la première page de la revue dans laquelle son article a été publié afin de trouver ses coordonnées. Si vous n'arrivez pas à les repérer, communiquez avec nous à PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca.





<http://www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/irc>

Letters to the editor

NRCC-37027

Haysom, J. C.

October 1992

A version of this document is published in / Une version de ce document se trouve dans:
Solplan Review, (47), pp. 9, October, 1992

The material in this document is covered by the provisions of the Copyright Act, by Canadian laws, policies, regulations and international agreements. Such provisions serve to identify the information source and, in specific instances, to prohibit reproduction of materials without written permission. For more information visit <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/showtdm/cs/C-42>

Les renseignements dans ce document sont protégés par la Loi sur le droit d'auteur, par les lois, les politiques et les règlements du Canada et des accords internationaux. Ces dispositions permettent d'identifier la source de l'information et, dans certains cas, d'interdire la copie de documents sans permission écrite. Pour obtenir de plus amples renseignements : <http://lois.justice.gc.ca/fr/showtdm/cs/C-42>



National Research
Council Canada

Conseil national
de recherches Canada

Canada

thermally broken spacer) and R-4 glass (double glazed, Low E, argon & Superspacer™). They both have an ER of -11!

The differences in frame construction also show up in an ER comparison. Another window, a fibreglass casement, with R-3.3 glass (Double glazed, hard coat Low E, argon & Superspacer) has an ER of 1. The best window on the list is an R-6.2 fixed window, also made from fibreglass, has an ER of 17!

So although it's tempting to get infatuated with the centre glass R-value, it is much more informative to compare the ER value.

Stephen Thwaites P. Eng.
Thermotech Windows Ltd.
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,

I am writing to applaud your efforts (Technical Research Committee report SOLPLAN REVIEW, August-September 1992), to encourage builders to get involved in helping to shape the proposed new energy code.

One of my roles in the Canadian Codes Centre is to act a Technical Advisor to the Standing Committee on Energy Conservation in Buildings, the subcommittee of the Canadian Commission on Building and Fire Codes responsible for the development and maintenance of the Canadian Code for Energy Efficiency in New Houses. I can assure you that the Standing Committee welcomes the construc-

tive input of builders and we agree with you that the provincial and national TRC's provide a logical conduit for that input.

We do find somewhat unfortunate that your reporting of some of the issues that the Standing Committee is addressing is not totally accurate (e.g. it is NOT proposed to require airtightness testing of all houses) and is stated in fairly incendiary language. However, we won't complain too loudly if that approach is successful in drawing builders' attention to the fact that an energy code is being developed which may be adopted by many provinces and that they need to get involved if they wish to ensure that the final result is a code the building industry can live with.

I do want to assure your readers, however, that the draft of the Code you have seen and on which your report is presumably based is very preliminary and will undergo several revisions before being released for public review next summer. In view of the input already being received from CHBA and from builder members of both the Standing Committee on Energy Conservation in Buildings and the Standing Committee on Housing and Small Buildings (the committee responsible for Part 9 of the NBC), it is unlikely that some of the "worst case scenarios" described in your report will appear in the final version. Nevertheless, additional input is always welcome and we appreciate your efforts to generate it.

I hope that we can count on your further assistance in letting the industry know when the energy code and changes to the National Building Code are available for public review next year.

John C Haysom, P.Eng
Unit Head, Buildings and Services
Canadian Codes Centre
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,

I enjoyed your recent item on the Builder's Ten Commandments (SOLPLAN REVIEW Aug-Sept 1992). It seemed hard on Sub-trades, especially those who choose to work for homeowners (which obviously can be easier or more difficult depending on the circumstances), so they might more likely be seen as the Ten Commandments of the Sub-trades. For the sake of balance (I have worked as both, for homeowners and contractors), herewith my Ten Commandments of the General Contractor.

1. We are not simple builders, we are construction project managers

(we don't know a 2x4 from a vacuum relief valve, but we certainly can spit out a pretty looking flow chart)

2. Sub Contractors should be best left to their own devices

(we can't improve their performance or quality because we really don't know what they do)

3. No one uses material of your choice anymore.

(We don't because it's not the cheapest)

4. You can't buy material of your choice any more.

(We are the low bidder and we are not buying it)

5. If our sub trades screw up, we don't pay them

(but you might have to)

6. R-2000 houses are dangerous and ventilation, what's wrong with windows?

(we are not interested in building science and you want the cheapest job, don't you?)

7. Our sub trades stand by their work

(call them, not us)

8. This house will be quality throughout

(it will meet the minimum requirements of the building code).

9. All our sub trades use seasoned certified professionals

(well, some may be 20 and have a drivers licence)

10. Yes, we are the low bidder and will be using the cheapest trades, but you are protected by our excellent specs and power of payment

(our own quality control is the over-worked building inspector)

David Riley
Circa Homes Ltd.
White Rock, B.C.