



Date received:	7 th July 2026
Date responded:	17 th July 2026
Subject:	Council social housing – cavity beads

Question:

You initially requested (on 7th June 2026) the following information:

"After my request about cavity beads in walls within Council property, I have further questions to do with the same subject.

- 1. Who was responsible for the placement of cavity beads? Was it a government decision or a decision made by the authorities themselves?**

In 2008, the Isle of Man Government established a framework agreement for cavity walls, and all local authorities were invited to participate in the scheme. In May 2008, the Council agreed to participate in the scheme and approved the first phase of the cavity wall (and loft insulation) framework. Several phases were agreed by the Council to undertake after this date. The Council was responsible for the project specification for Douglas social housing properties.

- 2. If it was government, are Treasury releasing any funding for addressing the issues caused by this, to return Council properties back to a good modern standard?**

This question asks for comment on a matter of opinion rather than recorded information held by the Council. It therefore does not constitute a request for recorded information under the Freedom of Information Act 2015.

- 3. Have any legal pursuits of any company/companies taken place for the inadequate works taken place, to at least extract the insulation in properties that deemed unfit for purpose?**

No. The Council is not aware of any legal actions in direct relation to previous cavity bead installations.

- 4. The work obviously commenced without appropriate surveys and prior planning. Who in DCC is responsible for chasing all of this up?**

Council-led projects have a project manager who is responsible for day-to-day management. The Council has had no reason to follow up this project; however, if follow-up were required, the Project Manager would have responsibility for doing so.

- 5. Also, government alike, liaising with authorities?**

The Department of Infrastructure has oversight of local authorities and would be responsible for liaising with local authorities if required.

- 6. Have any surveys been done before and after the works have been undertaken to ensure the properties meet a minimum U-value?**

The Council does not hold any record of any before or after surveys relative to U-values at Spring Valley.

- 7. As tenants are being forced to pay extra on their rent for energy efficient appliances, that their property may not maintain efficiently. Should these properties come with cost saving appliances included because of the lack of U-value? Otherwise tenants are simply paying for efficiency, they do not have.**

This question asks for an opinion rather than recorded information held by the Council. It therefore does not constitute a request for recorded information under the Freedom of Information Act 2015.

- 8. In DCCs opinion, should government foot that bill, if inadequate insulation was their decision? Or do they think it's the tenants responsibility?**

This question asks for the Council's opinion rather than recorded information held by the Council. The Council cannot provide opinions in response to Freedom of Information requests.

- 9. Cllr Devon Watson expressed to MHK David Ashford that the test phase of Spring Valley was a great success, and that DCC are continuing that work and have more lintels ordered and are due to be fitted. If it was a success, why is there a clear specification change to that first phase around the estate with lintels?**

The Council does not hold any recorded information on views expressed between two elected Members.

The test phase of the Spring Valley works was measured against the physical lintel replacement, levels of disruption and prevention of further related issues, with the aim of prolonging the lifespan of the properties in an economically efficient manner. A specification change to a potentially better and more economic product is not unusual and demonstrates appropriate project management to align with budgetary resources and the availability of suitable professionals to carry out the work.

- 10. There are differing lintel types, heights, DPC details, sill finishes and more. There have been no planning notices published and there is no information available for the project on any of our public forums. The test phase has been left with unfinished render. What caused the old ones to fail?"**

Spalling render and concrete eventually exposed the lintel reinforcement bars which had impacted the product integrity over time.



On 7th July, a further request was submitted in response to the above, asking the following;

“On response number 10, why was there a change in height, is there old lintels above them examples?”

Response:

The change in lintel height occurred due to the installation of a secondary lintel under the existing lintels. There are existing lintels above the secondary lintels.

