

Optimization of construction compositions for design of green building The 1st World Sustainability Forum

Ing. Monika Čuláková prof. Ing. Ingrid Šenitková, PhD.

TO ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES



BACKGROUN

Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice and rising global average sea level. The linear warming trend over the **50** years from 1956 to 2005 (0.10 to 0.16°C per decade) is nearly **twice** that for the **100** years from 1906 to 2005.

Drivers of climate change = GHGs = greenhouse gas emissions (CO₂-eq.)



IMPACT OF BUILDINGS





- major user of land
- the second largest consumer of raw materials (about 32% of the world's primary resources)
- generate a great amount of waste (45% of solid waste)
- consume more than 40% total energy and 12% water
- produce minimal 30% of greenhouse gas emissions

The increase of population with increasing requirements on living and degree damage to the environment direct to urgent need for revalue civilizing activities of human, which they could have irreversible impact on change climate, extinction of some countries and so on.

That's why **sustainable construction** has recently been identified as one of the lead markets for the near future of the whole world.

Environmental considerations have called for new developments in building sector to bridge the gap between this need for lower impacts on the environment and ever **increasing comfort**. These developments were generally directed at the reduction of the energy consumption during operations. While this was indeed a mandatory first step, complete environmental life cycle analysis raises new problems.



SH et. al. 2010

A. DIMOUDI et. al., 2008

.Z. BRIBIÁN et. al.

STUDIES OF ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Operating energy has major share **80–90%** in life cycle energy use of buildings followed by **embodied energy 10–20%**, whereas demolition and other process energy has negligible or little share.

Embodied energy correspondence varies between 12,55 and 18,50% of the energy needed for the operation of an office building over a **50 years** life.

60 studies of different buildings located in 9 countries have been performed and found that the proportion of embodied energy in materials used and life cycle assessed varied between 9% and 46% of the overall energy used over the building's lifetime when dealing with low energy consumption buildings and between 2% and 38% in conventional buildings.

mansory flat - building, 1999

without thermal insulation



mansory flat - building, 1927

without thermal insulation

low-energy house.2002 with wooden frame



YAN et. al. 2011

J. ZABALZA, et. al., 2001

M.J.GONZÁLEZ et. al. 106

L. GUSTAVSSON et al 2006

B. BERGE, 2009

STUDIES OF CO₂ eq. EMISSIONS

The results from case study in Hong Kong show that 82–87% of the total GHG emissions are from embodied GHG emissions of building materials, 6–8% are from transportation of materials, and 6–9% are due to energy consumption of construction equipment.

It's estimated that 1 m² produce 1,5 tons of CO₂ during useful life span building

Selection of **low environmental impact** materials can result at a reduction up to **30% of CO₂ emissions** in the construction phase.

The results of energy and CO₂ emissions comparisons of apartment buildings made with wood or concrete frames, by taking into account the energy available from biomass residues from the wood products chain as well as cement process reactions including calcination and carbonation, prove that the wood buildings have lower energy use and emission.

A conventional **timber frame** house contains about **150 kg/m²** of timber. Thus a **120** m² house 'stores' about **32 tons of CO₂**. If a building is constructed in logs, or the increasingly popular system of massive timber then this can be increased to about 550 kg/m². This means carbon storage of nearly 120 tons of CO₂. Page 6

SSESSMEN

OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE

Systematic model for multi-criteria assessment



BUILDING MATERIALS ON PLANT BASE

"The forest gives generously products of its life and protects us all."

Main environmental advantages>

- ✓ sustainable or green materials
- ✓ healthy and safety

Pao Li Dung

- ✓ lock in carbon in mass/ absorb CO₂
- $\checkmark\,$ reduce of greenhouse effect
- ✓ renewable (straw, hemp, flax annual)
- ✓ locally available
- ✓ low energy intensity
- $\checkmark\,$ breathable absorbing and releasing air moisture
- \checkmark non-toxic and non-irritating
- \checkmark not destroy negative ions in air
- \checkmark low toxicity levels and low emission e.g. VOCs
- ✓ low water use in manufacture
- ✓ low wastage in manufacture and in assembly
- ✓ biodegradability of the material at the end of its life-cycle

OPTIMIZATION OF CONSTRUCTIONS

- by maximal application of plant base materials
- the basic data for each evaluated constructions:
- ✤ passive standard
- Ioad-bearing function timber
- thermal physical data according Slovak valid standards

Environmental evaluation is based on the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) - described in ISO 14040 -14049:2006, with boundary : "Cradle to Site"

Input data of embodied energy, CO_2 - eq.(GWP), SO_2 –eq. emissions (AP) for building materials are from available databases:

- Bauteilkatalog Austrian Institut,
- ♦Öbox Öko-institut Darmstadt
- only for straw bale are from Wihnan's case study and Center for Appropriate Technology (GrAT)

OPTIMIZATION OF FLOOR CONSTRUCTION







OPTIMIZATION OF FLOOR CONSTRUCTION



MIRELON 1% WOODEN PE FOIL PARQUET 2% TIMBER 1% ROCK WOOL INSULATION 24% total 898,3 MJ/m² embodied CO₂ eq. WOODEN PARQUET 6% PE FOIL 1% TIMBER -13% **ROCK WOOL** INSULATION 30% total 5,6 kgCO₂ eq/m²

OPTIMIZATION OF FLOOR CONSTRUCTION



RESULTS OF ASSESSMENTS OF FLOOR CONSTRUCTION

Selected thermal-physical parameters for floor construction alternatives

	m	U	Q	D
	[kg/ m ²]	[W/(m ² K)]	[kJ]	[-]
1A	485,77	0,010	579,36	13,37
1B	158,00	0,010	170,85	5,35
1C	96,30	0,091	182,04	11,02

Total results of environmental assessment for floor construction alternatives





The construction alternative **1A** proves the worst results from environmental sustainability but represents the best value of thermal storage. The most environmental suitable alternative is variant **1C** and demonstrates a possible way to optimization of construction for green building design. It is about **85%** preferable to alternative **1B** in terms of embodied energy from non-renewable resources and only this variant is able to **absorb a lot of CO₂ eq. emissions**.

embodied energy MJ/m²











RESULTS OF ASSESSMENTS OF EXTERNAL WALLS

Selected thermal-physical parameters for external wall alternatives

	m	U	Q	D	Ψ	g_{v}	g_k
	[kg/ m ²]	[W/(m ² K)]	[kJ]	[-]	[hrs]	[kg/m ² .yr]	[kg/m ² .yr]
2A	90,15	0,099	133,41	9,23	24,94	<0,5	0
2B	40,41	0,102	60,60	4,56	12,30	<0,5	0
2C	211,20	0,106	263,12	9,03	24,38	8,597	0,010

Total results of environmental assessment for external wall alternatives



embodied energy MJ/m²









The construction alternative **2C** is the most sustainable from evaluated alternatives. This variant achieves the best results in terms of GWP because participates in reducing of more than **130 kg CO₂ eq. emissions**. It is about **11%** preferable to alternative **2B** in terms of embodied energy and about more than **630%** in terms of embodied CO_2 eq. emissions. The alternative 2C accounts positive influence on the future operational energy consumption.

OPTIMIZATION OF ROOF CONSTRUCTION



-4%

DIFFUSIVE FOIL

7%



Page 18

total -36,34 kg CO₂eq./m²







Page 19

total -30,91kgCO2 eq/m²

7%

-4%

OPTIMIZATION OF ROOF CONSTRUCTION



RESULTS OF ASSESSMENTS OF ROOF CONSTRUCTIONS

Selected thermal-physical parameters for roof construction alternatives

	m [kg/ m ²]	U [W/(m ² K)]	Q [kJ]	D [-]	Ψ [hrs]	g _v [kg/m ² .yr]	g _k [kg/m ² .yr]
3 A	139,89	0,089	165,25	9,96	26,90	8,432	0,002
3B	65,88	0,087	102,02	5,59	15,09	<0,5	0
3 C	224,08	0,085	192,81	9,47	25,59	3,255	1,264

Total results of environmental assessment for roof construction alternatives









The alternative of roof construction **3C** is the most sustainable from designed alternatives. This alternative of extensive green roof proves the most suitable results of environmental and thermal-physical assessment. It is about more than **8%** preferable to alternative **3B** in terms of embodied energy and is about **214%** preferable to alternative **3A** from this point of GWP. The variant **3C** achieves excellent results in terms of thermal-physical assessment.



The results of **environmental** and **thermal-physical** assessments and decision analysis demonstrate that the alternative of floor **1C** of external wall **2C** and of roof construction **3C** are the best from long-term point for **green residential building**.

The optimized construction alternatives are used for designed passive bungalow which is situated **in Košice**, in Eastern part of Slovakia. The average summer temperature is about 20.5° C and average winter temperature is about -13° C.







Total embodied energy MJ	Total embodied kg CO ₂ eq. emissions			
387 374.489	-76 291.390 Bogo 22			



The applied clearly natural plant materials are achieved to store great amount of CO_2 emissions as locked carbon in envelope of house after phase of demolition. This wood-framed house determines reduction of more than **76 to**n of CO_2 eq. emissions what corresponds to approximately **550 kg** of CO_2 eq. emissions per square meter of its floor area.

The **plant** and other **clearly natural** building materials are perspective way to **optimization design of green building** in conditions of the Slovak Republic.

green wood-framed house philosophy of healthy housing

The principle of optimization of material and energy flows within whole life cycle is one of the basic principles of sustainable development. Sustainable or green construction is thus one of the most important challenges we face. And the potential for improvement is huge.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION