

#### **Mechanical Ventilation & Heat Recovery**





**Psi Ψ Calculation** 

U-Factor (Junction 3 + Junction 4)

Psi Ψ Calculation (Junction 4)

Psi Ψ<sub>(4)</sub> = Psi Ψ<sub>(3+4)</sub> - Psi Ψ<sub>(3)</sub> Psi  $\Psi_{(3+4)}$  = L2D<sub>(3+4)</sub> - (L1D<sub>wall</sub> + L1D<sub>roof</sub>)

L2D<sub>(3+4)</sub> = U<sub>factor</sub> x Length<sub>total</sub> = 0.136 x 1.72913 = **0.235 W/mK** 

L1D<sub>wall</sub> = U<sub>wall</sub> x Length<sub>wall</sub> = 0.113 x 0.673 = 0.076 W/mK

 $L1D_{roof} = U_{roof} \times Length_{roof}$ = 0.086 x 1.685 = 0.145 W/mK

Psi  $\Psi_{(4)}$  = 0.016 W/mK

**Psi Ψ Calculation** 

exterior 0.1224

Psi Ψ Calculation (Junction 5)

U-Factor (Junction 5)

Psi Ψ<sub>(5)</sub> = L2D<sub>(5)</sub> - L1D wall

 $L2D_{(5)} = U_{factor} \times Length_{total}$ = 0.1224 x 1.848

 $L1D_{wall} = U_{wall} x Length_{wall}$ = 0.113 x 1.695

=0.226 W/mK

= 0.192 W/mK

**Psi Ψ Calculation** 

Heat transfer resistance (m90W) enterior Rsi 0 . 17

ercentage of Ser

LID FLOOR U-VALUE CALCULATOR (ISO 13370)

8' (m) 9,130 Floor U value (W/m<sup>2</sup>K)

Floor perimeter (m)

(W/mK)

5000

where: U<sub>wall</sub>

where:  $U_{floor} = 0.09 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$ Length<sub>floor</sub> = 4+ thickness of wall

= 4.565 m

exterior 0.0318 30.0 21087.7 N/A

**Concrete Floor Slab** 

6 Concrete Floor

norste Sorsed morste Slab Logspan" FIR Ins

O PASSIVATE

ckness (n

equivalent

**U-factor (Junction 6)** 

ntellor 0.1340 0.0

Psi Ψ Calculation (Junction 6)

Psi  $\Psi$  = L2D - (L1D <sub>wall</sub> + L1D <sub>floor</sub>)

= 0.670 W/mK

= 0.159 W/mK

 $L1D_{floor} = U_{floor} \times Length_{floor}$  $= 0.09 \times 4.565$ 

= 0.411 W/mK

= 0.670 - (0.159 + 0.411) Psi Ψ = **0.100 W/mK** 

Psi  $\Psi$  = L2D - (L1D <sub>wall</sub> + L1D <sub>floor</sub>)

 $L1D_{wall} = U_{wall} \times Length_{wall}$  $= 0.113 \times 1.408$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{Psi} \ \Psi_{(3+4)} \ = \ \mathsf{L2D}_{(3+4)} \ \text{-} \ (\mathsf{L1D}_{\mathsf{wall}} \ \text{+} \ \mathsf{L1D}_{\mathsf{roof}}) \\ \ = \ 0.235 \ \text{-} \ (0.076 \ \text{+} \ 0.145) \end{array}$ = 0.014 W/mK

 W/Ar2 K
 C
 Rotation

 interfor
 0.1360
 30.0
 1723.13
 A
 Total Length

 exterior
 0.0464
 30.0
 5061.63
 N/A
 Total Length

1848.05 N

where:

where: U<sub>factor</sub> Length<sub>total</sub>

where:  $U_{wall} = 0.113 vv/m$ . Length<sub>wall</sub> = 0.3 + 0.373 = 0.673 m

where:  $U_{roof} = 0.086 W/m^2 K$ Length<sub>roof</sub> = 1.12 + 0.565 = 1.685 m

where:  $U_{factor} = 0.122$ Length<sub>total</sub> = 1.848 m

Uwall

= 0.1224 W/m<sup>2</sup>

= 0.113 W/m<sup>2</sup>K

Percentage of Sec. 3

40.8

0.090

Length<sub>wall</sub> = 1.695 m

= 0.136 W/m<sup>2</sup>K = 1.72913 m

**Therm Model - Junction 4** Geometry as per BR 497:2007 conventions

As the distance between the lintel / window head junction (junction 4) from the parapet junction (junction 3) is less than half the thickness of the wall, then both junctions 3 & 4 are modelled together. The total  $\Psi$  is then apportioned by subtracting  $\Psi_{(3)}$  from  $\Psi_{(3:4)}$  to give  $\Psi_{(4)}$  as per Section 2.2.3 Adjacent Thermal Bridges of BR 497:2007. 1,120 565 (3 x thickness of element)









**Therm Model - Junction 6** 











Other PHPP implications of the rooflights included:

Mech Ventilation & Heat Recovery

been reached but Primary Energy was still too high.

newly created light wells.

the "Areas" sheet of PHPP.

Volume

bulkheads and boxed-in ducting etc.

K Linear Thermal Bridging

L Treated Floor Areas

Solar Hot Water

Lighting Controls

4 x T6 (2.5m high x 1.9m wide)

2 x T7 (2.5m high x 2.4m wide)

resorting to night purge ventilation.

Shading

(m<sup>2</sup>a) threshold.

Μ

Ν

0

Q

Energy.

demand.

Increased "Enclosed Volume" (Ve) from 1280.4m<sup>3</sup> to 1325.76m<sup>3</sup> as a result of the

U-values were established for the lightwell reveals using rigid woodfibre insulation

on stud as exposed and semi-exposed areas. These areas were then input into

The volume was again revised to account for a slightly lowered ceiling (to

accommodate a service zone below the airtightness layer) as well as numerous

2 x MVHR units were introduced - "MAXK-13 2000DC Lufta" with a heat recovery

new plant rooms within the WC blocks. All ducting was kept within the thermal

envelope. At this point, the annual heating demand target of 25 kWh/(m2a) had

Linear thermal bridge analysis using THERM was used to calculate Psi values

for junctions at the eaves, flat-roof abutment, parapet, ope sill, ope head and

the "Areas" sheet. The presence of positive Psi values in the slab perimeter

and surface condensation risk along key juction details. Psi values were obtained

base of wall as well as a number of combined juctions where they occured closer

than the thickness of the surface elements. These Psi values were then input into

junction resulted in an increase in the annual heating demand above the 25 kWh/

Revisions were made to reflect previous planning changes such as plantrooms,

10m<sup>2</sup> aperture, vaccuum tube collectors on the south east facing roof pitch. The

Energy efficient lights with automatic, dimming controls and motion detectors are

With the annual heating demand having increased again due to the linear thermal bridging, it is decided to join the south east facing openings to the classrooms in

an attempt to increase the solar gain during the winter months thus reducing heat

Windows 9,10,13,16,19 and 20 are widened to create two new window types :

Daytime natural ventilation in summer time is introduced with an air change rate

of 0.3 ac/h - the minimum required for ventilation in any case. It is decided **not** to

have night time purge ventilation during the summer as security may be an issue. It is intended that the design meet the 10% frequency of overheating without

Through the use of sun studies via a BIM model of the school simulating both

gains charts in PHPP. 1.2m deep horizontal louvered shading was found to

the 10% threshold without the need for any night purge ventilation

provide maximum shade in the summer and maximum solar access during the

winter. Once this was input into PHPP, the frequency of overheating fell below

winter and summer sun, it was established that the south east windows were the

biggest source of solar gain. This was confirmed in the monthly solar and internal

introduced to provide daylight responsive lighting to reduce lighting energy

Additional Openings for Solar Gain

Summer Daytime Natural Ventilation

demand. This proves successful however exacerbates overheating.

introduction of domestic solar hot water has effectively halved the Primary

reduced lobby area as well as the introduction of fixed furniture in circulation areas such as bench seating in the corridor and storage in the entrance lobby.

efficiency of 83.6%. Adjustments were made to the floor plan to make way for two

#### **Design Process**

A Basecase

Detailed analysis of existing conditions using PHPP to establish a basecase model. Incremental improvements introduced into PHPP with each step recorded separately to monitor the impact of each intervention. A total of 17 steps (A to Q) were recorded with their impacts on annual heat demand, primary energy and frequency of overheating summarised in the adjacent design tracker graph.

B External Insulation The first step was to upgrade the thermal fabric with improved U-values. External insulation was chosen as the prime insulation strategy. It was decided that materials with higher sustainability credentials would be used to begin the optimisation process to see how far one could get in attempting to achieve EnerPHit standard without resorting to highly synthetic materials. It was anticipated that such materials would quickly reach their thresholds and that those with increasingly lower U-values would need to be introduced in order to reach the Enerphit standard. "Gutex" woodfibre insulation with a thermal conductivity of 0.039 W/mK was therefore chosen as the external wall insulation while "Warmcell" Cellulose blown insulation with a thermal conductivity of 0.038 W/mK was chosen for the pitched roof loft. While these remained in place throughout the optimisation process, it proved necessary to use "Kingspan" PIR

> insulation. "Ecobead" pumped insulation was used for the existing wall cavities. The "Area" sheet was updated to account for the increased wall thicknesses and therefore external surface areas. Likewise, the Vn50 and enclosed volume (Ve) were also revised to accound for the increased window reveals.

insulation with a conductivity of 0.022 W/mK for both the floor and flat roof

C Airtightness Airtightness was improved to an  $n_{50}$  of 1.0ac/h @ 50pa - the minimum required

D Glazing All glazing replaced with triple glazing with a g-value of 0.63 and a U-value of 0.69 W/m<sup>2</sup>K.

E Window Frames Munster Joinery "PassiV Future Proof" with SP Tri seal. Uf =  $0.76 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$ , 102mm thick frames.

The number of divisions were also reduced Thermal Mass Floor U value according to ISO 6946 (W/m²K) 0.112

for achieving Enerphit standard.

The thermal mass of the existing concrete structure and the new floor concrete slab are retained and taken into account. Openings

A selection of existing windows (mainly north west facing) were removed to reduce unnecessary glazing heat loss. The clerestory windows in particular were proven through simulation to provide zero contribution to daylighting. They were therefore removed and blocked up so that glazing areas could be redistributed elsewhere to better advantage.

North West Windows - w32, 33, 38,40,43,48,49, 50-63.

The following existing windows were removed: South East Windows - w7,23

An additional 2 windows were then added - 1 each for the two middle classrooms to match the existing so that they now had 4 rather than three opes so as to improve daylight and increase solar gain during the winter.

= 0.113 W/m<sup>2</sup>K H Rooflights Length<sub>wall</sub> = 1+ thickness of slab = 1.408 m

strategies were therefore necessary to tackle to the problem.

4m x 1.2m rooflights inclined at 41 degrees were provided for each of the four classrooms mounted on the North West facing roof slope with the intention of achieving the minimum required Daylight Factors. The minimum DoES requirements for classrooms are an average DF range of 4.5 - 5.5 and a minimum threshold DF of 2.0%.

> To achieve such daylight factors, the rooflights would need to be much larger, resulting in significant heat loss in winter and overheating in summer - even with very low U and g-values. It was attempted through PHPP to arrive at an optimum size which would provide reasonably good daylight but which would still be manageable in terms of glazing heat loss and solar gain.



### **Design Tracker**















900

# **EnerPHit - School Project**

mo zainal 10/01/2014

## **DT774b** Energy Retrofit Technology