ENERBUIL



Evaluation ENERBUILD-Tool – existing buildings Ateliers municipaux Bassens, Savoie (73), France







1 Basic information about the building

| Name of the building | Ateliers municipaux de la commune de Bassens |
|--|--|
| Address of the building | Avenue de Mérande 73000 Bassens |
| Owner/investor | Mairie de Bassens |
| Year of construction | 2009-2010 |
| Building type | Tertiary |
| Building method | Structure with wood frame and concrete |
| Number of buildings | 2 |
| Number of levels above earth | 2 |
| Number of levels underground | 0 |
| Kind of the public use | Technical locals |
| Effective area for public use in m ² (net) | |
| Additional private uses | |
| Effective area for private use in m ² (net) | |
| Total effective area in m ² | 345 m ² |
| Source of energy for heating | Gas |
| Heating system | Heat boiler |
| Water heating system | Solar thermal with auxiliary gaz |
| Date of the building evaluation | 16/12/2010 |





2 Execution of the building evaluation with the ENERBBUILD tool

Responsible Organisation: ASDER (Association Savoyarde de Développement des Energies Renouvelables), local energy agency

Contact person: Delphine Mugnier - Karine Le Diouron

Telephone: 04 79 85 88 50 Email:

Email: delphine.mugnier@asder.asso.fr ; karine.lediouron@asder.asso.fr

Temperature for thermal comfort in summertime:28 °CLocal limits for heating demand:RT 2005 130 kWh/an/m²

3 Results

| Nr. | | Title | Must criteria max points e | evaluated |
|-----|--|-------|----------------------------|-------------|
| | | Tille | (M) | max. points |

| Α | | Quality of location and facilities | max. 100 | 76 |
|---|---|------------------------------------|----------|----|
| А | 1 | Access to public transport network | 50 | 26 |
| А | 2 | Ecological quality of site | 50 | 50 |

| В | | Process and planning quality | | max. 200 | 60 |
|---|---|--|---|----------|----|
| В | 1 | Decision making and determination of goals | | 25 | 10 |
| В | 2 | Formulation of verifiable objectives for energetic and ecological measures | М | 20 | 20 |
| В | 3 | Standardized calculation of the economic efficiency | М | 40 | 0 |
| В | 4 | Product-management - Use of low-emission products | | 60 | 10 |
| В | 5 | Planning support for energetic optimization | | 60 | 20 |
| В | 6 | nformation for users | | 25 | 0 |

| С | | Energy & Utilities (Passive house) | | max. 350 | 321 |
|---|---|------------------------------------|---|----------|-----|
| С | 1 | Specific heating demand (PHPP) | М | 100 | 46 |
| С | 2 | Specific cooling demand (PHPP) | М | 100 | 100 |
| С | 3 | Primary energy demand (PHPP) | М | 125 | 125 |
| С | 4 | CO2-emissions (PHPP) | | 50 | 50 |

| D | | Health and Comfort | max. 250 | 0 |
|---|---|---|----------|---|
| D | 1 | Thermal comfort in summer | 150 | 0 |
| D | 2 | Ventilation - non energetic aspects | 50 | 0 |
| D | 3 | Daylight optimized (+ lightening optimized) | 50 | 0 |

| Е | | Building materials and construction | | max. 200 | 175 |
|-----|---|--|-----------|----------|-----|
| Е | 1 | DI3 _{TGH-Ic} ecological index of the thermal building envelope (respectively OI3 of the total mass of the puilding) | | 200 | 175 |
| | | | | | |
| Sum | | | max. 1000 | 632 | |

ENERBUIL





4 Conclusions from the building evaluation with the ENERBUILD-Tool

a) Generally

Some criterias are difficult to assess. This building is for a technical use, and doesn't fit in very well in these criteria.

b) About the planning process

It can be difficult to get certain documents needed to assess when the project already exists: for example the documents proving the decision-making, determination and definition of the initial objectives (criteria B1 and B2)

c) About the building itself

Cconsumptions' of hot water are considered negligible in this type of commercial building and then entered zero in the calculation regulations. But, on average, each technician takes a shower / day. A solar water heater was even installed only for these needs. The project is therefore advantaged, because of the failure to take account hot water consumption in calculations.

d) About the evaluation process

A tertiary building for technical use doesn't fit easily into the required criteria:

- User Handbook: The project was designed in conjunction with users, according to their requirements.

- Dynamic simulation: its cost is considered too important for the client for its interest in this type of building.

We do not have access to the data requested in the standard D2 Ventilation, air quality inside.

ENERBUIL



5 Suggestions for improvement of the ENERBUILD-Tool

<u>General Suggestion</u>: Proposal to differentiate criteria depending on the nature of building: social housing building, commercial building, technical building

<u>Criterion A1:</u> Access to public transport network access Proposal to extend this criterion to other infrastructures valuing friendly transport (cycling and train station in particular).

<u>Criteria B</u>: Project Management Proposal to add a criterion on water (management, recovery ...).

In this project, all of the following elements could have been valued:

- Recovery of rainwater: a 20 000L storage for water recovery was set up under the pavement of vehicles garage.
- Rain water retention: a retention system has been set up to water rain from the courtyard in accordance with the requirements of Chambéry Métropole (local authority).
- Water Treatment: a water treatment system of the washing area was established in accordance with the requirements of Chambéry Métropole (local authority).

<u>Criterion D2</u>: Ventilation, Indoor Air Quality Proposal to split the test into 2 sub-levels

- Conservation of the criterion on the acoustic measurements but simplifying the criteria indicators.
- Adding a line on the quality of ventilation (based on the occupation of the building).
- Proposal to focus more on assessing the air quality analysis by an onsite measurement.