



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/109078/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Baborska-Narożny, M., Stevenson, F. and Grudzińska, M. (2016) Overheating in retrofitted flats: occupant practices, learning and interventions. *Building Research and Information*, 45 (1-2). pp. 40-59. ISSN: 0961-3218

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2016.1226671>

---

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Building Research and Information* on 11/10/2016, available online:  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09613218.2016.1226671>.

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Magdalena Baborska-Narożny, Fionn Stevenson, Magdalena Grudzińska

Title

## **Overheating in retrofit apartments – occupant practices, learning and interventions**

### **Abstract**

The overheating risk in apartments retrofitted to energy efficient standards has been identified by previous studies as one that is particularly high. With climate change and rising mean temperatures this is a growing concern. There is a need to understand the kinds of practices, learning and interventions adopted by the occupants of individual households to try to reduce overheating, as this area is poorly understood and under-researched. This case study focuses on the impact of different home use practices in relation to the severity of overheating in 18 apartments in one high-rise residential building in northern England. Internal temperatures monitored in comparable apartments show that the percentage of time spent above the expected category II threshold of thermal comfort according to BSEN 15251 can differ by over 70%. Extensive monitoring, covering a full year including two summer periods, identified emergent changes in heatwave practices linked with increased home use skills and understanding among the research participants. Close analysis of design intentions versus reality has identified key physical barriers and social learning opportunities for appropriate adaptation in relation to heatwaves. Recommendations for designers and policymakers are highlighted in relation to these factors.

Key words:

Overheating; apartment buildings; retrofit; occupant behaviour,

## **1. Introduction**

Every one in six occupants in the EU lives in an apartment (BPIE, 2015). The overheating risk in UK apartments has been identified by previous studies as particularly high, compared to other dwelling types (Beizaee *et al.*, 2013; Lomas and Kane, 2013). In the mild UK climate, where the external summer temperature relatively rarely rises above a comfortable internal temperature,

the vulnerability of apartments is due to their relatively low external surface to floor area ratio compared to detached houses. This reduces conductive heat loss and the potential for ventilation cooling. Top floor apartments have repeatedly been found to be most vulnerable due to their minimal solar thermal protection by shading from other buildings or trees and the additional solar gain from the roof (AECOM, 2012a). Contextual factors such as geographical location, orientation, solar gain via the thermal transmittance, excessive glazing, lack of appropriate external shading options, exposed thermal mass which cannot be adequately cooled via ventilation, and even poorly insulated hot water pipes or other varying internal heat loads, have all been explored and linked with overheating (Peacock *et al.*, 2010; Kendrick *et al.*, 2012, ZCH, 2015). High-rise residential buildings are usually urban rather than rural and therefore impacted by the urban heat island effect - a growing concern due to global rising temperatures and predicted severe heatwaves (Oikonomou *et al.*, 2012; IPCC, 2014; Vardoulakis *et al.*, 2015). EU policy is focused on lowering heating demand as this is the major load in energy consumption in the residential sector in most European countries (European Parliament, 2010). However, regulations for retrofitting also need to respond to the potential overheating risk, so that refurbishment does not worsen summer temperatures in dwellings (Sehizadeh and Ge, 2014). For example, external solar shading, although typically found in vernacular residential architecture in southern Europe and confirmed by models as an effective tool for the UK, is not obligatory in the British residential sector (BPIE, 2015). The impact of user behaviour on overheating in a domestic environment, though significant (O'Brien, 2016), is also not sufficiently understood, despite on-going field and modelling studies (Porritt *et al.*, 2012; Arethusa *et al.*, 2014). This has implications for the validity of modelled overheating predictions which inform design guidelines and for overheating action plans to minimise the impact of heatwaves on public health (Lowe, 2011; D'Ippoliti, 2009). There is therefore a need to better understand the kinds of practices and interventions adopted by occupants, in terms of overheating. There is also a need to explore what interventions can be encouraged through design and as part of occupant guidance.

In a UK hospital study, Lomas (2012) points out that: ‘the minimum recorded temperature [...] occurred on one of the warmest nights of the year [...]; on this day a Level 2 heatwave alert was issued; in response to which, night time cooling by opening windows is a recommended procedure. It seems ironic that the coolest night time temperature, [...] should occur on one of the hottest nights’. This was clearly due to staff having good procedures in place for appropriate heatwave ventilation and knowing how to act on them. Within a domestic environment, however, the occupants need to tackle overheating using their own knowledge and skills, and the impact of their behaviour on the thermal environment needs to be carefully measured and evaluated due to its significance in this sector (Mavrogianni, 2014). Equally, the need to focus on the prevention of overheating may not be obvious to many occupants because:

- the degree of overheating risk varies for different housing typologies - apartments in high-rise buildings are at greater risk than houses
- temperatures are higher in the city centre than in rural areas
- climate change is likely to lead to increasing heatwaves over time, which will gradually affect housing typologies previously resistant to overheating (While and Whitehead, 2013).

Occupants thus may lack tacit knowledge in terms of overheating control practices accumulated through experience but nevertheless clearly need to cope with overheating. Adaptive thermal comfort theory states that ‘If a change occurs such as to produce discomfort, people react in ways which tend to restore their comfort.’ (Nicol and Humphreys, 2002) and that ‘...those with more opportunities to adapt themselves to the environment or the environment to their own requirements will be less likely to suffer discomfort’ (ibid p. 564). Recent studies have revealed that environmental control systems are not used by occupants as planned for in optimised design models leading to significant performance failures (Brown and Gorgolewski, 2015) which, if this leads to widespread adoption mechanical cooling, could have significant impact on resource use (Janda, 2011; Gram-Hanssen, 2013).

Given the increasing challenge of overheating, occupants need to use their own appropriate tacit knowledge, where this is available, and modify their practices. Learning occurs most effectively within the sensory category of 'trigger and feedback', strengthened by cognitive apprehension and social learning (Sørensen, 1996) characterised as '...a combined act of discovery and analysis, of understanding and giving meaning, and of tinkering and the development of routines.' (Ibid, p.6) This paper is largely focused on cognitive access to technology and trust (Glad, 2012), enhancing certainty (Tormala, 2016) and lowering the risk of occupants resorting to air conditioning instead of improving their low energy overheating mitigation practices.

Three key research questions arise from the above:

- What is the relationship between the indoor and outdoor air temperature profiles and occupant behaviour in retrofitted apartments?
- To what degree do housing occupants exploit the opportunities to adapt the environment to their thermal requirements using the fabric and systems installed?
- How can the adoption of heat mitigation best practices be enhanced in retrofitted housing developments?

The focus of this paper is on the various practices that occupants adopt when reacting to overheating discomfort experienced in a test sample of 18 comparable apartments out of 200 in a typical ten storey 1960's UK apartment block after deep retrofit. The impact of the identified practices is then compared against the heat gain calculations and performance of the fabric and system features of the case study apartments. The major differences identified in terms of occupants' skills, learning and understanding of their home environments prompted careful analysis of the design intentions and practices in order to highlight how both can be improved, given the severe consequences of the findings.

## **2. Case study**

### **The building**

The 'typical' case study for this paper (Yin, 2009) was a ten storey apartment block located in a central urban area of a major city in the North of England with deep retrofit work completed in 2012 (Table 1). Only 15.3% of UK dwellings are purpose built apartments (National Statistics, 2011, p.53), which is low compared to the European average of 32% (BPIE, 2011). Nevertheless, the typology is important because overall ca. 36 million households in the European Union live in high-rise apartment blocks (IEA, 2006), many of which are decades old and require upgrading that avoids overheating risks. This study focuses on the actual thermal environment and occupant home use practices in hot weather spells in this most vulnerable building type, without active cooling.

The private case-study refurbishment project aimed to positively boost a challenging neighbourhood. As such, the designers found the planning process very straightforward with little critical appraisal of the design intentions beyond the regulatory minimum for refurbishments at the time. As the Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) (DECC, 2005) overheating calculation used was not mandatory, the overheating risk identified using this tool was not tackled at the design stage. The study examined occupants' practices during the summer of 2013 and 2014 as part of a wider EU funded research project.

### **The apartment design**

On each floor, two cross-ventilated apartments spanning the width of the block in the original layout were refurbished and extended into four single aspect apartments (Figure 1). They were equipped with continuous mechanical extract ventilation (MEV), with extractor units in the kitchen and bathroom only, and large windows in the principle rooms (with ventilation openings of half to one fifth of the glazed area). Window opening was either through side hung casements or sliding doors where there was a terrace or a balcony available. Trickle vents were installed in the ground floor apartments only for security reasons – despite the original design intention to install them on all the floors. Supply chain issues, driven by delivery time, resulted in a change of window supplier and specification. This then resulted in windows that could be locked in a trickle position but lacked trickle vents. A restricted window opening width of up to just 100 mm,

locked with a restrictor for safety reasons at height, was another means of natural ventilation. The decision to keep the original concrete structure of the existing building resulted in very low ceiling heights in the apartments (ca. 2.2m) which were fully glazed to counterbalance the cramped feeling. The relatively high glazing to floor ratio varied for different apartments from 22% and 44% for the living/dining/kitchen area and as high as 30% to 88% for the bedrooms. Exposed concrete walls and ceilings were covered with gypsum board and insulation to cover the electrical wiring and improve apartments' soundproofing. This however minimised any benefit of the thermal mass and potential night purging. These procurement stage design and specification decisions had clear overheating consequences which are discussed later.

### **The participants**

A stratified 10% sample of households from across the apartment types and locations in the building participated in the in-depth research study and the whole household population of the apartment block (n= 200) was covered with extended well-known building use survey (BUS) (Leaman *et al.*, 2010) with several questions added by the authors specifically in relation to window opening, heating, ventilation and the occupants' previous accommodation. Two of the initial 21 households moved out with two subsequent volunteers substituted. One household withdrew their data by the end of the study. The analysis is based on the 18 households who participated throughout the study (Table 2). In 88% of these households, regular occupancy patterns prevailed, with the occupants generally out at work during the weekdays. The remaining 12% stayed at home most of the time, either working from home or being in retirement or remaining unemployed. One limitation of the research sample was the lack of families with children. The apartment block was predominantly occupied by young individuals or couples (Table 1).

## **3. Aims and methods**

The case study used a broad variety of quantitative and qualitative methods (Table 3) to provide an in-depth understanding of occupant activities related to fabric and systems in a domestic environment, and the resulting thermal environment achieved.

### **Recruitment process**

Occupants were recruited via posters placed in the communal areas, a research team meeting with the occupants organised in conjunction with the Occupants' Association meeting prior to the study commencing, and information letters delivered anonymously to each apartment followed by door-to-door visits by the field researcher. A financial reward of £50 per household was given after the completion of all the planned research tasks.

### **Occupant feedback and home use practices**

An in-depth building performance evaluation (BPE) methodology (Guerra-Santin and Tweed, 2015) was adopted in parallel with an investigation into specific overheating mitigation practices. Tacit knowledge, learning opportunities, and the usability of controls were examined as well as occupant understanding and skills (Stevenson *et al.*, 2013). An ethnographic approach (Atkinson & Hammersley, 2007) guided home visits every seven weeks for the duration of the monitoring period. This involved repeated researcher observation of fabric and system settings, a walk-through with the occupants, informal discussion between the researcher and occupants in their homes, detailed notes taken of each visit and a photographic /thermographic survey of the complete apartment block. The resulting analysis informed the questions for the final semi-structured interview with the occupants at the end of the study. Additional data on occupant practices related to overheating and their understanding of the available mitigation methods was acquired through content analysis of a closed Facebook group of the occupants which operated during the study and beyond (Baborska-Narožny *et al.*, 2015).

### **Temperature monitoring and evaluation**

All the participating apartments were monitored continuously from 24<sup>th</sup> July 2013 to 24<sup>th</sup> July 2014 using three wireless iButton sensors DS1923 (Maxim, 2015) to log temperature and

relative humidity (RH) levels in the living room and bedroom every 30 minutes. This interval was deemed adequate for the purposes of the study, which was mainly to examine diurnal temperature profile patterns in relation to occupant practices. The sensors were placed by the researcher on internal walls or fixed furniture at a height of 800–1000 mm and away from direct sunlight as recommended (Figure 1). In order to extend the period between visits for downloading data and thus keep the number of visits manageable, the sensors were set for a low resolution allowing an accuracy of better than  $\pm 0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  within a temperature range of  $-10^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $+65^{\circ}\text{C}$  according to manufacturer's data sheet. Temperature error analysis indicated faulty readings in 0.1% of cases, which were removed from further calculations. Radiant heat monitoring could not be performed due to practical constraints of minimising the visibility and maximising the robustness of the equipment installed in apartments. This is a typical limitation found in other field studies (Beizaee *et al.*, 2013).

## **4. Analysis and discussion**

### **4.1 Evaluation of thermal environment**

#### **Weather**

To understand the internal thermal environment in relation to external weather conditions, meteorological data was retrieved from the MIDAS Land Surface Observation database run by the Meteorological Office for Bramham weather station located ten miles (15.4 km) from the study site (UK Meteorological Office) (Figure 2). During the monitoring period between 24<sup>th</sup> July 2013 and 24<sup>th</sup> July 2014 the maximum extreme temperature of  $29.2^{\circ}\text{C}$  occurred between 5pm and 7pm on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2013, triggering a 'heatwave' in this location for this period only, according to the 'Heatwave plan for England' (NHS, 2015). Both the July monitoring periods of 2013 and 2014 were relatively warm compared to the long term average for the same period but below record temperatures (Table 5). However, the summer of 2013 was hotter than that of 2014 and a period during July and August 2013 was therefore selected for the monitoring

results analysis. Another vital reason for focusing on the first summer period was that it showed the practices and interventions unaffected by any research feedback and instead based on the typical occupant learning situation i.e. relying on tacit knowledge from previous accommodation, home owners guide, on-line resources, trial and error etc. This provided a better representation of the challenges related to overheating of the retrofitted apartments.

The external environment of the apartment block generated considerable overheating potential, due to relatively little overshadowing and an inner city location subject to the urban heat island effect. A strong albedo effect was observed (but not monitored) with a black asphalt car park running continuously along the west side of the building, resulting in excessive heat due to the build-up of solar gain during the day, whereas the east façade looked onto a green landscaped area which provided a cooling effect.

### **Monitored temperatures**

During the monitoring period between 24<sup>th</sup> July and 31<sup>st</sup> August 2013 the mean internal temperature in the monitored apartments was almost 8°C higher than the average external air temperature of 16.7°C with 24.4°C registered in the bedrooms and 24.6°C in living rooms. These results suggest uncomfortably warm bedrooms according to the UK Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE) guidance which states that above 24°C the quality of sleep may be compromised (CIBSE, 2015). CIBSE static overheating criteria for bedrooms relates to occupied hours only and these are typically assumed to be between 23:00-7:00, however it is worth noting that four out of the 95 BUS survey respondents and one of the 21 in-depth study households worked in shifts which meant that their sleeping hours did not match those considered in the earlier studies (Lomas and Kane, 2013). Prevailing occupancy patterns for the 18 households were established based on repeated home visits and interview findings. These were then applied to all the apartments to enable comparison of their thermal environments. Temperatures in bedrooms were examined for the period 22:30-7:00 on weekdays (8.5 hours/day) and 22:30-9:00 on weekends (10.5 hours/day). The living rooms were examined for 7:00-8:30 and 18:00-22:30 on weekdays (6 hours/day) and 9:00-22:30 for

weekends (13.5 hours/day). Results indicate a significant variation in the thermal environment across the apartments (Figure 3) with 4.7°C and 4.3°C range in mean temperature in bedrooms and living rooms respectively (Table 4). Major overheating occurs in 44% bedrooms and 28% of living rooms according to CIBSE static criteria for an overheating risk. Within the 39 day period analysed, the maximum annual 1% allowance for temperature over the threshold of 28°C for living rooms and 26°C for bedrooms was already exceeded. The total annual occupied hours calculation yielded a constant occupancy pattern throughout the year of 3303 hours for bedrooms and 2964 hours for living rooms. Unsurprisingly the BUS survey prompted 43% of the respondents ( $n=95$ ) to complain about overheating with occupants commenting that their homes were 'Like an oven in the summer' and that 'The heat in summer is unbearable.' This would seem to confirm the CIBSE guidance and indicates that the *subjective* overheating issue was as severe for occupants as the physical measurements would seem to suggest. The BUS survey is clearly not a proxy for a thermal comfort study (Nicol and Roaf, 2005) but it does confirm the significance of the perception of overheating issue at the time it was carried out in February 2014. Thermal environment variation between different apartments is further demonstrated by a more detailed thermal comfort model analysis in the following section.

### **Ventilation issues**

A gap between the ventilation design intention and the observed occupant practices created some of the overheating issues. The home visits and survey results confirmed that only 6% of BUS respondents used the ventilation system as intended ( i.e. keeping the mechanical extract ventilation (MEV) fans on continuously in the kitchen area and bathroom) while a further 3% kept just one fan switched on continuously, usually in the bathroom. Significantly, 32% of respondents never switched the fans on at all and a further 17% felt that the question was simply not applicable. This practice during hotter periods spells indicates a major gap in the occupants' understanding of the MEV role in overheating mitigation. Keeping the MEV fans off altogether, instead of switching them on only intermittently occurred in all the apartments except for one i.e. the best performing in summer 2013 - No. 16 (Table 6). Interestingly in one of

apartments most prone to overheating, i.e. No. 13, poor shading practices in the bedroom with excessive 88% glazing to floor ratio were partially mitigated by keeping the MEV fan continuously on in the en-suite bathroom. Other studies of continuous mechanical ventilation in housing have had similar findings in relation to occupant behaviour (Balvers *et al.*, 2012) but these have mostly focused on air quality or heat loss with no particular interrogation of the interrelationship between overheating issues and occupant understanding and use of technology.

30% of respondents kept their windows open constantly on the latch to provide a 100mm air gap during hot spells, but a higher percentage (46%) only opened the windows when they were at home due to the security issues for ground floor occupants and the risk of window damage on higher floors from high winds while the occupants were away. This latter risk was explicitly identified in the 'Home Owners Guide' (HUG), explaining that the restrictors were not designed to withstand adverse weather conditions. Additionally, the property managing company sent notices to each household reminding they would be liable for any damage resulting from leaving unattended windows open. However only 33% of the sampled occupants were aware of the trickle ventilation option in terms of the various practices related to the window design (Table 6). The interviews indicated that those who were aware of this option had previous experience with similar windows and thus expected, and actively sought, such functionality. Unfortunately the trickle lock on the windows was not mentioned in the HUG leading to further occupant misunderstanding. Instead, misleading guidance stated that air circulation in an apartment could be achieved by regulating trickle vents that were not actually installed. As the heat built up in the sealed interiors during the day due to external heat gains, those who kept their windows closed while they were away (as advised) experienced severe overheating when coming home late in the afternoon. To mitigate this, they then opened the windows wide releasing the restrictors altogether – an action actively discouraged by the facility manager due to safety issues arising from the poor design of the large size of the windows, which could swing wildly without any restriction. The severity of overheating experienced even prompted some of the occupants on the top four floors to keep their front doors wedged open for cross ventilation,

despite the security issue arising from this action (Table 6). All the interviewed residents admitted having the windows open without restrictors at some point of the summer, knowing this was against the guidelines.

A portable air conditioning (AC) unit was bought by one of the participating households and used temporarily during the hot period in July and August 2013. The occupants would switch it on in the afternoon after they returned from work. This was partly a result of the occupants not having any shading in the living room and keeping the MEV system switched off, in order to 'save electricity'. They did not realise that their individual AC unit (800W) was potentially using more power than the MEV system within their home (2-5W per fan depending on trickle or boost fan speed mode).

### **Adaptive thermal comfort**

The dynamic thermal comfort variation analysis (Lomas, 2012; CIBSE A, 2015) reported here was based on temperature measurements in all the occupied bedrooms and living rooms during the key monitoring period referred to previously. It indicated significant differences between apartments in terms of temperatures (Figure 1). Ideally, a residential building should comply with the comfort criteria for category II according to guidance issued in the UK (CIBSE A, 2015: p.1-17). If the measured temperature exceeds the recommended threshold II boundary temperatures in relation to the changing outdoor running mean temperature, then the thermal comfort is affected negatively. Results for each apartment show very different thermal conditions in comparable apartments with significant comfort issues arising according to this guidance:

- 22% of the sample apartments (Nos.: 11, 13, 15, 18 - ninth and tenth floor) overheat for over 20% of the occupied time, and the living rooms in Nos. 13 and 18 overheat for over 40% of the occupied time
- 28% of the sample apartments (Nos. 2, 5, 8, 9, 16 - ground floor, second, sixth, eighth and tenth) are too cool for ca. 20% of the occupied time (Figure 4).

Interestingly no comments were made by the occupants about too cool apartments in the summer. It was only the overheating that raised complaints. The above results are highly significant with a high variation in thermal conditions between nearby free-running apartments, ranging from 'too cool' for 23% of the time when occupied (No. 16) to 'too warm' for 49% of the time (No 13) (Figure 5). This trend was established in relation to the contextual factors described earlier and the occupancy profile for 'young working adults with no children'.

Interestingly, the coolest apartment in the sample is on the top floor, which is generally regarded as the most vulnerable floor in terms of overheating (Mavrogianni *et al.*, 2015) and the warmest apartment is on floor nine - one floor below. In fact, all floor nine apartments experience overheating but significant differences between them are still evident; the living room temperatures in the two comparable and adjacent west-facing apartments (No. 12 and No. 13) are above the BSEN15251 category II threshold for 5% and 49% of the time respectively. The latter finding suggests that occupant practices are a major source of the overheating variation for similar contexts, with some occupants having effectively prevented overheating while others clearly were unable to do so. This is further explored in the next two sections of the paper (Figure 6 and Table 6). Results presented in Figure 1 are also in line with a general trend of apartments on upper levels in a block being warmer than those located lower down. This has been linked with the observed stack effect in the staircase partially open to the elements but more research is needed to understand the impact of staircase design on temperatures in adjacent apartments (Baborska-Narožny *et al.*, 2016).

### **Heat gains**

In order to reveal the importance of occupant practices against the varied contextual factors in relation to overheating, simple heat gain calculations for each sampled apartment were compared with the monitored temperatures. The calculations covered the same 39 day period of summer in 2013 (Table 2). The aim was to see if the overheating vulnerability matches the variation in the actual temperatures between apartments in terms of contextual factors.

The calculations used meteorological and design data with regard to glazing type, glazing and floor area (Met Office, 2015). The total solar irradiation on the horizontal plane was firstly divided into direct and diffuse components based on the correlation between the hourly values of extra-terrestrial radiation and horizontal global and diffuse irradiation according to Muneer (2004). Secondly solar radiation incident on vertical planes of walls and windows was calculated using a model validated for a wide range of locations in the UK (Muneer, 1987, Muneer, 1990). The solar gains were all calculated for unshaded windows in order to highlight the variation in overheating vulnerability between apartments resulting from their designed glazing to floor ratio. The difference in total solar transmittance between clear and tinted glazing in different parts of the windows was also taken into account (Table 8). In the apartments located on the highest floor additional solar gains from the roof were also included, generating approximately 10% of total solar gains for those particular apartments. Solar gains from outer walls were ignored to simplify calculations on the basis that they were not significant compared to the other variables and problems with obtaining reliable results exist. The external opaque cladding in the case study building is ventilated through a 30 mm air gap behind it and a 10 mm distance between the panels. There is no standard calculation methodology dealing with such a case. Rough estimation (assuming that the gap was not ventilated) indicated that solar gains through the walls would not exceed 5% – 6% of the total heat gains in the examined apartments. Experiments and complex computational fluid dynamics (CFD) modelling (Suárez et al. 2012, Gagliano et al. 2016) showed that solar heat gains coming from ventilated walls could be approximately 30% to 50% lower compared with walls constructed with non-ventilated cavities. What is more, during summer nights the cooling effect of the ventilated cladding was observed. Calculating the overall effect of external walls with ventilated cladding on heat gains needs further guidance but in the case case study it would not be significant due to small external opaque wall area.

The main occupancy types related to the period of occupancy and the number of occupants per apartment and per bedroom were established through home visit data and these were then used to calculate the internal heat gains. These were the only user related variables that

informed the calculations. Other internal loads were assumed to be the same for all apartments, with an average usage pattern based on interviews and home visits notes, in the absence of sub-metering data. The HUG identified that the sample apartments were all equipped with the same appliances and lighting specified at the design stage. This was then verified with a walk through tour of each apartment. The equipment related heat load was based on manufacturer specifications related to the appliances and CIBSE guide A (Table 7). It is recognised that this is also a limitation and that the resulting heat gain calculation is indicative only.

The results (Figure 6) show a weak positive correlation of 0.170 for the living room and 0.386 for the bedroom between heat gains and temperatures (Figure 7) which may indicate the importance of occupant behaviour despite the potential limitation of the modelling. However, there also appears to be some correlation between two peak temperature for the bedrooms of apartments No.11 and 13 where the exceptionally high glazing to floor ratio (Table 3) coexists with poor user practices. Apartment No.13 is included in the practice analysis in relation to overheating (Table 6). At the same time, it is clear that the ground floor apartments are persistently cooler apart from No.1, which does not have direct contact with the ground, having a gym below it.

## **4.2 Overheating prevention and mitigation practices**

A closer examination of occupant practices is used here to illustrate how the occupants adjusted their domestic thermal environments to suit their individual needs. Six apartments with varied overheating level from top two floors are selected: two adjacent ninth floor apartments (Nos. 12 and 13) and four top floor apartments (Nos. 15, 16, 17 and 18). The identified temperature variations on the vulnerable floors are linked with the varied occupant practices and interventions in relation to overheating (Table 6). Behavioural thermal adaptation unrelated to the building fabric and services, such as the use of showers, cold drinks etc. identified in other studies (AECOM, 2012b) is not discussed here.

### **Shading**

The home visits revealed that all the bedroom windows, but only half of the living room windows, were equipped with internal blinds. Only the bedroom venetian blinds were originally part of the standard specification provided by the developer, with living room blinds added by the occupants themselves, and some also modifying the standard bedroom shading. Furniture and IT equipment often prevented occupants from being able to open the windows, and the layout of the apartments also made it difficult to move these items in relation to the specific configuration of the full height glazing. The window opening was typically obstructed when the blinds were pulled down. Six of the rented and owned apartments surveyed lacked any blinds in the living room. Interestingly, some owners changed the specified blinds for bespoke blackout blinds in their bedrooms but did not add any in the living room, which was nevertheless a prime area of overheating. Interviews revealed that shading choices were guided by lighting preferences rather than solar gain considerations with occupants unaware that the blackout blinds could be more effective than the venetian blinds in terms of reducing solar gain during the daytime. None of the practices related to the use of blinds was optimal for the prevention of overheating, which would have involved significantly reducing the solar gain in all windows (Table 4) and exploiting the night-time cooling potential of the full height glazing. The latter would involve actually keeping the internal blinds open between dusk and dawn when there is no solar gain and when the external temperature is lower than the internal one.

### **4.3 Tacit knowledge and learning practices**

While over half ( $n=58$ ) of the BUS survey respondents ( $n=95$ ) in the case study reported that their previous accommodation had provided comfortable temperatures in the summer, only a quarter ( $n=27$ ) felt the same about their new apartment (Table 9). A significant number of occupants ( $n=26$ ) experienced a severe overheating problem in their apartment compared to their previous accommodation. None of the sample participants had used continuous MEV before and in the Usability survey developed for the study (Baborska-Narozny *et al.*, 2016) half of the participants said they had received no home handover demonstration tour when they first moved in and were not aware of the Home Owner Guide (HUG). Of those that acknowledged

having a HUG, only 15% found it useful. This may be because many of the participants were actually renting their apartments from the original owners, in which case there was no formal provision for another handover demonstration or provision of a HUG. Without either of these, it is highly unlikely that the occupants would be able to use their homes effectively to avoid overheating, given their lack of tacit knowledge in relation to this type of apartment and ventilation system if these were new to them.

These findings are significant because during the interviews 85% of the participants indicated that they used their own tacit knowledge and trial and error procedures as the main means of developing their practices to manage thermal comfort. Trial and error, as described by the occupants, was not a sustained and systematic review of all the options available, but rather a simple 'sensory trigger and feedback' process followed by social learning from other occupants. This social learning included observing others, sharing experiences through a closed Facebook group and participating in the action research available to them via this study. The available means of learning in relation to specific practices (Table 10) shows that some occupants found that effective practices were easy enough to discover through simple trial and error or observation while for many other occupants it was virtually impossible.

### **Learning ventilation practices**

Occupants observing others wedging their front doors open to help cool their homes, associated this with the strong draft experienced when they tested such a practice while entering their own apartment, making this practice for thermal comfort very obvious and easy to learn. At this stage of learning, a persona based analysis (Haines and Mitchel, 2014) highlighting how different occupant personalities work with practices, could help to estimate the likelihood of a particular persona adopting or rejecting such a practice. Indeed, all the participants in the sample were aware of the 'front door wedging' option but only some adopted it, which suggests that it was either an unacceptable option for some or possibly their persona did not naturally engage with this type of trial and error learning.

However the occupant experience in relation to the MEV presented a different picture in terms of learnt practices. Firstly, there was no neighbourly discussion concerning whether ones'

neighbours had their MEV fans switched on or not, other than a Facebook discussion described in the following paragraph. Potential differences in MEV use were not visible to both parties, and in many cases was simply an unknown factor, as discussed earlier. Secondly there was no sensation of air movement when the fans were working, due to their operational low air flow levels, which meant there was no sensory trigger available to provide feedback to occupants in relation to the MEV functioning. Finally, the main sensory trigger linked with the MEV fans being perceived as switched on was often the unwelcome buzzing noise it generated: 23% of BUS respondents indicated this noise as the main reason for turning the MEV system off altogether, negating any interaction or learning. Another visible 'trigger' association in relation to ventilation for some occupants was the need to remove condensation after having a shower. Indeed, according to the BUS survey, the most common practice by occupants was to have their bathroom MEV fan switched on only when showering, showing a clear understanding that these fans removed excess moisture. However, only 9% of the BUS respondents and 10% of the in-depth sample occupants had both the kitchen and bathroom fans working continuously in their apartments throughout the monitoring period, as designed for. It would have required a sustained and focused effort for individual households to test and compare the impact of having the MEV fans 'on' and 'off' in order to discover that keeping them continuously on would help prevent overheating. This link was not made explicit in either the HUG or the MEV guidance so it is hardly surprising that MEV use did not change seasonally as indicated in another paper exploring usability issues of continuous mechanical ventilation (Baborska-Narozny and Stevenson, 2016). About half of the occupants overall therefore remained unaware of an efficient method to prevent overheating, as sensory learning was not helpful and the generic advice to keep the fans on proved insufficient. Similar learning contexts were analysed in relation to trickle windows opening or trickle vents (Table 10). Worryingly, the use of new air conditioning units (AC) for overheating mitigation is well within the sensory learning category, given that people in the UK now have prior experience of using AC in their cars. Cost barriers, both initial and the operational, were mentioned in the BUS comments. However, it was not easy for occupants to trace the operational costs, given the wide variety of electricity tariffs,

energy suppliers and direct debit electricity payments associated with their use of energy. Electricity meters were not accessible to occupants and readings could only be taken intermittently by the facility manager on their behalf. This, together with the lack of smart meters, gave the occupants few tools with which to understand their own energy consumption.

Another challenging learning context was observed in relation to window opening. The occupants were once again provided with contradictory information: explicit written advice by the manufacturer, physically sealed to each window frame prohibited the release of the restrictors; however a social norm developed for opening windows beyond the restrictor width during heatwaves and few occupants actually followed the original advice given. This social norm was further strengthened by the sensory feedback of increased air flow for occupants, and was clearly stronger than the manufacturer's advice. The critical role of sensory learning in adopting a practice is *the level of certainty it brings* – cognitive learning based on advice is only taken into consideration if it is trusted to address the needs of the occupant. In fact, the HUG provided erroneous information, describing the role of trickle vents that were not even installed, giving it low credibility among occupants. Action research provided an opportunity for some occupants to find information perceived as more credible, and they sought advice from the researcher directly. They followed this advice even though it merely suggested the actual deployment of MEV equipment that was already installed in the apartment from the start.

As Tweed notes: *'In post-occupancy or in-use performance evaluation, the most important audience for feedback are the users (occupants, owners, managers) and the designers'* (2015, p.180). This one year study provided an opportunity for the researchers to observe the occupant learning process and to intervene through feedback at a group level (feedback meetings) and an individual level (individual visits). Aggregated feedback on ventilation practices as well as energy consumption with tailored individual advice was given to those participants who showed an explicit interest in the research results and in improving their home use practices. This action- research approach resulted in four occupants starting to use their MEV continuously during the study; including one occupant repairing the MEV fan that had been broken since he had moved in. Once the occupants in apartment No. 9 started to use the MEV on boost and to

leave their balcony doors fixed on trickle ventilation mode while they were away, as advised, they decided their AC unit was no longer necessary as there was no longer a build-up of heat in the apartment. However, practices deployed in apartment No. 9 in summer 2013 meant that these occupants did not use the MEV at all, fearing its high electricity cost. They were unaware that the MEV fan load was only 2W compared to their portable AC unit, which was 800W. This led to them resorting to active cooling with potentially up to 160kWh additional electricity use for just one apartment.

At the end of the study in mid July 2014 four in-depth study participants (apartments Nos.3,5,6,17) took part in closed residents' Facebook group thread focused on overheating. The thread was initiated by a non-participant. The participants used the opportunity to disseminate some of their newly adopted ventilation practises and planned interventions in relation to solar heat gain reduction. Three of them pointed towards the research feedback as the source of 'invaluable' overheating related 'advice and insights'. This reveals a dynamic learning need that the standard guidance did not respond to.

The most successful apartment in the summer 2013 – No. 16 largely avoided overheating through a combination of measures and interventions that either followed or ignored the standard guidance and what's more involved context specific bespoke practices aimed at securing excellent air change rates:

- having the MEV continuously on (as designed)
- leaving windows open on the latch 24/7 regardless of the weather variation (discouraged by labels and HUG)
- wedging the doors open every afternoon during heatwave and placing a tower fan in a wide open window in the living area during heatwave (not mentioned in the guidance).

In terms of using internal shading to prevent overheating, participant interventions were limited to the bedroom where the standard venetian blinds were substituted with heavy blackout curtains. Surprisingly the windows remained unshaded in the living room. The lack of shading in this area was due to the owner occupier's preference for lots of daylight and was compensated

for by their wedging the front door open all afternoon and evening to create cross-ventilation. This degree of flexibility in occupant overheating adaptation in a domestic environment has already been established some time ago by (Dubrul, 1988) but has not been well researched in relation to retrofitted apartments in the UK.

Typically occupants went through three phases of learning in relation to overheating: a trigger response and core learning followed by testing and then embedding results (Figure 8). Trigger responses may be prompted by forward thinking when overheating risk has been identified and, for example, solar gain is prevented by effective use of internal shading or by troubleshooting when overheating is already being experienced. An example of this being when windows and front doors are wedged wide open to cool down an 'oven hot' apartment that was left sealed and unshaded all day. This key learning difference linked with either prevention or mitigation measures seems to be related with occupants' tacit knowledge in relation to overheating, and their understanding of the practices and interventions available to control the thermal environment in their apartment. This area needs further research. Core learning involves individual occupants developing practices and interventions which respond to their individual needs and are perceived as normatively acceptable. Not all the practices are equally visible and easy to understand (Table 10) and they can be learned in different ways through tacit knowledge, sensory learning, individual cognitive learning or social learning. There is a vital role for a clear HUG and other cognitive and social learning options to encourage the preventive and low energy practices that may be difficult to intuitively link with overheating reduction. As the discussion above shows, learning at this stage can be very easily hindered by poor guidance. Having tested a new practice and finding it to be efficient, the next stage of embedding learning would ideally involve disseminating the findings among those who face similar issues. In this case study an opportunity was provided through closed Facebook group activity and also through expert/research feedback (Vlasova & Gram-Hanssen, 2014, p.515).

## Overheating challenge - Learning and Adaptation Process




Figure 8. Overheating challenge – learning and adaptation process.

## 5. Conclusions

This case study evaluated occupant home use practices in a retrofit high-rise UK apartment block and the associated bedroom and living room temperature profiles. Even though the case study apartments were prone to overheating due to poor design decisions in relation to the lack of adequate shading for overly large windows with poor control for ventilation, the findings show that when occupants used the continuous mechanical extract ventilation (MEV) and windows, according to best practice, the overheating was largely avoided. Although the monitored period in the summer of 2013 did not exceed a daily running mean of 18.5°C, there were nevertheless significant overheating issues reported by the occupants. Overheating might typically have been further avoided in the given context by always opening windows when the external temperature is lower than the internal one, and using internal shading during the day to reduce solar gain (Porritt *et al.*, 2012). However, none of the sample households adopted such a scenario, partly because although shading options were there, open windows could not be left unattended and partly because occupants were not aware of best practice. Worryingly, the apartments were not

fitted with any shading at all in the living areas and only with venetian blinds in bedrooms. 25% of the sample occupants did not add any further shading, stating a preference for maintaining the excellent daylight levels, but they did use the shading already provided. This suggests that provision of internal shading to all the windows is desirable despite the conflict between daylight preferences and optimum shading scenarios identified in a field study in another northern European country (Simone et al., 2014). This recommendation is a pragmatic solution, given the exorbitant cost of installing more effective fixed external shading in an apartment block of this type, after the original retrofit.

As hot weather is predicted to become more frequent and severe in the UK, the perceived overheating that is already occurring in a relatively cool summer is a worrying finding. Poor levels of occupant understanding of the means to prevent overheating in their dwellings appear to be linked to apartments that overheat. Some occupants adopted very efficient practices while others clearly failed to, and this deserves further research in order to understand why these discrepancies are occurring. The coolest apartment was paradoxically due to occupants developing a hybrid pattern for mitigating overheating. This included the use of MEV but not the use of shading and thus they needed to compensate for this by introducing cross ventilation via the wedged front doors. This negated fire safety requirements and is clearly an undesirable practice. Nevertheless, the occupants have clearly traded the immediate gain of comfort against safety in this instance, which perhaps illustrates their level of need for increased comfort and also the desirability of providing safe methods for cross ventilation.

The majority of occupants in this study did not experience overheating in their previous accommodation and had no experience of MEV systems. Learning to deploy the MEV to prevent overheating proved to be a particular challenge as this system provides no instantaneous trigger for learning. Sustained trial and error therefore did not take place and as a result only 9% of households had the MEV working continuously as designed for, to mitigate any overheating during the summer. This reveals a clear gap in occupant understanding of MEV. Both the home user guidance and the home demonstration tour failed to provide occupants with the necessary understanding of the ventilation and shading scenarios offered by

the design intentions. The most widespread occupant practices were those that could be easily observed by other occupants in the development (e.g. window opening) as well as those learned through sensory trigger and feedback. The majority of occupants did not discover the best possible overheating mitigation strategies using the technical means available in their apartments when acting independently, but instead relied instead on social media or action-research interventions, suggesting that a collective learning process has a significant potential to improve in terms of energy efficiency the ways in which occupants tackle overheating.

There are clear lessons to be learnt from this study in terms of closing the gap between design intentions and building performance through helping occupants to be able to learn and manage their own ventilation strategies:

- Robust design strategies should respond to different occupant needs and preferences for ventilation and shading, paying particular attention to window design and ventilation systems.
- Home user guidance and home demonstration tours which include adequate and accurate details on appropriate ventilation and shading strategies are vital in retrofit apartment developments to avoid overheating issues.
- Home user guidance should be checked to align with retrofit construction and services as built.
- Occupants need to be made aware of practices that clearly support overheating mitigation to avoid the risk of them installing air conditioning units unnecessarily.
- MEV systems need to be designed to provide a clear trigger response and feedback for occupants so that they know they either are working well, or not working.
- Design intentions need to ergonomically include the ability for occupants to easily learn how to use their homes in relation to robust ventilation and shading strategies to prevent overheating.

- Window and shading design should take into account increasingly adverse weather conditions in order to maintain the ventilation and shading options. In particular conflict between blinds and window opening access should be avoided.
- Collective learning opportunities for housing occupants to understand how to mitigate overheating need to be embedded as part of the management process.

## References

- AECOM (2012a). Investigation into Overheating in Homes; Literature Review. Retrieved from [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)
- AECOM (2012b). Investigation into Overheating in Homes; Analysis of Gaps and Recommendations. Retrieved from [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)
- Arethusa, M.T., Kubota, T., Nugroho, A.M., Antaryama, I.G.N., Ekasiswi, S.N & Uno, T. (2014). A Field Survey of Window-Opening Behavior and Thermal Conditions in Apartments of Surabaya, Indonesia, *Intercultural Understanding*, 4, 17-25.
- Baborska-Narozny, M., Stirling E., & Stevenson, F. (2016). Exploring the Relationship Between a 'Facebook Group' and Face-to-Face Interactions in 'Weak-Tie' Residential Communities, Proceedings of SMSociety 2016, July 2016, London, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2930971.2930989> (will go live within the next few days).
- [Baborska-Narozny, M. and Stevenson, F. \(2016\)](#), Mechanical ventilation in housing: understanding in-use issues, [Engineering Sustainability \(accepted for print 16.06.2016\)](#).
- Beizaee, A., Lomas, K.J., Firth, S.K. (2013). National survey of summertime temperatures and overheating risk in English homes, *Build. Environment*, 65, 1–17.
- BPIE (Building's Performance Institute Europe) (2011) Europe's buildings under a microscope. A country by country review of the energy performance of buildings.
- BPIE (Building's Performance Institute Europe) (2015) Indoor Air Quality, Thermal Comfort and Daylight; Analysis of residential building regulations in eight EU Member States, ISBN: 9789491143106  
[http://bpie.eu/uploads/lib/document/attachment/120/BPIE\\_IndoorAirQualityThermalComfortDaylight\\_2015.pdf](http://bpie.eu/uploads/lib/document/attachment/120/BPIE_IndoorAirQualityThermalComfortDaylight_2015.pdf)
- [Balvers, J., Bogers, R., Jongeneel, R., van Kamp, I., Boerstra, A. and van Dijken, F. \(2012\)](#). Mechanical ventilation in recently built Dutch homes: technical shortcomings, possibilities for improvement, perceived indoor environment and health effects, *Architectural Science Review*, 55(1), 4-14.
- Brown C. and Gorgolewski M. (2015), Understanding the role of inhabitants in innovative mechanical ventilation strategies, *Building Research & Information*, 43:2, 210-221.
- BS EN 15251 (2007), *Indoor environmental input parameters for design and assessment of energy performance of buildings addressing indoor air quality, thermal environment, lighting and acoustics*.
- CIBSE TM37 (2006) *Design for improved solar shading control*. London: The Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers.
- CIBSE Guide A (2015) *Environmental design*. London: The Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers.

- Coutts, A.M., Beringer, J., Tapper, N.J. (2007). Impact of increasing urban density on local climate: Spatial and temporal variations in the surface energy balance in Melbourne, Australia. *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.* 2007;46:477–493.
- European Parliament (2010) Directive 2010/31/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 May 2010 on the energy performance of buildings (recast), Official Journal of the European Union 53:13, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:L:2010:153:TOC>
- DECC (2009) The Government's Standard Assessment Procedure for Energy Rating of Dwellings; SAP2005, BRE, Retrieved from [http://projects.bre.co.uk/sap2005/pdf/SAP2005\\_9-83.pdf](http://projects.bre.co.uk/sap2005/pdf/SAP2005_9-83.pdf)
- D'Ippoliti, D., Michelozzi, P., Marino, C., de'Donato, F., Menne, B., Katsouyanni, K., Kirchmayer, U., Analitis, A., Medina-Ramon, M., Paldy, A., *et al.* (2010). The impact of heat waves on mortality in 9 European cities: Results from the EuroHEAT project. *Environmental Health*, 9
- Glad W. (2012) Housing renovation and energy systems. *Building Research & Information*, 40:3, 274-289.
- Gagliano, A., Nocera, F., Aneli, S. (2016) Thermodynamic analysis of ventilated façades under different wind conditions in summer period, *Energy and Buildings*, 122, 131-139.
- Gram-Hanssen, K. (2013) Efficient technologies or user behaviour, which is the more important when reducing households' energy consumption? *Energy Efficiency*; 6, 447–457.
- Guerra-Santin, O. and Tweed, A.Ch. (2015), In-use monitoring of buildings: An overview and classification of evaluation methods, *Energy and Buildings* 86, 176-189.
- Robinson, D., Haldi, F. (2011) Modelling Occupants' Presence and Behaviour – Part I, *Journal of Building Performance Simulation*, 4(4), 301-302.
- International Energy Agency (IEA) (2006) High-rise Refurbishment; The energy-efficient upgrade of multi-story residences in the European Union, IEA Information Paper, [http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/pw\\_highrise.pdf](http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/pw_highrise.pdf)
- International Planet Protection Congress (IPPC) (2014) *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*, Working Group I contribution to the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (WGI AR5), Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Geneva.
- Janda, K. (2011). Buildings don't use energy: people do. *Architectural Science Review*, 54,15-22.
- Kendrick, Ch., Ogden, R., Wang, X., Bousmaha, B.B. (2012). Thermal mass in new build UK housing: A comparison of structural systems in a future weather scenario, *Energy and Buildings*, 48, 40-49.
- Leaman, A., Stevenson, F., & Bordass, B. (2010). Building evaluation. *Building Research & Information*, 38(5), 564-577.
- Lomas, K.J., & Giridharan, R. (2012). Thermal comfort standards, measured internal temperatures and thermal resilience to climate change of free-running buildings: A case-study of hospital wards, *Buildings and Environment*, 55, 57-72.
- Lomas, K.J. & Kane, T. (2013). Summertime temperatures and thermal comfort in UK homes. *Building Research and Information*, 41(3), 259-280.
- Lowe, D., Ebi, K.L. & Forsberg, B. (2011). Heatwave Early Warning Systems and Adaptation Advice to Reduce Human Health Consequences of Heatwaves, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 8, 4623-4648.
- Mavrogianni, A., Davis, M., Taylor, J., Chalabi, Z., Biddulph, P., Oikonomou, E., Das, P., Jones, B. (2014). The impact of occupancy patterns, occupant-controlled ventilation and shading on indoor overheating risk in domestic environments, *Building and Environment*, 78, 183–198.
- Mavrogianni, A., Taylor, J., Davis, M., Thoua, Z. & Kolm-Murray, J. (2015). Urban social housing resilience to excess summer heat, *Building Research and Information*, 43(3), 316-333.

- Muneer, T. (1987). *Solar radiation modelling for the United Kingdom*, PhD thesis. London: Council for National Academic Awards.
- Muneer, T. (1990). Solar radiation: Further evaluation of the Muneer model. *Building Services Engineering Research and Technology*, 11, 77-78.
- Muneer, T. (2004). *Solar radiation and daylight models*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- National Health Service (NHS) (2015). Heatwave plan for England; Protecting health and reducing harm from severe heat and heatwaves. Retrieved from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/429384/Heatwave\\_Main\\_Plan\\_2015.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/429384/Heatwave_Main_Plan_2015.pdf)
- Nicol, JF. & Humphreys, M.A. (2002). Adaptive thermal comfort and sustainable thermal standards for buildings, *Energy and Buildings*, 34, 563-572.
- Haines, V. & Mitchell, V. (2014). A persona-based approach to domestic energy retrofit, *Building Research and Information*, 42(4), 462-476.
- Nicol F. and Roaf, S.(2005). Post occupancy evaluation and field studies of thermal comfort. *Building Research and Information*, 33(4), 338-46.
- O'Brien, W., & Bennet, I. (2016). Simulation-Based Evaluation of High-Rise Residential Building Thermal Proceedings of ASHRAE Winter Conference, ASHRAE Transactions, 122(1) (preprint).
- Oikonomou, E., Davies, M., Mavrogianni, A., Biddulph, P., Wilkinson, P., & Kolokotroni, M. (2012). Modelling the relative importance of the urban heat island and the thermal quality of dwellings for overheating in London. *Building and Environment*, 57, 223-238. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2012.04.002
- Orme, M., Palmer, J., Irving S. (2003). Control of overheating in well-insulated housing, Faber Maunsell Ltd., Hertfordshire, UK
- Peacock A.D., Jenkins D.P., Kane D. (2010) Investigating the potential of overheating in UK dwellings as a consequence of extant climate change, *Energy Policy*, 38, 3277-3288.
- Porritt, S.M., Cropper, P.C., Shao, L. and Goodier, C.I. (2012). Ranking of interventions to reduce dwelling overheating during heat waves. *Energy and Buildings*, 55, 16-27.
- Raheem, A.A., Issa, R.R., Olbina, S. (2014) Solar transmittance analysis of different types of sunshades in the Florida climate, *Building Simulation*, 7, 3-11.
- SAP 2005: *The Government's Standard Assessment Procedure for Energy Rating of Dwellings*, BRE Garston, Watford WD25 9XX
- Sehizadeh, A., and Ge, H. (2014). Impact of future climate change on the thermal comfort of Canadian housing retrofitted to the PassiveHaus Standard: a case study. Proceedings of Indoor Air 2014, July, Hong Kong.
- Simone, A., Avantaggiato M., de Carli M., Olesen B.W. (2014). [Analyses of passive cooling strategies' effect on overheating in low-energy residential buildings in Danish climate](#). Proceedings of Indoor Air 2014. International Society of Indoor Air Quality and Climate.
- Shove, E., Pantzar M., Watson M. (2012). *The Dynamics of Social Practice; Everyday life and how it changes*, Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Sørensen, K.H. (1996). Learning Technology, Constructing Culture: Socio-technical Change as Social Learning, STS Working Paper No. 18/96, Centre for Technology and Society, Trondheim: University of Trondheim.
- Stevenson, F., Carmona-Andreu, I., Hancock, M. (2013). The usability of control interfaces in low-carbon housing. *Architectural Science Review*. 56(1), 70-82.
- Suárez, M.J., Sanjuan, C., Gutiérrez, A.J., Pistono, J., Blanco, E. (2012) Energy evaluation of an horizontal open joint ventilated façade, *Applied Thermal Engineering* 37, 302-313.
- Tormala, Z.L. (2016). The role of certainty (and uncertainty) in attitudes and persuasion, *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 10, 6-11.

UK Meteorological Office MIDAS land surface stations data (1853–current) British Atmospheric Data Centre (2012) Retrieved from <https://badc.nerc.ac.uk/home/>

Vandentorren, S., Bretin P., Zeghnoun A., Mandereau-Bruno L., Croisier A., C. Cochet, J. Riberon, I. Siberan, B. Declercq, M. Ledrans (2006) August 2003 heat wave in France: risk factors for death of elderly people living at home, *Eur. J. Pub. Health*, 16, 583–591.

Vardoulakis S., Dimitroulopoulou, Ch., Thornes, J., Laid, K., Taylor, J., Myersf, I., Heaviside, C., Mavrogianni A., Shrubsole C., Chalabi Z., Davies M., Wilkinson P. (2015) Impact of climate change on the domestic indoor environment and associated health risks in the UK, *Environment International*, 85, 299-313.

Vlasova, & Gram-Hanssen, K. (2014). Incorporating occupants' everyday practices into domestic retrofits. *Building Research & Information*, 42, 512-524.  
doi:10.1080/09613218.2014.907682

Wall, M., Bülow-Hübe, H. (Eds.) (2001). *Solar protection in buildings*. Report TABK-01/3060, Lund University, Sweden.

Wall, M., Bülow-Hübe, H. (Eds.) (2003). *Solar protection in buildings, Part 2: 2000 – 2002*. Report EBD-R-03/1, Lund University, Sweden.

While, A., & Whitehead, M. (2013). Cities, Urbanisation and Climate Change, *Urban Studies*, 50(7), 1325-1331.

Wittchen, K.B., Johnsen, K., Grau, K. (2004). *BSim user's guide*. Hørsholm: Danish Building Research Institute.

Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and method*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.

---

Zero Carbon Hub (ZCH)(2015) Overheating in Homes; The big picture, Full Report, available at: [www.zerocarbonhub.org](http://www.zerocarbonhub.org)

[1] It was established that this temperature was recorded when the occupant was away for a few days with widows shut and the mechanical ventilation off.

Captions (figures):

Figure 1. Four single aspect apartments per floor accessible from communal communication core. Temperature sensors location indicated (circles).

Figure 2. External temperature and solar radiation for a) July and b) August 2013 retrieved from Bramham MET office weather station.

Figure 3. Percent of occupied hours above 26°C in the bedroom and 28°C in the living room (24<sup>th</sup> July-31<sup>st</sup> August 2013).



Figure 4. Percentage of occupied time when the monitored internal temperatures lie within boundaries set in BS EN 15251 – time span analysed 24 July – 31 August 2013.

Figure 5. Internal temperature during occupied hours: bedroom and living room (24 July-31 August 2013), compared to BSEN 15251 II and III Category limits (Apts. 13 and 16).


Figure 6. Heat gain vs. mean temperatures monitored in each apartment for 24<sup>th</sup> July - 31<sup>st</sup> August 2013.

Figure 7. Correlation of the calculated heat gains per [m<sup>2</sup>] with the monitored temperatures.


Figure 8. Overheating challenge – learning and adaptation process.



# July 2013



# August 2013



**% occupied hours over CIBSE treshold temperatures  
24th July-31st August 2013**






Figure 3. Percent of occupied hours above 26°C in the bedroom and 28°C in the living room (24<sup>th</sup> July-31<sup>st</sup> August 2013).


# BSEN:15251 Thermal Comfort Categories




# Apartment No. 13



# Apartment No. 16








Figure 7. Correlation of calculated heat gains per [m<sup>2</sup>] with the monitored temperatures.

# Overheating challenge - Learning and Adaptation Process


*Triggering learning*

*Core learning*

*Testing and embedding results*

**Troubleshooting**  
(mitigation)

**Seeking solutions to individual needs**



**Forward thinking**  
(prevention)

Table 1. Case study building and participants characteristics.

<b>Case study</b>	Deep retrofit 1950's apartment block
<b>Renovation completion</b>	2011
<b>No. of floors</b>	10
<b>Dwellings</b>	234 dwellings: 1&2 bedroom owned/shared ownership/rented Single aspect: east (1 bedroom) or west facing (mostly 2 bedroom)
<b>Floor to ceiling height [m]</b>	ca.2.2
<b>Apartment floor area [m<sup>2</sup>]</b>	32.2-57.2
<b>Apartment glazing/floor ratio</b>	30-88% in bedrooms 22-44% living/kitchen area
<b>Thermal mass</b>	Low (walls and ceilings clad with gypsum board, acoustic floor clad with wood panels) external wall SIPS panels: $U=0.20 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$ , clad in anthracite panels to the west, otherwise light grey
<b>Fabric U-values*</b>	stairwell wall: brick and block $U=0.25 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$ flat roof: $U=0.2 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$ ; modified bitumen membrane double glazing (trickle vents on the ground floor): $U=1.57^3 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$ (1.71 in SAP) concrete floor slab: $U=0.17 \text{ W/m}^2\text{K}$
<b>Air permeability</b>	designed: $q_{50}=7 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr.m}^2$ achieved: $q_{50}=4.29 - 5.33 \text{ m}^3/\text{hr.m}^2$ (from sample of 4 tests available)
<b>Ventilation system</b>	mechanical extract ventilation (MEV) – extract fans in the open kitchen and bathroom
<b>Energy standards</b>	2006 UK Building Regulations for retrofit; Eco Homes Very Good
<b>Demographics*</b>	66% less than 30 years old 5 occupants less than 18 years 60% two adults households, 40% single adults (inc. 2 single parents)

\*Data from BUS survey that covered the whole population of the building (response rate 44%).

Table 2. The monitored apartments' characteristics.

Apt.	Floor No.	Glazing/Floor ratio [%]		Orient.	No. of occup.	Occupancy*	24th July- 31st August 2013			
		Average heat gains [kWh/m <sup>2</sup> ]					Mean temp. [°C]			
		Bedroom	Living				Bedroom	Living		
<b>1</b>	1	67	44	West	1	partial/regular	27.5	26.0	25.5	25.2
<b>2</b>	1	48	27	East	1	partial/regular	19.9	17.8	23.4	23.9
<b>3</b>	1	48	22	East	1	mostly home/ varied	19.9	15.2	23.4	23.2
<b>4</b>	1	30	34	West	1	partial	12.3	17.3	23.4	23.6
<b>5</b>	3	40	32	West	2	partial	16.7	19.1	23.7	22.9
<b>6</b>	4	88	37	West	2	mostly home/ regular	37.3	21.7	24.5	25
<b>7</b>	6	49	44	East	2	partial/regular	20.8	21.3	24.2	24.6
<b>8</b>	6	40	25	West	2	partial/regular	20.5	15.1	23	23.2
<b>9</b>	8	40	25	West	2	partial/regular	20.5	17.1	22.8	22.9
<b>10</b>	8	40	34	West	2	partial/varied	16.7	18.4	25.4	25.3
<b>11</b>	9	88	37	West	2	partial/regular	37.3	22.0	26.4	25.7
<b>12<sup>a</sup></b>	9	88	37	West	2	partial/regular	37.3	22.0	23.6	24.1
<b>13<sup>a</sup></b>	9	88	37	West	1	partial/regular	34.4	20.6	26.3	27
<b>14</b>	9	40	25	West	2	partial/regular	20.5	15.1	24.7	25.3
<b>15<sup>a</sup></b>	10	40	32	West	2	partial/regular	21.7	20.3	26.6	26.2
<b>16<sup>a</sup></b>	10	53	33	East	2	partial/regular	24.0	20.4	22.5	22.6
<b>17<sup>a</sup></b>	10	40	32	West	1	partial/regular	17.9	21.9	23.9	23.4
<b>18<sup>a</sup></b>	10	40	25	West	1	partial/regular	17.9	15.3	24.5	26.8

\*partial/regular – weekdays ca. 8:30-18 away from home

partial/varied – weekdays away from home daily but not fixed times

mostly home/regular – regular pattern of up to half a day away from home

mostly home/varied - irregular pattern of up to half a day away from home

<sup>a</sup> Apartment selected for in depth analysis

<b>Aim</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Methods used</b>
<b>Evaluation of building related overheating risk</b>	Fabric and systems as designed and as built	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design and construction audit – design and commissioning documents audit verified with on-site visits (mechanical ventilation air flow rate check, thermal imaging, photographic survey)</li> <li>• Interview with the design team (May 2013)</li> <li>• Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) check</li> <li>• Air tightness certificate check</li> <li>• Simple heat gains calculations using weather data from the MIDAS MET Office database</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation of thermal environment achieved</b>	Bedrooms and living rooms temperature monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry bulb temp. monitoring (I-button sensors) for 1 year half an hour readings (24 July 2013 – 24 July 2014)</li> </ul>
	Thermal comfort guidance in BSEN15251 and CIBSE Guide A 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measured temperatures analysis against guidance criteria</li> </ul>
<b>Overheating mitigation practices</b>	Mechanical ventilation system operation Window/doors operation Windows shading operation Home use skills and understanding Constraints like occupancy profile and other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repeated observation and conversations during home visits for one year (ca. 4 days in the case study every 7-8 weeks)</li> <li>• Interview</li> <li>• BUS survey (February 2014)</li> <li>• Usability Survey (January 2014)</li> <li>• Resident's facebook group content analysis</li> </ul>
<b>Overheating practices learning</b>	Tacit knowledge from previous accommodation Home user's guide (HUG) Handover process Collective home use learning opportunities Impact of increased understanding due to participation in research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building Use Studies(BUS) survey extended with bespoke questions</li> <li>• Home User's Guide check</li> <li>• Interview (July 2014)</li> <li>• Facebook group content's analysis</li> <li>• Analysis of change in temperature profile during hot spells in subsequent summers</li> </ul>

Table 3. Aims, focus and research methods applied in the case study presented.

Table 4. Living and bedroom temperatures in occupied hours (24 July-31 August 2013)

Apt.	Living					Bedroom				
	No. of hours with temp. >28°C	% of hours* >28°C	Temperature [°C]			No. of hours with temp. >26°C	% of hours >26°C	Temperature [°C]		
			Min.	Max.	Mean			Min.	Max.	Mean
1	29.5	9.4	19.5	31.5	25.4	86.5	24.0	21.5	29	24.8
2	1.5	0.5	18	31.5	23.7	0	0.0	18	25.5	22.1
3	0	0.0	20	26.5	23.4	0	0.0	20	25.5	22.5
4	0	0.0	21.5	27	23.9	0	0.0	21	25.5	23.2
5	7	2.2	17	29	23.2	1.5	0.4	19.5	26.5	22.9
6	13.5	4.3	22	30	25.1	26.5	7.6	19.5	27.5	23.8
7	5	1.6	20	28.5	24.7	8	2.2	20	27	23.4
8	4	1.3	19	28.5	23.5	7.5	2.1	19	27.5	22.6
9	7.5	2.4	19	31.5	23.3	1.5	0.4	19	26	22.6
10	52	16.6	20	30.5	25.6	108	30.0	20.5	29.5	24.9
11	57.5	18.3	22	33	26.1	138	38.3	22	34.5	25.9
12	25.5	8.1	20.5	31.5	24.4	25.5	7.1	19	29	23.2
13	135.5	43.2	23.5	35	27.6	173.5	49.9	23	30.5	25.8
14	28.5	9.1	21.5	30	25.5	54.5	15.1	20	29	24.3
15	61	19.4	23.5	30	26.5	251.5	72.7	22.5	30	26.3
16	1.5	0.5	18	28	23.0	1.5	0.4	18	26.5	21.6
17	12	3.8	18.5	32.5	23.7	36	10.0	20	28.5	23.6
18	133	42.4	23	33	27.5	76.5	21.3	20	29	24.0

\*Total occupied hours living – 314

7:00-8:30 and 18:00-22:30 weekdays

9:00-22:30 weekends

Outside temp: 0.7 % of hours above 28°C

Grey: Annual overheating time criterion limit exceeded (33 hours for bedroom and 29.5 hours for living room)

Monitoring period analysed: 24 July – 31 August 2013 (39 days)

\*\*Total occupied hours bedroom – 360

22:30-7:00 weekdays

22:30-9:00 weekends

Average monthly temperature for Leeds [°C]				
	(1961-1990)*		2013**	2014**
	mean	warmest		
July	14.8	18.8	17.7	17.3
August	14.5	18.3	16.5	14.5

\*MET Office statistics for Leeds:

\*\* (CEDA,2015)

Table 5. Average monthly temperature for Leeds.

(separate file – landscape orientation)

Table 6. Occupant practices for the selected ninth and tenth (top) floor apartments.

Table 7. Equipment in the dwellings and adequate heat gains included in the heat gain calculations.

<b>Room</b>	<b>Appliances</b>	<b>Operation time / number of cycles per day</b>	<b>Consumed power per hour or cycle</b>
<b>Living/kitchen</b>	TV set	2 hours	50 W – operation
		22 hours	1 W – standby mode
<b>Living/kitchen</b>	Laptop computer	2 hours	30 W
<b>Living/kitchen</b>	Electric hob	1 hour	725 W
<b>Living/kitchen</b>	Fridge (small)	24 hours	30 W
<b>Living/kitchen</b>	Electric kettle	2 cycles	110 Wh
<b>Living/kitchen</b>	Hot water boiler	6 hours	85 W
<b>Living/kitchen</b>	Washing machine + tumble dryer	2 cycles (per week)	5100 Wh
<b>Living/kitchen</b>	Lighting	1 hour	12 W/m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Bedroom</b>	Laptop computer	2 hours	30 W
<b>Bedroom</b>	Lighting	1 hour	12 W/m <sup>2</sup>

Table 8. Properties of glazing and shading systems included in heat gain calculations.

No.	Element	Total solar energy transmittance $g$ [-]	Solar direct transmittance $\tau_e$ [-]	Solar direct reflectance $\rho_e$ [-]	Solar direct absorptance $\alpha_e$ [-]
1.	Clear glazing	0.63	0.56	0.29	0.15
2.	Tinted glazing	0.44	0.38	0.17	0.45

Perceived air temperature in summer							
Accommodation	Too hot				Too cold		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Previous	8%	7%	17%	55%	6%	3%	4.5%
Case study building	24.5%	20%	28%	26%	0%	1.5%	0%

Table 9. Overheating experience previous vs. case study accommodation (extended BUS survey).

(separate file – landscape orientation)

Table 10. Overheating prevention and mitigation practices learning opportunities as identified in the case study.

Learning about...		Overheating prevention & mitigation practices							Understanding of related energy load
		Trickle vents open	Keeping MEV fans 'on' continuously	Opening windows		Blocking front doors open	Shading windows	Additional fans/air conditioning	
Learning through...				Wide	Trickle				
Tacit knowledge	Prior experience	Varies	No experience	'Yes'	Varies	No experience	Varies	'Yes' from commercial setting/ cars	Previous interest in electricity consumption
Sensory learning	Trigger and feedback	Low air flow not evident	Low air flow not evident; evident noise, condensation removal after shower	Air movement not always evident without cross-ventilation	In hot weather effect not evident	Immediate effect (strong draft – cross-ventilation activated)	Visual effect stronger than cutting off solar radiation	If installed immediate cooling effect	Bills based on: Assumptions – feedback delayed Meter readings – high load visible
Individual Cognitive learning	Home User's Guide	Described (installed on Floor 1)	Type specified; no explanation of impact/ need for	No mention					Specification enables finding manuals (online)
	Reading labels, manuals	Not available	Advice to keep 24/7	Prohibited by manufacturer's label; 10cm gap on latch allowed	Not available			Available	Energy load from manufacturer's label
	Testing if practice effective, monitoring	Difficult + (installed on Floor 1 only)	Systematic trial & error would show effect			Immediate effect visible via air temp. measurement	Systematic trial & error would show effect	Immediate effect visible via air temp. measurement	Impossible without techn. knowledge & equipment
Social learning	Home Handover Demo. Tour*	Varied testimonies		Not intended thus not covered	Varied testimonies	Not intended thus not covered			Not covered
	Observing others	Practice hardly visible	Practice invisible	Practice visible	Practice invisible	Practice visible		Practice invisible	n/a
	Closed Facebook group	Repeated discussions on overheating mitigation – quality of peer feedback varies							
	Research feedback	Discussed (50% of the sample came to feedback meetings, 40% asked for advice during home visits)							
	Talking to neighbours	Never recalled							

Learning opportunities enhancing practice adoption:

	Not supportive
	Supportive for some
	Highly supportive for some
	Highly supportive for everyone
	Contradictory message – learning challenge

Apt.	Occupancy (apt. empty weekdays)	Shading		Ventilation							% time overheating (2013)	
		living	bedroom	Mechanical Extract Ventilation		Windows opening		Doors blocked open		Additional fans	living	bedroom
				living	bathroom	living	bedroom	Front	Bedroom			
12	7:00-18:00	Venetian blinds – closed 50% most of the time	Venetian blinds – closed 50% most of the time	On only when frying	On only when showering	All weather balcony doors open on trickle 24/7, wide in the morning and afternoon	Balcony doors open on trickle 24/7, wide in the morning and afternoon	Occasionally in the afternoon	Closed	None	5%	5%
13	Leave: 8:30-9:00 Return: 18:00-19:00	None	Venetian blinds – closed for the night	Off	On	Balcony doors usually locked, open when at home and hot	Usually locked, open when hot in the evening	Never	Closed	None	49%	27%
15	8:30-17:15	Venetian blinds – closed when dark, in hot spells in the afternoon/evening	Venetian blinds – 50% closed 24/7	Off	On only when showering	When hot 10cm gap 24/7	When hot 10cm gap 24/7	Only when cleaning the flat (vacuuming)	Open	None	15%	22%
16	8:15-17:30	None	Black out curtains – closed 24/7 with a gap for openable window	On	On	All weather 10cm gap 24/7, hot spells: when at home open wide 24/7	All weather: open 10cm, hot spells: when at home open wide 24/7	In hot spells most of the time when at home during the day	Open	Tower fan in the living room open window; in hot weather – on when at home (inc. night)	1%	None
17	Leave:9:00 Return: 18:00-18.30	Venetian blinds – 50% closed 24/7	Venetian blinds closed during the night	Off (2013) On boost when away otherwise on trickle, off at night (2014)	Off (2013) On boost when away otherwise on trickle, off at night (2014)	Hot weather balcony doors open on trickle 24/7, wide in the morning and afternoon	Hot weather open on trickle 24/7, 10 cm gap in the morning and afternoon	Hot weather when at home in the afternoon	Open	Tower fan in living area 2.5m away from the window, in hot weather on in the afternoon/evening	2%	3%
18	Leave: 8:30-9:00 Back: 18:00-19:00	None	Venetian blinds - 75% closed 24/7	Off	On only when showering	When hot 10cm gap when at home (2013) When hot 10cm gap 24/7 (2014)	When hot 10cm gap 24/7	In hot spells 5 min when returning home – never unattended	Open	None	43%	12%

Practices evaluation in relation to overheating prevention/mitigation:

	Most ineffective
	Ineffective
	Effective
	Most effective

Table 5. Occupant practices for the selected ninth and tenth (top) floor apartments.