

## THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

### Edinburgh Research Explorer

# Measured and simulated thermal behaviour in rammed earth houses in a hot-arid climate

#### Citation for published version:

Beckett, C, Cardell-Oliver, R, Ciancio, D & Huebner, C 2017, 'Measured and simulated thermal behaviour in rammed earth houses in a hot-arid climate: Part B: Comfort', *Journal of Building Engineering*, vol. 13, pp. 146-158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2017.07.013

#### **Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

10.1016/j.jobe.2017.07.013

#### Link:

Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

**Document Version:** Peer reviewed version

Published In: Journal of Building Engineering

#### General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

#### Take down policy

The University of Édinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



#### Measured and simulated thermal behaviour in rammed earth houses in a hot-arid climate. Part B: Comfort

C.T.S. Beckett<sup>a</sup>, R. Cardell-Oliver<sup>b,\*</sup>, D. Ciancio<sup>a</sup>, C. Huebner<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>School of Civil, Environmental and Mining Engineering, The University of Western Australia <sup>b</sup>School of Computer Science & Software Engineering, The University of Western Australia <sup>c</sup>Institute for Industrial Data Processing and Communication, University of Applied Sciences Mannheim

#### Abstract

Heating and cooling of residential buildings consumes around ten percent of the world's energy. One approach for reducing these costs is solar passive design using building materials with high thermal mass such as Rammed Earth (RE). Several studies have examined the performance of small RE structures or individual rooms within RE dwellings and have demonstrated the material's capacity to passively provide comfortable internal conditions. However, there is a lack of scientific evidence about the performance of full RE houses in real-world settings spanning several seasons. This research investigated the thermal performance of RE structures prior to occupancy and over the course of an occupied year. Two custom-designed houses were built in the hot-arid city of Kalgoorlie-Boulder, Western Australia: one with traditional solid RE walls and the other with walls with an insulating polystyrene core (iRE). Otherwise the houses were identical in orientation and design.

This study is presented in two Parts. Part A examined the houses' performance without occupants: This Part examines their occupied behaviour in terms of the occupants' thermal comfort. Comfort was examined using qualitative and quantitative data from sensor measurements as well as occupant surveys and simulated results using state-of-the-art assessment software *BERS Pro.* Comfort scores for measured and simulated data were determined using rules built into *BERS Pro*'s engine *Chenath* and a modified version of the ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 55-2010 SET\* method.

Real-world thermal comfort of both houses outperformed their simulated behaviours: occupants reported comfortable conditions throughout Summer (outdoor maxima 45°C) and Winter (minima 1°C) with no artificial cooling and with minimal heating. The *Chenath* and SET<sup>\*</sup> methods agreed with comfort performance in Summer but scored Winter performance poorly. Similarly, simulations predicted poor performance in Winter. Consequently, predicted energy demands due to heating were likely far higher than those needed in reality. This paper therefore argues from measured evidence of RE and iRE houses for the suitability of RE as a sustainable building material able to curb domestic energy demands. Collected data has been made publicly available for future analyses.

*Keywords:* rammed earth, thermal comfort, environmental monitoring, rural housing

June 16, 2017

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author Email address: rachel.cardell-oliver@uwa.edu.au (R. Cardell-Oliver) Preprint submitted to Elsevier

#### 1 Contents

2	1	Intr	oduction	4
3	<b>2</b>	Dat	a Management	6
4		2.1	Virtual Sensors	6
5		2.2	Simulations	7
6	3	The	rmal performance metrics	8
7		3.1	Occupant surveys	8
8		3.2	Thermal comfort $\ldots$	9
9			3.2.1 Chenath assessment $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	10
10			3.2.2 SET* assessment $\ldots$	11
11	4	$\operatorname{Res}$	ults and Discussion	13
12		4.1	Surveys	13
13		4.2	Outdoor temperatures	14
14		4.3	Indoor temperatures	14
15			4.3.1 Summer	16
16			4.3.2 Winter	16
17		4.4	Thermal comfort	19
18			4.4.1 Summer	22
19			4.4.2 Winter	27
20		4.5	Comfort model consequences on energy efficiency	36
21	5	Con	clusions	36

#### 22 1. Introduction

Rammed earth (RE) is a high thermal mass construction method relied upon 23 for millennia to passively provide comfortable living conditions [13]. In RE, 24 soil is compacted into formwork in layers to produce thick, freestanding high 25 density ( $\sim 2000 \text{kg/m}^3$ ) walls. Depending on its quality and grading, soil can be 26 claimed directly from the site, making RE an ideal choice for construction where 27 transportation costs can be prohibitive, as is the case in rural Australia and 28 other communities around the world [5]. However, the global RE industry is at 29 a critical juncture. On the one hand, it has the potential to offer sustainable, 30 low-embodied energy construction and to curb domestic energy demands. On 31 the other, its use is threatened by new and/or inappropriate regulations on its 32 thermal properties and design. One such example are those imposed by the 33 Australian Nationwide House Energy Rating Scheme (NatHERS), which often 34 rates RE thermal performance poorly despite vernacular evidence to the contrary. 35 Recent research has identified shortfalls in these regulations [6–8]. However, more 36 evidence is needed to adapt them to better reflect actual RE thermal performance. 37 As a leader in RE construction (e.g. Ciancio and Beckett [4]), adaptations to 38 Australian regulations will encourage similar changes around the world. 39

In this series, we contrast the unoccupied and occupied thermal behaviour of two houses, one built with traditional solid RE walls (RE) and the other with walls with an insulating polystyrene core (iRE). The houses are hereafter referred to as the "monolithic" and "insulated" houses respectively. The houses were built in Kalgoorlie-Boulder, Western Australia (WA) and designed to optimise passive solar behaviour, making extensive use of thermal mass, optimised ventilation and orientation. Performance prior to occupancy was discussed in Part A of this se-

ries. That paper described the houses' construction and instrumentation, our 47 experimental approach and the strategies used for data collection and manage-48 ment. Unoccupied performance was quantified in terms of thermal stability (the 49 ability to resist large changes in diurnal temperature) and thermal lag (the ability 50 to offset peak temperatures): features important to controlling thermal comfort. 51 Performance in all rooms was measured using a suite of sensors and simulated 52 using NatHERS softare *BERS* Pro (v4.3). We showed that thermal stability and 53 lag were similar in both houses despite differences in their construction: the more 54 costly iRE did not provide a notable benefit in the WA climate. Notably, BERS 55 Pro simulated thermal stability and lag did not match measured values: stability 56 scores were significantly poorer and lags significantly longer in rooms with lower 57 and higher thermal mass envelopes respectively. 58

Part B of this series expands on Part A's findings to examine the houses' oc-59 cupied performance over twelve months. Again, performance was evaluated using 60 measured data and simulated data from BERS Pro. Comfort scores based on the 61 Chenath assessment method (used within BERS Pro) applied to measured data 62 were compared to occupant feedback, obtained through regular surveys, to exam-63 ine *Chenath*'s ability to match reported data and identify causes for discrepan-64 cies. Chenath scores were also contrasted against those from the ANSI/ASHRAE 65 Standard 55-2010 SET<sup>\*</sup> method to examine strengths and weaknesses in the as-66 sessment criteria [1]. Data presented in both Parts of this study have been made 67 publicly available and can be downloaded from http://datascience.ecm.uwa. 68 edu.au:55555/. A timeline describing the unoccupied and occupied analyses 69 covered during this series is given in Table 1. 70

71 (Insert Table 1 somewhere near here)

Table 1: Analysis timeline. MMT: Mean Monthly Temperature (°C)

Year	2014				2015												2016		
Month	S	0	Ν	D	J	F	Μ	А	Μ	J	J	А	S	0	Ν	D	J	F	Μ
Max MMT	24.6	29.3	30.0	32.7	34.9	36.8	29.1	22.4	20.0	19.5	17.3	18.5	23.5	30.9	31.0	32.9	32.8	31.6	27.8
Min MMT	10.4	14.5	15.5	16.8	18.8	20.8	16.7	12.3	8.0	7.2	6.2	7.7	8.2	15.7	16.6	16.8	19.0	18.0	17.1
Period	U	noccupi	ied										Occi	ipied					
Season	U	noccupi	ied									Winter					Summer	r	
Dates	01/09	9/14-30/	/11/14								14/06	6/15-23/	'09/15			21/11	/15-02/	03/16	

#### 72 2. Data Management

This study's experimental programme was explained in detail in Part A of this series. Here, we describe the techniques used to adapt the installed instrumentation to accommodate occupants and the simulation methodology.

#### 76 2.1. Virtual Sensors

The aim of this research is to investigate the thermal behaviour of hybrid 77 RE and iRE houses under real-world conditions. Head-level room temperatures 78 and humidities are key data for the assessment. However, it was not feasible to 79 have sensors hanging at head-level while the houses were occupied. To address 80 this problem, we developed a machine learning algorithm that learned models 81 for accurate, long-range estimation of sensor readings [2]. At any time such 82 "virtual sensors" estimated their readings using those from the permanent sensors 83 mounted in the ceilings and walls. Data gathered during the unoccupied period, 84 discussed in the first Part of this series, was used to train virtual sensors for head 85 level temperature and humidity. Although a simple linear regression appeared to 86 give reasonably correlated results, its fit to extreme temperatures, most notably 87 daily maxima, was poor. For testing periods of 7 to 14 days, in 90% of the cases 88 the error for linear regression models was within 1°C. However, as the testing 89 period increased, the estimation accuracy decreased. On the other hand, virtual 90 sensing was extremely accurate and stable for long periods: for up to 95% of the 91

sensor readings it achieved estimation errors within 0.5°C. "Best", "high" and "low" virtual sensor values were computed for both houses, corresponding to the median, upper and lower quartiles of the prediction model. These virtual sensor observations were used for thermal comfort analyses during the occupied period.

#### 96 2.2. Simulations

A common grievance of occupants of Australian low-energy dwellings is that 97 NatHERS energy assessments fail to accurately capture their use of the structure 98 and so its efficiency [8]. Commentators on the accreditation process claim that 99 the disparity is due to shortfalls in the *Chenath* engine's comfort-rating criteria. 100 Daniel et al. [6, 7, 9], Miller et al. [14] showed that the *Chenath* engine is able 101 to capture the thermal behaviour of unoccupied high thermal mass structures. 102 However, it is less able to model occupant behaviour or comfort interpretation in 103 houses designed to function passively [8]. 104

In this study, house performance was simulated using *BERS Pro* v4.3 (incorporating *Chenath* v3.13, released September 2015) to compare predicted unoccupied and occupied performance to measured data and to identify disparities in any sources of discomfort. Simulations were based on 30-year average annual temperature data (as required by the rating system) and provided a simulated year's worth of data for each condition (i.e. unoccupied or occupied). Wall material thermal properties used in *BERS Pro* are given in Table 2.

(Insert Table 2 somewhere near here)

For unoccupied performance, simulations assumed external doors and windows remained shut and no artificial heating or cooling (including cooking, bathing etc.) was permitted. Occupied simulations assumed normal occupant activity (cooking, bathing, sleeping etc.) and the opportunity to employ artificial heat-

Material/component	Density (dry) $(kg/m^3)$	$\begin{array}{l} {\rm Resistance} \\ {\rm (m^2K/W \ per \ metre)} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} {\rm Capacitance} \\ {\rm (kJ/m^3K)} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \text{R-value} \\ (\text{m}^2\text{K}/\text{W}) \end{array}$
Rammed earth (RE) Extruded polystyrene (EP) Concrete Steel Timber (softwood)	2000 32 2400 N/A N/A	0.80 35.72 0.69 0.02 10.00	$     1940.0 \\     340 \\     2112.0 \\     3900.0 \\     1057.5 $	- - - -
External surface Internal surface Total RE wall Total iRE panel	- - 300mm RE 125mm RE, 50	- - mm EP, 125mm RE	-	0.04 0.12 <b>0.40</b> <b>2.14</b>

Table 2: Material and component thermal properties used in BERS Pro simulations

ing and cooling. The *Chenath* engine simulates cooling hierarchically. First, the
effect of opening windows in that room was calculated. If that was not sufficient,
occupants were assumed to activate forced air movement (e.g. from ceiling fans).
Finally, if neither approach sufficiently reduced perceived temperatures, active
cooling was applied in the model. Unlike cooling, no hierarchy existed for heating; if temperatures dropped below the heating threshold, artificial heating was
applied [12].

#### 124 3. Thermal performance metrics

#### 125 3.1. Occupant surveys

The monolithic house was occupied by a family of five: two adults and three children under the age of ten. The insulated house was occupied by two adults. Both were Aboriginal families who volunteered to take part in the study and who had had no prior contact with the research team. Either family was free to withdraw at any point with no repercussions (i.e. they would not be asked to leave the houses). Both families resided in the houses for the duration of the study, excepting short absences for holidays in Winter. The occupants were surveyed monthlyand asked:

135	• how they would rank the thermal comfort during the day (very poor/poor/normal/excellent);
136	• how they would rank the thermal comfort during the night (as above);
137	• whether they had used the ceiling fans or heaters (and, if so, when);
138	• whether they had experienced any day or set of days that were too hot or
139	cold (and, if so, when);
140	• how many people had occupied the house (normal tenants/moreor fewer),
141	with details;
142	• whether they were happy to continue with the study.

Occupants were surveyed by a local liaison officer, known in the community, to reduce potential bias in their responses. Responses were obtained for the majority of the surveyed months for both houses (some absences in winter). Occupants were not contacted directly by the research team, except if access was needed to repair equipment.

#### 148 3.2. Thermal comfort

Thermal comfort was assessed by 'scoring' each house according to the percentage of time that hourly temperature was within comfortable thresholds. Comfort thresholds were calculated using two methods: the comfort rules used within *BERS Pro* (the *Chenath* engine) as part of the NatHERS rating system; and the ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 55-2010 SET\* method. Scores from both methods were compared to qualitative feedback from the occupants. Hourly contributions to Time Outside Comfort, TOC, were also examined, calculated as the percentage time that a given hour fell outside the comfort boundaries. TOC values were used to identify times in the day most responsible for poor comfort performance for both methods.

#### 159 3.2.1. Chenath assessment

The *Chenath* engine specifies different minimum and maximum permissable temperatures for every hour of the day and rates that hour as either too hot, too cold or within tolerance. The cooling threshold (i.e. the upper comfort limit per hour),  $T_{upper}$ , varies by activity but not by room use and is defined as

$$T_{upper} = T_n + 2.5 + \Delta T \tag{1}$$

where  $T_n$  is the "trigger temperature" based on the psychrometric chart and  $\Delta T$ is an offset accounting for air movement and humidity [3, 11].  $T_n$  changes per location: in Kalgoorlie-Boulder,  $T_n = 26^{\circ}$ C.  $T_n$  also varies depending on activity: if during a sleeping period, defined as 00:00–07:00,  $T_n$  is reduced by 1.5°C [15].  $\Delta T$  is found via

$$\Delta T = \left[1.6 + 6(v - 0.2) - 1.6(v - 0.2)^2\right] + (2.67 - 0.053r) \tag{2}$$

where v is the indoor air speed (which must be between 0.2 and 2m/s) and r is relative humidity in %. The relative humidity reduces or increases acceptable temperatures for r > 50% or r < 50% respectively. A further modification is applied depending on the comfort condition of the previous hour:  $T_{upper}$  is reduced by 2°C if the previous hour exceeded its calculated  $T_{upper}$  [15]. This modifica-

Threshold	Rooms	Times	Temperature limits (°C)
Cooling	All rooms	00:00–07:00 07:00–00:00	$T_{upper} - 1.5^*$ $T_{upper}^*$
Heating	Living rooms	00:00–07:00 07:00–00:00	N/A 20
	Bedrooms	01:00-07:00 07:00-08:00 16:00-00:00	15 18 18

Table 3: Hourly *Chenath* heating and cooling temperature thresholds. \*Reduced by  $2^{\circ}C$  if previous hour was outside comfort limits

tion forces *Chenath* to apply more rigorous cooling (if possible) to rapidly return
conditions to within comfort levels.

The heating threshold (i.e. the lower comfort limit) varies by room use and 176 activity. In living rooms, heating is required if temperature falls below  $T_{lower} =$ 177  $20^{\circ}$ C from 07:00–00:00. Comfort outside of those hours is not considered as the 178 rooms are assumed to be vacant. In bedrooms, heating is required if temperature 179 falls below  $T_{lower} = 15^{\circ}$ C from 01:00–07:00 or  $T_{lower} = 18^{\circ}$ C from 08:00–09:00 180 and 16:00–00:00. Otherwise, bedrooms are assumed to be empty. Unlike cooling, 181 no penalty is applied to  $T_{lower}$  if the previous hour fell below its heating threshold. 182 Hourly *Chenath* heating and cooling thresholds are summarised in Table 3. 183

(Insert Table 3 somewhere near here)

#### 185 3.2.2. $SET^*$ assessment

The SET<sup>\*</sup> method is a simpler alternative to the *Chenath* comfort rules which can easily be applied to any room of a structure. As such, its use can provide insight into what benefits the more complex *Chenath* method provides. SET<sup>\*</sup> uses a thermo-physiological simulation of the human body to define a range of comfortable temperatures according to mean monthly outdoor temperature (MMOT). <sup>191</sup> The input temperature,  $T_{SET^*}$ , is defined as

$$T_{SET^*} = T_i - \Delta T \tag{3}$$

where  $T_i$  is the indoor dry bulb temperature and  $\Delta T$  is as per Eqn 2.  $T_{SET^*}$  is deemed uncomfortable if it falls outside of the comfort limits for its corresponding MMOT. de Dear and Brager [10] suggested an improvement to MMOT, being the "thermal expectation",  $T_{RM}$ , which includes effects of the preceding week of temperatures on perceived comfort:

$$T_{RM} = 0.34T_1 + 0.23T_2 + 0.16T_3 + 0.11T_4 + 0.08T_5 + 0.05T_6 + 0.03T_7$$
(4)

where, for a given day of observation,  $T_j$  (for j = 1 to 7) is the mean temperature 197 (i.e. the average of the day's maxima and minima) for the jth preceding day. 198 For BERS Pro simulations,  $T_{RM}$  was calculated for the first day of each month 199 using 30-year average daily temperature data for Kalgoorlie-Boulder (BoM). This 200 value was used in place of MMOT with the ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 55-2010 201 acceptable operative temperature range chart. Measured outdoor dry bulb tem-202 peratures from April 2015 to April 2016 were used to calculate  $T_{RM}$  for the 203 measured data set. Resulting monthly 80% acceptable minimum and maximum 204 temperatures for both data types are given in Table 4: 80% limits were used 205 rather than the tighter 90% limits to provide as broad a range of potential com-206 fort as possible. Unlike Chenath, SET\* limits are not affected by room type. 207 However, ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 55-2010 assumes standard daytime occupant 208 activities:  $T_{SET^*}$  is not designed to apply to nighttime comfort. 209

Data	Threshold	January	February	March	April	May	June
Measured	Cooling (°C) Heating (°C)	29.9 22.9	29.0 22.0	$30.5 \\ 23.5$	27.6 20.6	26.3 19.3	25.1 18.1
		July	August	September	October	November	December
	Cooling (°C) Heating (°C)	24.8 17.8	$25.8 \\ 18.9$	26.2 19.3	27.8 20.9	29.2 22.2	28.8 21.8
		January	February	March	April	May	June
Simulated	Cooling (°C) Heating (°C)	January 29.9 22.9	February 29.8 22.8	March 28.6 21.7	April 27.2 20.2	May 25.7 18.7	June 26.0 19.0
Simulated	Cooling (°C) Heating (°C)	January 29.9 22.9 July	February 29.8 22.8 August	March 28.6 21.7 September	April 27.2 20.2 October	May 25.7 18.7 November	June 26.0 19.0 December

Table 4: SET\* monthly 80% acceptance cooling and heating thresholds for measured data (2015–2016 hourly temperatures) and *BERS Pro* simulated performance (30-year mean hourly temperatures)

#### 211 4. Results and Discussion

This section assesses the thermal performance of the Kalgoorlie-Boulder rammedearth houses during Summer and Winter. The following questions were addressed:

1. How differently did the houses perform?

216 2. Did the residents perceive the houses to be thermally comfortable or not?

- 3. For how much of the time and when were the houses thermally comfortableaccording to either simulations or measured data?
- 4. What were the sources of differences between the comfort scores and occu-pant feedback?
- 221 4.1. Surveys
- Survey results showed that both houses were comfortable *throughout Summer* and Winter. In Summer, occupants did not use any artificial cooling (e.g. mobile

air conditioning) but did make use of ceiling fans. Artificial heating was used in
both houses in Winter: although fixed heating units were not installed, occupants
were free to use mobile heaters. Both houses were occupied for the entirety of
Summer but were reported vacant for short intervals during Winter; these periods
were not included in comfort analyses. Although not part of the survey, occupants
reported a reduction in their annual energy bills compared to previous homes and
excellent acoustic insulation owing to the houses' thick walls.

#### 231 4.2. Outdoor temperatures

Outdoor hourly temperatures during Summer and Winter are compared in 232 Figure 1. An unpaired Welch Two sample t-test was used to assess differ-233 ences between measured and simulated climate data; all seasons were signif-234 icantly different between measured and simulated values (unpaired p values: 235 Summer = 3.995e - 17; Winter = 5.712e - 04). Simulated outdoor median, lower 236 and upper quartile temperatures were *cooler* than measured values for all sea-237 sons. Temperature ranges were similar for Winter but smaller for Summer. Con-238 sequences of these differences on thermal comfort are discussed in the following 239 sections. 240

#### <sup>241</sup> (Insert Figure 1 somewhere near here)

#### 242 4.3. Indoor temperatures

Hourly temperatures were measured or simulated for each room in both houses throughout Summer and Winter. Here, we predominantly focus on those in the southern bedroom both for brevity and as it was the room with the largest RE or RE/iRE envelope (by metre of wall). Measured and simulated dry bulb temperature in the southern bedroom and outdoors during Summer are shown in Figures 2 to 4. The same results for Winter are shown in Figures 5 to 7.



Figure 1: Boxplots of measured and simulated outdoor hourly temperature in Summer and Winter

#### 249 4.3.1. Summer

Figure 2 shows that internal temperature variation was significantly less than that outside for both houses in Summer. Internal temperature variation was broader for a given hour in the monolithic house than in the insulated (Figure 3). The insulated house had marginally higher temperatures overall, most significantly from 21:00–09:00.

BERS Pro simulated internal temperatures were lower than measured as a consequence of lower outdoor temperatures predicted for the period (Figure 1). Temperature ranges per hour were similar throughout the day in both houses. However, daily temperature variation was larger than for measured values, as were hourly variations (likely due to the houses' poorer simulated thermal stability, covered in Part A of this series). Opposite to measured behaviour, simulated variations were the largest from 10:00–21:00.

<sup>262</sup> (Insert Figure 2 somewhere near here)

<sup>263</sup> (Insert Figure 3 somewhere near here)

<sup>264</sup> (Insert Figure 4 somewhere near here)

265 4.3.2. Winter

As for Summer, Figure 5 shows that internal temperature variations were sig-266 nificantly less than those outdoors in Winter for both houses. However, surveys 267 revealed that occupants used portable heaters on various occasions, demonstrated 268 by sharp temperature spikes in Figure 5. Such spikes did not represent mean air 260 temperature. Rather, heaters were (unintentionally) positioned below ceiling sen-270 sors in some rooms, generating false readings. Severe spikes were removed during 271 data cleaning. Remaining spikes were included in comfort assessments as their 272 presence was useful to indicate heating episodes. Again, internal temperatures 273



Figure 2: Head-level southern bedroom (BS) indoor and outdoor dry bulb temperatures during Summer, compared to *Chenath* and SET<sup>\*</sup> comfort limits



Figure 3: Measured ("best") Summer monolithic and insulated house hourly temperatures in the southern bedroom. Box necks show the 95% confidence interval on the mean (roughly 90 samples per analysed hour). + symbols are outliers



Figure 4: *BersPRO* simulated Summer monolithic and insulated house hourly temperatures in the southern bedroom. Format as per Figure 3

were warmer in the insulated house and temperature ranges per hour were smaller 274 (Figure 6). However, all temperature outliers (the majority positive) occurred for 275 the insulated house, indicating greater random variation (i.e. irregular heating). 276 Simulated results in Figure 7 demonstrate BERS Pro's assumption of near-277 constant heating in Winter: hourly ranges were significantly narrower than mea-278 sured values due to tight heating control. Temperatures were also warmer than 279 measured values. Positive outliers occurred in both houses at every hour, corre-280 sponding to heating episodes enforced by the comfort criteria: this is discussed in 281 more detail in the following sections. As a consequence of heating, temperatures 282 in both houses were highly similar. However, simulated temperature ranges in 283 the insulated house were somewhat broader and warmer from 10:00–16:00. These 284 hours were centred about the diurnal maximum (around 13:00–14:00) and corre-285 sponded to warmer Winter days during the overall period when heating was not 286 applied. Part A demonstrated that the insulated house's thermal stability was 287 marginally worse than the monolithic's, hence its more notable reaction to higher 288 outdoor temperatures. 289

#### 290 (Insert Figure 5 somewhere near here)

<sup>291</sup> (Insert Figure 6 somewhere near here)

<sup>292</sup> (Insert Figure 7 somewhere near here)

#### 293 4.4. Thermal comfort

Thermal comfort scores for both houses using the *Chenath* and SET<sup>\*</sup> methods in Summer and Winter are given in Tables 5 and 6. "Best", "high" and "low" comfort calculations assumed airspeeds of 0.2m/s (minimum value in Eqn 2). An additional "best" calculation was completed at 0.3m/s to examine the effect of higher airspeeds on overall scores.



Figure 5: Head-level southern bedroom (BS) indoor and outdoor dry bulb temperatures during Winter, compared to *Chenath* and SET<sup>\*</sup> comfort limits. Shaded regions denote times when houses were reported unoccupied



Figure 6: Measured Winter ("best") monolithic and insulated house hourly temperatures in the southern bedroom. Format as per Figure 3



Figure 7: BersPRO simulated Winter monolithic and insulated house hourly temperatures in the southern bedroom. Format as per Figure 3

Season	Room	Best		Best	$0.3 \mathrm{m/s}$	High	L	Low		Simu	ilated
		RE	iRE	RE	iRE	RE	iRE	$\mathbf{RE}$	iRE	$\mathbf{RE}$	iRE
Summer	Liv	88	89	96	95	85	84	97	97	84	83
	BE	93	89	98	97	91	87	97	97	92	94
	BS	<b>94</b>	90	98	97	<b>92</b>	88	<b>98</b>	97	<b>94</b>	94
	BW	88	87	96	95	86	84	97	97	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>
	Kit	89	89	96	95	86	85	98	96	91	91
	Average	90	89	97	96	88	85	97	97	91	91
Winter	Liv	44	40	44	40	46	42	40	37	96	96
	BE	79	65	79	65	80	67	<b>74</b>	62	95	97
	BS	77	64	77	64	79	66	<b>74</b>	61	96	97
	BW	<b>84</b>	67	<b>84</b>	67	86	68	77	62	96	97
	Kit	<b>43</b>	41	<b>43</b>	41	<b>45</b>	42	39	38	97	97
	Average	65	55	65	55	67	57	61	52	96	97

Table 5: *Chenath* method thermal comfort scores. "Best", "High" and "Low" are results for different estimation methods. Bold entries show highest scores per analysis. <sup>a</sup>: calculated for airspeed of 0.2m/s. <sup>b</sup>: airspeed of 0.3m/s

<sup>299</sup> (Insert Table 5 somewhere near here)

300 (Insert Table 6 somewhere near here)

#### 301 4.4.1. Summer

#### 302 Measured behaviour

*Chenath* comfort scores were over 80% in all rooms. Scores in the monolithic house were marginally higher than in the insulated for all analyses. At no time did hourly indoor temperatures fall below the heating threshold. Hence, "low" and "high" estimates produced the highest and lowest scores due to the assumption of lower or higher temperatures respectively.

Chenath and SET<sup>\*</sup> TOC results for the southern bedroom ("best" estimation) are shown in Figure 8. Note that Figure 8 shows the percentage time a given hour was uncomfortable for that hour: the total detriment to the comfort score (i.e. 100-score) is the average of the hourly values. Similar analyses were 22

Season	Room	Best RE	iRE	Best RE	$0.3 \mathrm{m/s}$ iRE	High RE	iRE	Low RE	iRE	Simu RE	ilated iRE
Summer	$Liv \\ BE \\ BS \\ BW \\ Kit$	94 94 93 95 93	99 98 98 98 98 99	91 89 87 91 90	98 98 97 98 98	94 94 94 95 94	99 98 98 98 98	89 90 89 90 87	97 97 96 98 98	63 65 60 66 61	63 66 61 67 61
	Average	94	98	89	98	94	98	89	97	63	64
Winter	Liv BE BS BW Kit	15 10 10 14 14	6 6 5 6 6	10 7 7 8 9	5 4 4 5 5	19 12 10 15 17	7 6 6 7 7	9 8 7 9 7	$     \begin{array}{c}       4 \\       4 \\       4 \\       4 \\       4     \end{array} $	51 8 4 8 54	$52 \\ 10 \\ 4 \\ 11 \\ 54$
	Average	13	6	8	4	15	7	8	4	25	26

Table 6: SET\* method thermal comfort scores. Legend as for Table 5

completed for remaining rooms. By the *Chenath* method, 00:00–07:00 was the 312 least comfortable period in all rooms in the insulated house. TOC was higher 313 during that interval due to the lower value of  $T_n$  for sleeping periods in Eqn 1. 314 This was also the least comfortable period in the monolithic house's southern 315 and eastern bedrooms. Given that living rooms and kitchens were likely to be un-316 occupied from 00:00–07:00, specifying "comfort" at these times was misleading; 317 removing restrictions on  $T_n$  when sleeping, as for heating in living rooms, would 318 more accurately reflect their use and improve scores. Notably, TOC results in 319 the monolithic house's western bedroom, living room and kitchen between 15:00-320 23:00 were as high as those for 00:00-07:00. Part A showed that these rooms had 321 poorer thermal stability than the eastern and southern bedrooms due to their 322 orientation and lower thermal mass envelopes respectively. These rooms also ex-323 perienced thermal lags of roughly 1 hour. As such, temperatures in these rooms 324 were higher in the afternoon and evening than in the other bedrooms, exceeding 325 the Chenath waking cooling threshold. However, increasing "best" airspeed im-326

proved comfort scores significantly: an airspeed of 0.3m/s produced similar com-327 fort levels to the "low" estimate due to more-positive values of  $\Delta T$  in Eqn 1. All 328 rooms achieved 100% comfort at 0.6m/s, which could, for example, be provided 329 by a pedestal or ceiling fan. Use of air movement also benefitted from low daily 330 humidities (around 50%); if humidity was higher then higher airspeeds, perhaps 331 outside the fans' range, would have been needed. Chenath scores of 100% could 332 therefore realistically be achieved in all rooms, agreeing with occupant feedback. 333 SET\* Summer comfort scores were higher than *Chenath* scores: over 90% 334 in both houses. Contrary to Chenath, SET\* scores were higher in the insulated 335 house by 4-9%: indeed, scores were close to 100% in the insulated house. This 336 difference was due to marginally higher temperatures in the insulated house, as 337 previously discussed: the majority of uncomfortable hours in both houses were 338 too cold according to the SET\* comfort thresholds. Hence, the "low" estimation 339 method received the lowest score. Similarly, increasing airspeed was detrimental. 340 For the few hours that fell below comfort, 06:00–07:00 was the least comfortable 341 time in all rooms in the monolithic house, corresponding to daily diurnal minima. 342 Discomfort was also high around 16.00 in the living areas, corresponding to those 343 days with high external maximum temperatures (close to  $40^{\circ}$ C) combined with 344 the room's thermal lag, as discussed above. All TOC values were similar in the 345 insulated house according to the SET<sup>\*</sup> thresholds. 346

Overall, both the *Chenath* and SET<sup>\*</sup> gave high comfort scores in Summer, agreeing with occupant feedback. However, as occupants did not report any instances of being too cold, the SET<sup>\*</sup> method was less appropriate despite achieving higher comfort scores in some cases. Specifying separate waking and sleeping comfort criteria in *Chenath* was therefore beneficial for describing Summer performance.



Figure 8: Chenath and SET<sup>\*</sup> measured ("best" estimate) percentage TOC per hour for summer in the southern bedrooms

#### 353 (Insert Figure 8 somewhere near here)

#### 354 Simulated behaviour

BERS Pro hourly humidity values were not available. Therefore, humidity was set to 50% in Eqn 2, removing its contribution to  $\Delta T$ . 50% was representative of 30-year annual average humidity in Kalgoorlie-Boulder (Australian Bureau of Meteorology). An indoor airspeed of 0.2m/s was also assumed.

Chenath comfort scores were >80% for all rooms in both houses in Summer. 359 similar to measured "best" scores. No hourly temperatures fell below the heating 360 threshold. However, it is unclear from temperature values alone whether this was 361 due to the houses' passive performance or infrequent instances of artificial heating, 362 allowed under the BERS Pro comfort hierarchies. Most hours fell within the 363 comfort boundaries: discomfort did not vary significantly between hours for those 364 that did not. Based on measured data, including humidity effects in Eqn 2 would 365 increase the cooling threshold by 1–2°C, almost eliminating discomfort. Without 366 accounting for air humidity, increasing airspeed to 0.6m/s also achieved 100%367 comfort for all rooms. Chenath comfort scores for both houses were therefore 368 notionally 100%: as BERS Pro is built on Chenath, such a result was expected. 360 Both houses received similar SET<sup>\*</sup> scores for BERS Pro data. However, scores 370 up to 30% lower than those for measured values Unlike *Chenath*, no temperatures 371 exceeded the SET<sup>\*</sup> cooling threshold but intermittently fell below the heating 372 threshold, accounting for the lower scores. Peak discomfort occurred between 373 06:00–07:00 in all rooms (e.g. Figure 9 for the southern bedroom), corresponding 374 to outdoor temperature diurnal minima. As uncomfortable hours were deemed 375 too cold, including humidity effects or increasing airspeed *lowered* comfort scores. 376 Given the (sometimes) extreme outdoor temperatures, such a result was unreal-377

istic: as found for measured behaviour, the SET\* method's poorer performance
was due to its high Summer heating threshold.

(Insert Figure 9 somewhere near here)

381 4.4.2. Winter

#### 382 Measured behaviour

Sleeping and living areas scored differently in Winter under *Chenath* as the 383 method applies different heating comfort criteria to each. Overall Winter Chen-384 ath scores were higher in the monolithic house by roughly 10%. The greatest 385 differences were between the bedrooms: monolithic scores were around 80% but 386 insulated scores around 60%. Such a result may be unexpected, given the higher 387 mean hourly temperatures in the insulated house's bedrooms (e.g. Figure 6). 388 However, no hourly temperatures exceeded the cooling threshold. Hence, higher 389 upper quartile temperatures in the monolithic house during sleeping periods pro-390 duced higher scores. Figure 10 shows that the least comfortable hours in the 391 bedrooms were 08:00 and 18:00–00:00 for both houses. Chenath assumes that 392 bedrooms were unoccupied from 09:00 to 16:00, hence no uncomfortable hours 393 occurred during this period. The jump in discomfort at 08:00 was due to the 394 transition to a higher 07:00–08:00 heating threshold. Such a sudden shift in 395 perceived comfort is unlikely: removing it by extending the 00:00–07:00 heating 396 threshold to 08:00 marginally improved overall bedroom comfort scores by 1.5%397 in the insulated house and 3% in the monolithic house. Discomfort prior to 08:00398 was lower due to the lower sleeping period heating threshold. 390

400 (Insert Figure 10 somewhere near here)

401

Chenath Winter scores in the living rooms and kitchens were low in both



Figure 9:  $BERS\ Pro\ Chenath$  and  $\text{SET}^*$  percentage TOC per hour in summer in the southern bedroom



Figure 10: Southern be droom measured TOC ( Chenath and  $\operatorname{SET}^*$  methods, "best" estimate) in Winter

houses: roughly 40%. Again, no hourly temperatures exceeded the cooling thresh-402 old. Hourly TOC in the living rooms is shown in Figure 11: distributions were 403 different to those in the bedrooms, due to the different heating threshold require-404 ments. Living rooms and kitchens were assumed to be unoccupied from 00:00 405 to 07:00: TOC was zero during those times. A single heating threshold of 20°C 406 was applied at 08:00. In the insulated house, all hours 08:00-00:00 were simi-407 larly uncomfortable: occupants did not heat the living room up to the assumed 408 *Chenath* heating threshold. Discomfort marginally dropped in the monolithic 409 house around 14:00, corresponding to outdoor temperature diurnal maxima; as 410 discussed in Part A, the monolithic house, sited to the East of the insulated, 411 marginally benefitted from less shading. 412

413 (Insert Figure 11 somewhere near here)

414 (Insert Table 7 somewhere near here)

SET<sup>\*</sup> Winter comfort scores were poor in both houses: <15% in the mono-415 lithic house and <10% in the insulated. No temperatures in the monolithic house 416 exceeded the cooling threshold. Isolated incidents of temperatures exceeding the 417 cooling threshold occurred in the insulated house due to heating spikes. "Low" 418 estimates and increased airspeeds increased the heating and cooling thresholds 419 and so reduced comfort scores. Hourly TOC was similar throughout the day in 420 all rooms in both houses, shown in Figures 10 and 11. Again, an exception was 421 around 14:00 in the monolithic house's living room, where discomfort marginally 422 reduced due to outdoor diurnal maxima. As for Summer, poor scores stemmed 423 from a heating threshold that was much higher than that adopted by the occu-424 pants. 425

<sup>426</sup> Overall, the *Chenath* method was able to approximate occupant feedback but <sup>427</sup> imposed heating thresholds were too high, leading to lower scores. As for Summer,



Figure 11: Living room measured TOC (Chenath and SET\* methods, "best" estimate) in Winter

specifying different criteria for sleeping and waking times was advantageous, but 428 using rigidly-defined values and heating times was detrimental. This was reflected 429 in scores from the SET<sup>\*</sup> method, whose high heating threshold made it entirely 430 entirely inappropriate for judging Winter comfort, given that occupants did not 431 report any uncomfortable times. To highlight the effect of high heating thresholds 432 on comfort scores, scores corresponding heating thresholds reduced by only 2°C 433 are given in Table 7: Chenath kitchen and living room scores improved by 32%434 in the monolithic house and by 16% in the insulated house, almost matching 435 bedroom scores in both cases, and all  $SET^*$  scores improved by up to 40%. 436

#### 437 Simulated behaviour

All rooms required heating in Winter when simulated using *BERS Pro*, as shown previously in Figure 5. Two separate heating events occurred per day in the bedrooms, coinciding with the start of the two comfort-specified periods (00:00-08:00 and 17:00-23:00). One heating event occurred in the living rooms, starting at 08:00.

Chenath comfort scores were >95% in all rooms. Rapid changes in comfort 443 criteria led to some instances of temperatures falling below the heating thresh-444 old. In the bedroom, sudden TOC peaks occurred at 08:00 and 17:00 (Figure 12). 445 Similarly, a single peak occurred at 08:00 in the living room (Figure 13). Such 446 peaks did not reflect expected occupant comfort; rather, they reflected discon-447 tinuities in *Chenath*'s heating thresholds. Providing a more continuous heating 448 threshold definition would likely remove these instances. Rarely, indoor hourly 449 temperatures exceeded the heating threshold. Such instances occurred when out-450 door peak temperatures exceeded 25°C On these days, heating was not required 451 and the house ran freely. 452

House	Room	Chenath Original (%)	RT (%)	Change (%)	SET <sup>*</sup> Original (%)	RT (%)	Change (%)
Insulated	Liv BE BS BW Kit Average	40 65 64 67 41 55	$55 \\ 65 \\ 64 \\ 67 \\ 56 \\ 62$	$     \begin{array}{r}       16 \\       0 \\       0 \\       0 \\       16 \\       6     \end{array} $	6 6 5 <b>6</b> 6	25 24 23 <b>28</b> 25 25	19 19 18 21 19 19
Monoithic	Liv BE BS BW Kit Average	44 79 77 84 43 65	76 79 77 84 74 78	32 0 0 0 31 13	<b>15</b> 10 10 14 14 13	<b>58</b> 49 46 56 55 53	43 38 36 42 41 40

Table 7: Effect of reducing heating thresholds by  $2^{\circ}C$  on *measured* data *Chenath* and SET<sup>\*</sup> Winter comfort scores. Unaffected rooms shown in *italics*. RT: Reduced Threshold. Other labels as for Table 5

 $SET^*$  comfort scores exceeded 50% in the living rooms and kitchens but 453 largely fell below 10% in the bedrooms. In the bedrooms, almost all hours fell 454 below the heating threshold; neither BERS Pro heating episode was sufficient to 455 elevate temperatures above the SET<sup>\*</sup> heating threshold. In the living rooms and 456 kitchens, a single heating episode was sufficient to elevate temperatures above 457 the SET<sup>\*</sup> heating threshold. However, as discussed in Part A of this series, these 458 rooms' thermal stabilities were poorly captured by BERS Pro. Consequently, 459 temperature rose rapidly at the onset of heating and fell rapidly at its termi-460 nation, so that hourly TOC fell dramatically around 14:00, corresponding to 461 the combined maximum heating effect and outdoor diurnal maxima. Such rapid 462 changes were not representative of those rooms in reality. 463

(Insert Figure 12 somewhere near here)

465 (Insert Figure 13 somewhere near here)



Figure 12: Southern bedroom  $BERS\ Pro\ {\rm TOC}\ (Chenath\ {\rm and}\ {\rm SET}^*\ {\rm methods},\ "best"\ estimate)$  in Winter



Figure 13: Living room BERS Pro TOC (Chenath and SET\* methods) in Winter

#### 466 4.5. Comfort model consequences on energy efficiency

heating takes a lot of energy due to high thermal mass (density and specificheat cap)

Several differences between measured and simulated performance were appar-469 ent. The most critical was BERS Pro's requirement for near-constant heating 470 in Winter. Heating was needed in reality, however rooms were not heated up to 471 the *Chenath* (or SET<sup>\*</sup>) thresholds. Given RE and iRE's high thermal mass (high 472 density and specific heat capacity), additional heating represents a large energy 473 demand. Winter heating demands should therefore have been significantly lower 474 than predicted. Simulations also assumed that artificial cooling was required 475 in the living rooms and kitchens in Summer. In reality, this was not the case 476 as these rooms were significantly more thermally stable (discussed in Part A of 477 this series). Summer cooling energy demands should therefore have been lower 478 (if not zero) for both houses. A consequent quantitative reduction in simulated 479 energy demand cannot be determined; however, the discussion provided above 480 demonstrates that the houses' energy efficiency, predominantly in Winter, was 481 considerably higher than those predicted by BERS Pro. 482

#### 483 5. Conclusions

This series examined the performance of two RE houses in Kalgoorlie-Boulder, Western Australia. The houses were built to optimise passive solar properties and comprised mixes of RE, iRE and lightweight insulated walls. A substantial sensor and logging array was installed in each house to monitor unoccupied and occupied performance. Performance was also simulated using the state-of-the-art thermal modelling software *BERS Pro* v4.3 and assessed qualitatively through monthly occupant surveys. Indoor and outdoor data was gathered over the course of two
years and the cleaned data used in this series has been made freely available for
future research. This paper investigated the houses' thermal performance when
occupied during Summer and Winter.

The houses' performance in Winter was poorly reflected by the *Chenath* and 494 SET<sup>\*</sup> method comfort criteria. Occupants reported that both houses were com-495 fortable in Summer and largely comfortable in Winter, although infrequent heat-496 ing was required. In Summer, *Chenath* and SET<sup>\*</sup> comfort scores largely agreed 497 with occupant perceptions. BERS Pro simulations were also similar to measured 498 performance in Summer. However, Winter scores for measured data were poor 499 and did not reflect occupant feedback. Simulations also demanded artificial heat-500 ing in all rooms throughout Winter. Contrasting the *Chenath* and SET<sup>\*</sup> methods 501 and hourly TOC demonstrated that poor Winter performance was due to high 502 heating thresholds. The effect of reducing heating threshold demands by 2°C, 503 in agreement with occupant behaviour, on perceived comfort was demonstrated: 504 comfort scores improved by up to 40% in some cases. Given that heating consti-505 tutes the greatest energy demand for these houses, *BERS Pro* simulated energy 506 demands were likely far higher than in reality. However, results presented here 507 are for a case study only: as a subjective quantity, we cannot claim that occupant 508 comfort judged here reflects that of all occupants in low-energy homes in this or 509 other climates. 510

#### 511 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Mr Adrian Welke of Troppo Architects for his input throughout the project. We would also like to thank Mr Barron Bonney of the Indigo Mining Services for his help with running initial experiments, on-site technical support and for running occupant surveys. Funding for this project was
from the Australian Research Council (ARC), the Western Australia Department
of Housing Go8-DAAD. Work presented here was conducted under ARC Linkage
Grant LP140100375 and UWiN - Underground Wireless Sensor Networks. This
research was approved by the Human Research Ethics Office of the University of
Western Australia (RA/4/1/7273).

#### 521 References

- 522 [1] ANSI/ASHRAE, 2010. ASHRAE Comfort Standard 55-2010: Thermal environmental con-
- 523 ditions for human occupancy.
- [2] Cardell-Oliver, R., Sarkar, C., 2016. Robust sensor data collection over a long period using
   virtual sensing. In: TSAA 2016: Workshop on Time Series Analytics and Applications. pp.
   1–6.
- [3] Chen, D., 2016. AccuRate and the Chenath engine for residential house energy rating.
  [accessed: 25/01/2017].
- 529 URL https://hstar.com.au/Home/Chenath
- [4] Ciancio, D., Beckett, C. T. S. (Eds.), 10–13 February 2015. Rammed earth construction:
  Cutting edge research on traditional and modern rammed earth. International Conference
  on Rammed Earth Construction. University of Western Australia, CRC Press (The Nether-
- <sup>533</sup> lands), Perth, WA.
- [5] Ciancio, D., Jaquin, P., Walker, P., 2013. Advances on the assessment of soil suitability for
   rammed earth. Construction and Building Materials 42, 40–47.
- [6] Daniel, L., Soebarto, V., Williamson, T., 2012. Evaluating the suitability of the AccuRate
  engine for simulation of massive construction elements. In: Proceedings of the 46th Annual Conference of the Architectural Science Association (ANZAScA). Griffith University,
  Queensland (Australia).
- [7] Daniel, L., Soebarto, V., Williamson, T., 25–28 August 2013. Assessing the simulation capability of the AccuRate engine in modelling massive construction elements. In: Proceedings
  of the 13th International Conference of the International Building Performance Simula-
- tion Association. International Building Performance Simulation Association, Chambery,France.
- [8] Daniel, L., Soebarto, V., Williamson, T., 2015. House energy rating schemes and low energy
   dwellings: The impact of occupant behaviours in australia. Energy and Buildings 88, 34–44.
- 547 [9] Daniel, L., Williamson, T., Soebarto, V., Chen, D., 10–13 April 2014. A study of thermal
- mavericks in Australia. In: Proceedings of the Eighth Windsor Conference: Counting thecost of comfort in a changing world. Network for Comfort and Energy Use in Buildings,
- 550 London, Cumberland Lodge, Windsor, UK, pp. 1–16.
- 551 [10] de Dear, R., Brager, G. S., 1998. Developing an adaptive model of thermal comfort and

- <sup>552</sup> preference. ASHRAE Transactions 104, 145–167.
- [11] Delsante, A., 2005. Is the new generation of building energy rating software up to the task?
   a review of AccuRate. In: Building Australias Future 2005. ABCB, pp. 1–15.
- [12] Isaacs, T., May 2005. Accurate: 2nd generation nationwide house energy rating software.
  Environment Design Guide DES 23, BDP.
- Jaquin, P. A., Augarde, C. E., Gerrard, C. M., 2008. A chronological description of the
  spatial development of rammed earth techniques. International Journal of Architectural
  Heritage: Conservation, Analysis and Restoration 2 (4), 377–400.
- [14] Miller, W., Buys, L., Bell, J., 2012. Performance evaluation of eight contemporary passive
   solar homes in subtropical australia. Building and Environment 56, 57–68.
- 562 [15] Saman, W., Oliphant, M., Mudge, L., Halawa, E., 2008. Study of the effect of temperature
- settings on AccuRate cooling energy requirements and comparison with monitored data.