Student Dorms as Passive Houses

Experience from Germany and Austria







Peter Engelmann







Findings - technical analysis

findings - comfort and user influence





student living data from Germany





student living in Germany – numbers



housing type, data from 2009:

parents	23%
student dorm	12%
sublet	2%
flat sharing	26%
single flat	17%
flat with partner	20%

enrolled in wintersemester 2007/08: 1,818,000 students

215,000 students live in dorms

source: 19te Sozialerhebung des Deutschen Studentenwerks, Berlin, 2010



image: Tomas Riehle



dorms – typical energy consumption?





Data from 28 dorms: electric power consumption correlates with german average ¹⁾:

- single household: 1,790 kWh/cap,yr
- 4- people household: 1,110 kWh/cap,yr (4,440 kWh/yr)
- average Massachusetts²): 7,416 kWh/yr
- average US²: 11,040 kWh/yr

Fraunhofer

1) source: American Water Works Association

water consumption [m³/cap,yr]

dorms – typical water consumption?





 average total water consumption in Germany: 45.6 m³/cap,yr

 US indoor use¹: 82 m³/cap,yr

Fraunhofer

the dorms





"Neue Burse", Wuppertal, Germany







- built in 1977
- two buildings, 600 occupants
- refurbishment 2001 / 2003
- LEH 303 occupants, 8,420 m² (90,632 ft²)
- PH 323 occupants, 8,597 m² (92,537 ft²)







Neue Burse, Wuppertal, Germany





- central mechanical ventilation with heat recovery on every building wing
- space heating by reheating fresh air; radiators in the bathrooms
- Q_H,PHPP: 26 kWh/m²a (8.3 kBtu/ft²)



Molkereistraße, Vienna, Austria





- build as passive house in 2005
- 278 occupants, 8,842 m² (95,174 ft²)
- dorm for exchange students









images: Eduard Hueber



Molkereistraße, Vienna, Austria





decentralized mechanical ventilation units

graph: teamgmi

- air preheating using geothermal energy
- space heating by (mini) radiators near air-intake, thermostat in every room
- Q_H,PHPP: 12 kWh/m²a (3.8 kBtu/ft²)



technical analysis





energy flow - from primary energy to the user







site energy consumption – dorm comparison



Thermal energy

consumption

Electric power

for DHW gets

dominating load.

significantly lower than in other dorms.

consumption equals

Energy consumption

average of others.



energy consumption [kWh/oc,yr]



energy flow – thermal energy consumption



space heating ventilation heat recovery space heating ventilation 19.2 kWh/m²a 27 kWh/m²a 0.1 kWh/m²a heat recovery 19 kWh/m²a space heating 25.6 kWh/m²a space heating 36.3 kWh/m²a space heating rediators 17.1 kWh/m²a site energy site energy 79.8 kWh/m²a 66.5 kWh/m²a DHW 40,8 kWh/m²a ww usage DHW ww usage 43.5 kWh/m²a 40.3 kWh/m²a 35.6 kWh/m²a storage loss circulation loss: storage loss 0,5 kWh/m²a 3.4 kWh/m²a 5.5 kWh/m²a

Molkereistraße, Vienna

reference area: net floor area (NGF according DIN 277)

Neue Burse, Wuppertal

data from 2007, not adjusted to climatic conditions



water consumption

R 🕞 🖬

water consumption as indicator for occupancy

- weekend commuter
- semester break







heating loads Neue Burse, LEH

analyzing heat loads – ambient temperature correlation







heating loads Neue Burse, PH

analyzing heat loads – ambient temperature correlation





comfort and user influence





comfort and user influence window ventilation





Despite mechanical ventilation some users feel a need for window ventilation.



comfort and user influence window ventilation





- Window ventilation depends on personal habits, but is also highly influenced by outdoor conditions.
- Low ambient temperatures significatly reduce window ventilation.





comfort and user influence indoor temperatues

Neue Burse PH, January to March 2005



- mean value of indoor temperature: 22.3°C (72.1°F)
- median ambient temperature: 2.8°C (37°F)
- heating degree hours: 24.6 kKh





comfort and user influence indoor temperatues

Molkereistraße, January to March 2007



- mean value of indoor temperatures 23.3°C (73.4°F)
- median ambient temperature: 6.0°C (42.8°F)
- heating degree hours: 22.8 kKh



comfort and user influence user surveys

plotting satisfaction and importance of different parameters shows potential need for action



- "temperature" is most important.
- "user influence on space heating" is critizised, despite individual thermostat in every room.
- Whereas measurements indicate problems with air humidity, users aren't aware of that.



comfort and user influence user surveys



Question:

"What is your opinion on air quality during the last four weeks?"

Question:

"What do you think about air humidity during the last four weeks?"





comfort and user influence measurements



Measuring the CO_2 concentration in different rooms over 24h: as soon as people are in, fast excess of 1000ppm. Due to low air exchange rates, humidity is most of the time in comfortable range (during heating season).





comfort and user influence measurements



Due to mechanical ventiation, sufficient air exchange rates can be assured.

Air exchange with dry outdoor air causes uncomfortable low humidity indoors.







summary conclusions



Heat demand of DHW dominates the load for thermal energy.

High occupation density and fluctuating occupancy.

Exceeded expected energy consumption due to users' comfort decisions, inadequate user behavior and technical faults.

Errors in operating controls are often not detected





summary conclusions



Missing knowledge about technical features can cause misunderstandings.

High occupant turnover limits "learning effects".

Potential benefit for passivhouse concept: necessity of mechanical ventilation, high internal gains.

Potential for improvement especially in fields of adapted ventilation concepts.



thank you

additional information: www.cse.fraunhofer.org www.bine.info/en (english) www.btga.uni-wuppertal.de (german)

