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Addendum A - SBAT rating tool

SUSTAINABLE BUILDING ASSESSMENT TOOL (SBAT-P)

- Project title: Germinate: Architecture of Growth
- Date: October 2011
- Location: c/o Skietpoort Avenue and Koch Street
- Undertaken by: Author
- Building type: Mixed-use residential

Classification: GOOD

Social 3.7
Economic 3.5
Environmental 2.8
Overall 3.3

Classification: GOOD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicative performance measure</th>
<th>Measured Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO 1</td>
<td>Occupant Comfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 1.1</td>
<td>Daylighting</td>
<td>50 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 1.2</td>
<td>Ventilation</td>
<td>50 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 1.3</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>60 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 1.5</td>
<td>Voids</td>
<td>60 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 2</td>
<td>Indoor Environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 2.1</td>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>60 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 2.2</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>70 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 3</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 3.1</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>70 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 3.2</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>70 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 3.3</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>70 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 3.4</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>80 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 3.5</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>100 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 4</td>
<td>Participation &amp; Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 4.1</td>
<td>Environmental control</td>
<td>50 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 4.3</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>100 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 4.4</td>
<td>Sharing facilities</td>
<td>50 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 5</td>
<td>Education, Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 5.1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>50 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 5.2</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>50 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 5.3</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>100 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 5.4</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>100 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 5.5</td>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>100 1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Performance - Economic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicative performance measure</th>
<th>Measured Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC 1</td>
<td>Local contractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2</td>
<td>Local materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1.1</td>
<td>Local components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1.2</td>
<td>Local materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1.3</td>
<td>Local components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1.4</td>
<td>Local materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1.5</td>
<td>Local materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2.2</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2.3</td>
<td>Space per occupant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2.4</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2.5</td>
<td>Material &amp; Components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3</td>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3.1</td>
<td>Vertical height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3.2</td>
<td>External space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3.3</td>
<td>Internal partition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3.4</td>
<td>Modular planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4</td>
<td>Ongoing costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4.1</td>
<td>Induction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4.2</td>
<td>Consumption &amp; waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4.3</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4.4</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5</td>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5.1</td>
<td>Local need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5.2</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5.3</td>
<td>Building costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5.4</td>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5.5</td>
<td>Existing buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Performance - Environmental**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicative performance measure</th>
<th>Measured Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN 1</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 2</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 3</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 4</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 5</td>
<td>Materials &amp; Components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture - Housing - South Africa - Sustainability - Community**
Addendum B - Horizontal textures

Informal

Formal

Illustrations 2.32-39: Site photos by Author
Circulation is the fundamental informant for the condition of the vertical surfaces. Along routes where pedestrians are expected wide boulevards equipped with street furniture are empty, whilst the informal paths (often the shortest route available) where people do walk are bustling with activity and small stalls selling fruits and sweets.

The informal surfaces include (clockwise direction) loose gravel, old pavers, compressed sand and unkept grass. These surfaces (with the exception of the grass) are most frequently used by pedestrians travelling to and from the station. These surfaces are not maintained and evolve over time.

The formalised surfaces include (clockwise direction) gravel for parking, smaller and larger concrete pavers and asphalt for the roadway. These surfaces are considered formal due to their intentional nature. They are preserved through maintenance and the intention is for them not to change over time.

The formal surfaces are generally not appropriately located and are not therefore not used as intended whilst the informal surfaces are created due to the informal circulation of pedestrians.

Any development, as proposed in this dissertation, should respond appropriately to the nature of the vertical surfaces. Informal areas that experience high levels of traffic could be developed and encouraged through the establishment of appropriate paving surfaces. The quality of the experience as seen from the user on a small scale should also be considered.
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