

BENNETTS ASSOCIATES

Bennetts Associates is committed to enacting ambitious climate action on our projects, and in the industry in general. One way of doing this is by making sure that our external communications reflect our views on key climate change issues within the industry. We are therefore making the below commitments, and welcome all Architects Declare signatories and journal editors to match our commitment.

	What we will do	Why
Energy	Energy targets should only be referred to if they are based on predictive analysis (ideally PHPP/Design for Performance/TM54) and should state in the text or a footnote what methodology was used. This would also apply to statements such as “x% reduction”. If no predictive assessment was undertaken, we will state this.	Most energy claims are based on building regulations compliance calculations (Part L or Section 6) which dramatically underestimate energy consumption, and for many typologies these have almost no correlation with the final energy usage. Whilst planning/building regulations/BREEAM are based on this, referring to these calculations just perpetuates the mistake.
	Where in-use data exists and we have permission to publish, this will be used in place of or in addition to predicted data.	Although we are obviously not in control of how our buildings are used, this is one of the best indicators of the design’s alignment with in-use targets.
Operational Carbon	Similarly to Energy, Operational Carbon assumptions should be based on predictive assessment.	As per “Energy”.
Upfront and Embodied Carbon	Any embodied or upfront carbon claims for a full building should be accompanied by a LETI declaration for the full scope of the project.	Many claims in the media are based on studies of only parts of a building (leading to misleading comparisons). It is also hard for others to assess the veracity of the claims without at least some breakdown of the numbers to check scope, methodology and omissions.
	Any claims in relation to individual building elements or systems should include explanatory text (even as a footnote) and include specific carbon figures alongside any reduction claims.	Claims can often be based on incorrect assumptions, and so any X% that is better than usual should define what assumptions the proposal is based on and what the usual case would be.

“Sustainable” Avoid using this word generically, e.g. “a new highly sustainable workplace”, instead focussing on specific aspects with clear outcomes (or processes). It is impossible to define “sustainable” so using it could allow us to imply a level of performance that is not present. Using more specific aspects also improves the wider discourse and hopefully pushes others to use and evidence their claims.

“Low Carbon” Similarly to “Sustainable” this is not well defined. We will therefore only use it when referencing projects that have met LETI/RIBA targets for upfront or embodied carbon, and only when those claims are outlined properly. See “sustainable”