24 April 2017

1

2

5

6

8

q

10

25

**ARTICLE IN PRESS** 

International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment (2017) xxx, xxx-xxx



# Fuzzy decision approach for selection of most suitable construction method of Green Buildings

Sunita Bansal<sup>a,\*</sup>, Srijit Biswas<sup>b</sup>, S.K. Singh<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Uttarakhand Technical University, Dehradun, India <sup>b</sup> Department of Civil Engineering, Manav Rachna International University, Faridabad, India <sup>c</sup> Department of Environmental Engineering, Delhi Technological University, Delhi, India

Received 15 December 2015; accepted 10 February 2017

### 11 Abstract

A big challenge in sustainable projects is selection of appropriate construction method and is considered to be the decisive factor for 12 its success. Many environment friendly prefabricated elements are entering into the market at an increasing pace. This has increased the 13 workload and inquisitiveness of the stakeholders who will need information about their environmental, technical and esthetic aspects. 14 15 The use of prefabrication in sustainable construction is advantageous but appropriate decision criteria and their weightage for applica-16 bility assessments for a project from every stakeholder's perspective is found to be deficient. Decisions to use prefabricated elements are 17 still largely based on anecdotal evidence or cost-based evaluation rather than holistic sustainable performance. But authenticated infor-18 mation is seldom available and suitability within the project requirements is always debatable. Environmental decisions, being closely coupled with society's built-in uncertainties and risks, are uncertain since ecological systems as well as social systems change in the future. 19 20 Thus the selection of a suitable construction method has been perceived as a multi-criteria decision-making problem highly intensive in 21 knowledge with partial information and uncertainty. This knowledge or perception base from the minds of experts has to be collected and processed for a decision. Fuzzy synthetic evaluation method using analytic hierarchy process by Saaty has been adopted to provide 22 23 an analytical tool to evaluate the applicability of prefabricated or on-site construction method.

24 © 2017 The Gulf Organisation for Research and Development. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* Buildings; Cast-in-situ construction; Precast construction environment; Mathematical modeling; Sustainability

#### 28 1. Introduction

With mounting threats of environmental pollution, natural resource depletion and accompanying social problems, sustainable development in construction has become a 31 growing concern (Neama, 2012). Construction of Green 32 Buildings has now become a flagship of Sustainable 33 Development in construction sector and offers an opportu-34 nity to create environmentally responsible and occupant 35 friendly buildings. However, definition, scope and various 36 approaches of Green Buildings compared to conventional 37 buildings is still not well understood. Also, little emphasis 38 has been laid on the importance of selecting more environ-39 ment friendly designs during the project appraisal stage 40

#### http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsbe.2017.02.005

2212-6090/© 2017 The Gulf Organisation for Research and Development. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Please cite this article in press as: Bansal, S. et al. Fuzzy decision approach for selection of most suitable construction method of Green Buildings. International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsbe.2017.02.005

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author at: Department of Civil Engineering, Manav Rachna International University, Faridabad, India.

*E-mail addresses:* sunitabansal.fet@mriu.edu.in, sunitabansal221@ gmail.com (S. Bansal), srijitbiswas@yahoo.com (S. Biswas), sksinghdce@ gmail.com (S.K. Singh).

Peer review under responsibility of The Gulf Organisation for Research and Development.

24 April A

2

41

42

43

44

Notation	
$u_1, u_2,, u_n$ are a set of evaluation factors or criteria $v_1, v_2,, v_m$ are a set of evaluation grades	CM is the construction method $W_{ECO}$ is the Weight vector for economic criteria W is the Weight vector for environmental criteria
Rfuzzy relation matrix from U to V	$W_{ENV}$ is the Weight vector for environmental enterna $W_{SOC}$ is the Weight vector for Social criteria $D_{PC1}$ , $D_{PC2}$ and $D_{PC3}$ are the decision making sets for
$r_{ij}$ is the membership degree $(i = 1, 2,, n;$ j = 1, 2,, m) N is the number of appraisal stakeholders	Precast $D_{CS1}$ , $D_{CS2}$ , $D_{CS3}$ are the decision making sets for Cast in Situ
$x_{ij}$ is the number of the appraisal commissioners W is the weight set	R <sub>PC-ECO</sub> , R <sub>PC-ENV</sub> , R <sub>PC-SOC</sub> are the Fuzzy Relation Sets for Precast construction
$w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n$ weights for evaluation criteria D is called the decision making set	R <sub>CS-ECO</sub> , R <sub>CS-ENV</sub> , R <sub>CS-SOC</sub> are the Fuzzy Relation Sets for Cast in Situ construction

when environmental matters are best incorporated. Project appraisal based on a multi-dimensional approach would need a sustainability model to allow the alternatives to be ranked (Ding, 2008).

45 Conventional on-site construction methods have long 46 been criticized for non-sustainability, low productivity, poor quality and safety records, long construction time, 47 and large quantities of waste in the industry (Abioye, 48 2015; Agamuthu, 2008). Prefabrication is a manufacturing 49 process, taking place at a specialized facility, to form com-50 51 ponent parts of the final installation. Several benefits of applying prefabrication technology in construction are 52 commonly listed as- shortened construction time, lower 53 overall construction cost, improved quality, enhanced 54 durability, better architectural appearance, enhanced occu-55 pational health and safety, material conservation, less con-56 57 struction site waste, less environmental emissions, and reduction of energy and water consumption (Yee and 58 Hon. 2001: Blismas et al., 2006). 59

Pasquire demonstrated that decisions to use precast ele-60 61 ments are still largely based on anecdotal evidence rather than rigorous data, as no formal measurement criteria 62 are available (Blismas et al., 2006). Gluch and Baumann 63 also indicated that holistic and methodical assessments of 64 the precast applicability to a particular project have been 65 found to be deficient, and common methods of evaluation 66 67 simply take material, time, labor and transportation costs into account when comparing various construction 68 methods, without explicit regard for the sustainability, 69 long-term cost or soft issues, such as health and safety of 70 workers, energy consumption, and environmental impacts 71 72 of a project (Gluch and Baumann, 2004). Also, for individ-73 ual building projects, precast technology is not always the only available option, nor is it always better than on-site 74 75 construction method due to various project characteristics and available resources. If not employed appropriately, 76 77 change orders, severe delays in production, erection sched-78 ules, substantial cost overruns, and constructability problems may be encountered in the use of precast concrete 79 systems (Sacks et al., 2004). The selection of appropriate 80

construction method of a project, considered to be a deci-81 sive factor for its success, is perceived as a knowledge prob-82 lem. The construction companies do not have formal 83 systems to collect, process and manage this knowledge held 84 in the minds of the professionals (Murtaza et al., 1993; 85 Ferrada and Serpell, 2014). Ying Chen identified 33 perfor-86 mance criteria based on the sustainable triple bottom line 87 and requirements of different project stakeholders, consist-88 ing of 16 economic criteria, 8 social criteria, and 9 environ-89 mental criteria (Chen et al., 2010). Wei Pan and Andrew 90 Dainty developed 50 criteria grouped under cost, time, 91 quality, health and safety, sustainability, etc. but cost was 92 again ranked most important and sustainability, process 93 and procurement were weighted lower. All of these demon-94 strate that criteria for decisions regarding construction 95 methods are unclear and unrecorded. But considering the 96 relative importance or weightage of each criteria from the 97 perspective of every stakeholder in the decision making 98 process is a difficult task. Thus the selection of a CM 99 among alternative CMs is a multicriteria decision-making 100 problem including both quantitative and qualitative crite-101 ria. In decisions related to environment and social factors, 102 the values of the qualitative criteria are often imprecisely 103 defined for the decision-makers. The conventional 104 approaches to CM selection problem tend to be less effec-105 tive in dealing with the imprecise or vague nature of the lin-106 guistic assessment. Thus we have a mix of both tangibles 107 like cost and time and intangibles relating to subjective 108 ideas and beliefs of the individual and the world of experi-109 ence. So we need to use a coherent theory that can deal 110 with both these worlds of reality without compromising 111 either (Saaty, 1987). The Analytical Hierarchy Process for-112 mulates and analyzes decisions by simplifying a complex 113 multi-criteria decision problem and uses the numerical 114 ratings from the pair-wise comparisons to establish an 115 importance weight for each criterion. The aim of this paper 116 is to solve CM selection problem using approach of fuzzy 117 synthetic evaluation group decision-making (Kahraman 118 et al., 2003). Criteria derived from prior studies have been 119 employed in the model developed to support and automate 120

Please cite this article in press as: Bansal, S. et al. Fuzzy decision approach for selection of most suitable construction method of Green Buildings. International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsbe.2017.02.005

Download English Version:

## https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6659536

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6659536

Daneshyari.com