



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Medina, E. M. & Fu, F. (2021). A New Circular Economy Framework for construction projects. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers: Engineering Sustainability*, 174(6), pp. 304-315. doi: 10.1680/jensu.20.00067

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/25808/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1680/jensu.20.00067>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

A New Circular Economy Framework for construction projects

Eurica Mae Medina¹, Feng Fu² C.Eng, F.ASCE

Abstract

Circular Economy (CE) is a holistic, viable solution to the linear model's 'take-make-dispose' system which enhances economic growth without threatening environmental and social value. Its principles are based on product optimisation, waste elimination, and regeneration of natural systems. In this paper, a pilot study evaluates the feasibility of implementing CE in construction projects, followed by the development of a new framework with strategies to alter current construction activities for greater circularity. To demonstrate the benefits of implementing a CE model, a critical assessment of its impacts in industry was made which considers costing, environmental impacts, and legislative action. A new comprehensive CE framework was developed which details a set of indicators, action plans and resources allocated to assess the performance of the strategy implementation, specifically designed for building cycles. To address the challenge of monitoring progress on the transition towards circularity, quantitative tools using a life cycle approach were developed in this study including an embodied carbon emissions calculator and databases for waste and circularity indexing of common construction materials. The framework, accompanied by these tools, were applied to a construction case study to verify its feasibility in combining scientific and policy making guidelines. Good practice recommendations were also offered, based on the qualitative research undertaken, to further enrich the study.

Author keywords Circular Economy, life cycle, construction project, waste and circularity indexing

¹ Student, School of Mathematics, Computer Science & Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, Northampton Square, London, CIV 0HB, U.K, Email: eurica.medina@city.ac.uk

² Senior Lecturer (Associate Professor), School of Mathematics, Computer Science & Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, Northampton Square, London, CIV 0HB, U.K.(corresponding author). Email: feng.fu.1@city.ac.uk

21 **1. Introduction**

22 Since the emergence of Circular Economics in the late 1970s, the pursuit of responsible and cyclical
23 resource use has been received as a modern solution to tackle unsustainable human activities. Circular
24 Economy (CE) policies seeks to replace the linear economic model, a system whereby value is
25 generated through mass production, consumption, and permanent disposal of resources, into one that is
26 “restorative and regenerative by intention and design” (EMF, 2013). This is achieved through
27 decoupling economic profit from exhaustive consumption of finite resources to alleviate environmental
28 burdens without economic compromise. With systems innovation at its core, CE solutions are most
29 relevant within a product’s life cycle - from conscientious production that reduces use of raw materials,
30 to serving a function that maximises reuse of it and its components and finally closing the systems loop
31 at end of life recovery.

32 Despite this business model’s growing traction in modern policy making, its lacking formal, mutually
33 agreed definition prevents establishing targets crucial to facilitating circular actions (Morseletto, 2020).
34 This poses a significant research gap that must be overcome to ensure industries, particularly the built
35 environment, are better prepared to adopt robust and new-found circularity practices and policies.
36 Though one of the most encompassing definitions within the sustainability science scope defines CE as
37 “a regenerative system in which resource input and waste, emission and energy leakage are minimised
38 by slowing, closing, and narrowing material and energy loops” (Geissodoerfer et al, 2017).

39 Section 1 will introduce Circular Economics as a business model and its applicability to construction.
40 Recurring themes of building cycles, environmental impacts, sustainable development, and value chains
41 helps assert the broader relevance of CE in construction. Section 2 organises research into qualitative
42 and quantitative methodologies. Qualitative research helps locate where circular solutions can be
43 embedded into practice and mobilise uptake of the model whereas quantitative tools developed attempts
44 to measure CE progress from a materials management perspective. Section 3 demonstrates use of these
45 quantitative tools into a case study while substantiating the qualitative findings. Section 4 and 5
46 discusses the case study findings and conclusions observed.

47 The main research outcome is to establish a new framework that outlines implementation strategies
48 across the whole building cycle, to be standardised for construction projects. This is approached by
49 evaluating the solutions offered within a circular model and coordinating where it can potentially
50 manifest along the construction value chain. The study aims to understand the challenges of replacing
51 the linear model and the entrenched policies and practices of traditional construction, allowing
52 discussion of the roles that cultural, market, regulatory and technological factors play in influencing
53 change. Another objective is to develop methods of monitoring/measuring progress of CE transition
54 against the framework. The study aims to contribute to the “need for specific methods to measure CE
55 progress” (Moraga et al, 2019), one which supports the legitimacy of the proposed framework.

56 The Ellen MacArthur foundation (who pioneers the CE concept formulation) distinguishes the
57 biological and technical material flow cycles through the ‘Butterfly diagram’. For a CE, biological
58 cycles focus on the natural recirculation of value within the biosphere whereas technical cycles promote
59 value retention mechanisms such as reuse, repair, and recycle. Circularity is fulfilled if the products
60 within these cycles are sustained at their highest utilities with minimal loss to negative externalities.
61 Scales of implementation are classified into micro (product level), meso (eco-industrial parks) and
62 macro scales (cities). For macro scale implementation, the complexity of the agenda overlaps to the
63 redesigning of entire industrial, infrastructural, cultural, and social systems to achieve the ultimate
64 vision of eco-cities (Ghisellini et al, 2016). Current circular practices, however, are limited to micro
65 scale intervention strategies (e.g. promoting sustainable product design) while meso-macro scales of
66 implementation remain vastly unexplored and inadequately managed (Levoso et al, 2020).

67 Circularity is highly applicable to the issues faced by the construction industry today. The industry is
68 regarded as the largest consumers of materials globally (WEF, 2016) and largest producers of waste-
69 with 66.2 million tonnes of construction and demolition waste generated in the UK in 2016 (Defra,
70 2020). These profound figures reveal material and energy inefficiency and poor waste management as
71 the root causes of unsustainable linear activities.

72 For the built environment, a shift towards circularity will provide resilient infrastructure and
73 communities against the topical issues of urban population growth, resource constraints and the climate
74 crisis (Toyne, 2016). The dilemma of material productivity, which concerns 50% of the current resource
75 challenge for construction, remains ever prevalent in the structural waste present in construction,
76 operation, and end of life phases. Though the CE model is garnering acceptance in academia as a
77 coherent strategy that responds to the resource challenge, the direction and change in practice remain
78 insufficient for fear of industrial disruption.

79 To initiate the shift away from linearity and foster circular growth, significant contribution to
80 completing the CE concept formulation is essential in preventing “divergent approaches within the field
81 from hampering progress” (Kalmykova et al, 2018). The urgency for reformation stems from the notion
82 that current anthropogenic impacts cannot be sustained without irreversible climate consequences, and
83 that academics, governments and economic actors must advocate for a new economic structure to bridge
84 prosperity across all dimensions of sustainability.

85 The following survey explores the initiatives available today designed to initiate transition towards
86 circular construction as well as the limitations anticipated with replacing conventional, linear practice.
87 The purpose of this qualitative survey is to contribute towards the development of the conceptual
88 framework later introduced in Section 3.

89 *Production*

90 Acknowledging that design phases and production processes impacts sourcing, resource use and waste
91 generation proves that the most significant opportunity to commit to circular construction practice exists
92 right from the beginning (Foster15). The growing emphasis for project optimising strategies therefore
93 recognises the importance of material flow and life cycles as being state-of-the-art analyses in studying
94 circularity (Ghisellini et al, 2016). By identifying practical value retention schemes for production
95 processes and proactively implementing these changes, the impacts down supply chains and consumers
96 are better managed. Sustainable supply chain management presents great opportunities for circular
97 ingenuity for management of material, information, capital flows and cooperation amongst companies-
98 forming robust foundations for a CE (Seuring et al, 2008).

99 Other initiatives being developed to promote circularity in production processes include modular
100 design, material passports and building for disassembly (material stocks). These emerging concepts,
101 however, face challenges with policies and practice integration. For example, modular construction
102 prefabricates building components and transports onsite for assembly and installation. Advantages
103 include 50% reduced costs, improved productivity, time efficiency, less site-labour intensive,
104 guaranteed quality control and reduced pollution (Kyrö et al, 2019; Mignacca et al, 2020; Munaro et al,
105 2020). Despite environmental and economic benefits, attitudinal, technical, financial, process, policy,
106 and aesthetic concerns from various stakeholders continues to withhold the industry from investing in
107 circular solutions such as this (Wuni et al, 2020). Material Passports (MP) is another example that
108 enables the perception of buildings as material banks. Utilising MP, an inventory for recycling potential
109 and environmental performances of materials, can serve as a powerful optimisation tool for improving
110 present use, recyclability, and adaptable reuse of buildings (Honic et al, 2019).

111 *Consumption/Operation*

112 CE redefines the concept of ownership to be replaced with sharing platforms schemes, consumption of
113 services instead of products, virtualisation, and the development of a collaborative economy (COM,
114 2015). A legislative example that encourages this is Green Public Procurement (GPP). This initiative
115 takes advantage of the purchasing power from public authorities faced with an ever-increasing moral
116 obligation to choose socially, ethically, and environmentally friendly goods, services and works
117 (Sönnichsen et al, 2020). This incentivises governments and authorities to fund sustainable
118 infrastructure projects with GPP in mind, thus setting standards founded under circular principles.

119 Some studies though, argue unsatisfactory public engagement with circular consumerism. Sharing
120 platforms, leasing, and purchasing remanufactured goods have unpopular consumer acceptance due to
121 poor awareness of circular programs, concerns of exploitation through sharing platforms and quality
122 issues of remanufactured products (Kuah et al, 2020). These responses to circular consumerism stress
123 the bigger dilemma of cultural and financial barriers. In the social, behavioural, and managerial context,
124 cultural barriers prevalent in construction include lack of interest and engagement across the value chain
125 and lack of collaboration between businesses (Hart et al, 2019).

126 *Waste Management*

127 The transformation away from a linear economy requires prioritising waste prevention as having the
128 best environmental outcome under the waste management hierarchy. Construction waste management
129 faces obstacles for site-level implementation for fear of programme delays and being a low priority
130 project objective (Bakchan et al, 2019). Still, progress made with monitoring waste operations like
131 recovery and recycling rates, incineration, and landfill has contributed to the Waste Framework
132 Directive (Pires et al, 2019). The European Commission Directives for waste plays a key role in
133 encouraging responsible waste collection, transport, disposal, and treatment while enforcing incentives
134 for compliance or penalties (e.g. polluter pays and carbon constraints).

135 *Recovery/Circularity*

136 To better capture the fundamentals of circularity that promotes material optimisation, lifespan extension
137 and useful end of life routes, a R0-R9 framework was studied to help develop the recovery criteria of
138 the framework. The R0-R9 offers a hierarchy for recovery strategies that expands on the usual 3R's
139 rubric: reduce, reuse, and recycle (developed by Potting et al, 2017). The hierarchy aligns with the
140 principle of cascading (a notion derived from CE fundamentals) which is understood to be consecutive
141 resource circulation that contribute towards higher resource efficiency (Campbell-Johnston et al, 2020).

142


143 From the survey, despite possessing the scientific and technological developments that offer solutions
144 for circular construction practices, there are still weaknesses in its feasibility. Owing to prominent
145 barriers hampering the effectiveness of implementation and the lack of supporting policies, it proves
146 “public attitude and behaviour determine the extent to which policies are effective” (EASAC, 2016).
147 Currently, there is no unified CE framework for engineers to use in the construction market. Therefore,
148 this paper is to establish a new framework that collates and organises feasible circular solutions to be
149 implemented across various points in the building cycle.

150 **2. Methodology**

151 ***2.1 Framework development***

152 The objective of this study is to propose a new framework for CE implementation for construction
153 (Figure 1). Through policy analysis, a unified assessment framework was developed which translates
154 sustainability science research into legislation designed to implement and measure progress towards
155 circularity (Turnheim et al, 2020; Momete, 2020). This study, which initially explored emerging
156 circular and sustainability strategies, now sees it organised into five phases of the construction process
157 acting as key intervention points (Production, Consumption/Operation, Waste Management,
158 Recovery/Circularity, and Innovation). Under these intervention points, strategies and policies that are
159 most impactful in delivering circular change are proposed (e.g. promoting modular design during
160 production stage).

Figure 1: Circular Economy Framework for construction developed in this study



162 ***2.2 Developing quantitative tools with a life cycle approach***

163 Transparent and accurate scientific study of the environmental and economic performances of products
164 and services across the value chain and service lives can be performed through life cycle assessments
165 and costing (LCA and LCC) (Boer et al, 2020). While both serve as modern cost management tools,
166 LCA are concerned with the environmental impacts of processes and products (e.g. emissions activity
167 during the product/service lives) whereas LCC accounts for expenses during the product/service lives
168 (Atia et al, 2020; Honic et al, 2019). Quantitative tools proposed in this study use LCA and LCC for:

- 169 • Quantifying embodied carbon emissions of construction at production and manufacturing stage
- 170 • Cost estimations for processes of acquiring raw materials to its construction.
- 171 • Scoring waste impacts of various end of life routes and how this can indicate transition towards
172 circularity for modern waste management.
- 173 • Scoring circularity potential of construction materials to measure implementation progress at
174 micro level and across the material's life cycle.

175 ***2.3 Embodied carbon calculator***

176 Embodied carbon (EC) is the emissions footprint from extracting, manufacturing, and transporting
177 building materials onto site. Unlike operational carbon (the carbon load used to heat, power, and
178 maintain buildings), EC is still yet to be formally regulated within building standards. Recent advances
179 have prioritised the reduction of operational carbon through energy efficient and intelligent building
180 design as well as schemes to decarbonise the energy grid but EC remains a major contributor to building
181 emissions and currently accounts for 11% of all global GHG emissions (UN, 2017). Hence, EC becomes
182 a necessary metric for measurement to facilitate better management of emissions in projects.

183 A register for raw materials and their associated carbon and energy load is an effective approach to
184 quantifying environmental impacts of production processes, a boundary referred as cradle-gate. This
185 study developed an EC calculator on Excel for common materials which sourced EC values from the
186 Inventory of Carbon and Energy Database (Jones et al, 2019). The computation requires inputting
187 material volumes used in construction which is multiplied with the material density and its

188 corresponding EC value (tCO₂e/tonne) to calculate total EC emissions (tCO₂e). This analysis is valid
189 in measuring circularity progress because it uses raw material parameters. Thus, materials with lower
190 EC tend to implement circularity better due to reduced virgin feedstock use (Giama et al, 2020).


191 This calculator tool can also be purposed to simulate emissions count for circular-alternative designs,
192 thus allowing comparisons of environmental impacts of the baseline (the client's initial specimen
193 design) and a circular-alternative (to be proposed during conceptual design). Therefore, potential
194 savings of materials, emissions, and feasibility assessments of adaptive designs that instead, tends
195 towards sustainable and circular practices, can be examined. Designers must undertake these obligations
196 to attract clients towards more green, economic, and valued engineering options.

197 ***2.4 Waste indexing calculator***

198 A database for indexing circular output flows against waste lost to negative externalities was developed
199 in this study and applied to a catalogue of common construction materials. Since large waste operations
200 are associated with construction, this indexing tool presents an opportunity to measure progress of the
201 industry's implementation of the circular principle of eliminating waste. It achieves this by calculating
202 the ratio of components recirculated at end-of-life against components linearly disposed for all
203 construction materials in the database (Figure 2). The higher the calculated waste index value for a
204 material, the better its end-of-life routes implements circularity since its rate of circular output flows is
205 higher than linear disposal flows. If more materials used in construction can progress towards obtaining
206 higher waste indexes, it suggests that the industry is also progressing towards implementing practices
207 that dissociates from the linear waste concept and its conventional disposal routes. Material end-of-life
208 data was collected from numerous Environmental Product Declaration (EPDs) forms which separates
209 linear end-of-life waste routes from end-of-life routes in favour of circularity.

210

Figure 2: Flowchart on computing material waste index



211

212 **2.5 Material circularity indexing calculator**

213 A database for circularity indexing was developed to indicate how well materials implement circularity
 214 across their life cycles. This method explores the notion of inherent circularity (first introduced by
 215 Saidani et al, 2019) which is a measure of the proportion of recirculated material within a product.
 216 The database was formed using materials information collected from EPDs and materials database from
 217 CES software. All data covered in the index formulation include renewable primary energy (MJ), non-
 218 renewable primary energy (MJ), secondary material (kg) and suitability to end-of-life routes of reuse,
 219 upcycling, downcycling, incineration with energy recovery, landfill, and biodegradability. This study’s
 220 proposed circularity index credits each operation with a +1 if the contribution to CE is positive and -1
 221 if not. This crediting system is summarised in Table 1. Equation 1 presents the formula developed in
 222 this study to calculate circularity index.

223 **Table 1: Crediting system summary for circularity index formula developed in this study**

Criteria for positive circular credit (+1)	Criteria for negative circular credit (-1)
Higher use of renewable primary energy compared to non-renewable primary energy (RPE)	Higher use of non-renewable primary energy compared to renewable primary energy (NPE)
Reuse of secondary material (SM)	Incineration with energy recovery (IwE)
Reusable (R)	Landfill (L)
Upcycling (UC)	
Downcycling (DC)	
Biodegradable (B)	

$$Circularity\ index = \left[\frac{(RPE + SM + R + UC + DC + B) + (NPE + IwE + L)}{No.\ of\ operations\ covered} \right]$$

224


Equation 1: Formula developed in this study to calculate circularity index

225 **3. Case study**

226 To study the feasibility of the proposed new framework in a real construction project, a case study is
 227 applied against it.

228 **3.1 Lambeth Bridge, London**

229 The pilot case study is on the Lambeth Bridge, spanning 236.5m, with steel arches and piers and
 230 abutments of reinforced concrete. Bridge design was selected for exploration as it represents large scale
 231 infrastructure projects of long design lives, long economic investments, high material tonnages, high
 232 emissions and waste operation impacts, high reuse and recycling potential and finally, high demands
 233 for collaborative engagements from diverse stakeholders. The new framework was implemented in this
 234 case study at a reduced scale as specified in Figure 3. Criteria selected for the case study application
 235 involves quantification of EC emissions, costing analysis with a R0-R9 framework, waste and
 236 circularity indexing and further recommendations for innovation.



237 **Figure 3: Proposed framework to be implemented in case study**

238 The structural drawings of the existing bridge dating back from 1930s were accessed from the London
 239 Metropolitan Archives. The bridge design was analysed by manually extracting dimensions and
 240 materials information from general arrangement and section drawings. Cross-sectional areas of the
 241 bridge components (e.g. deck, piers, abutments) were measured and multiplied with its width to obtain
 242 volumes and materials were determined through the drawing's annotations. Table 2 provides a volumes
 243 summary for each bridge component and the materials used.

Table 2: Summary of material volumes from structural drawings

Bridge component	Material information	Material volume (m³)
Bridge deck	Reinforced concrete deck	1700
	Asphalt road base	318.6
Pier 1	Reinforced concrete	1019
	Granite	16.2
Pier 1 foundation	Steel caisson	13.5
	Concrete	931.5
Pier 2	Reinforced concrete	1486
	Granite	16.2
Pier 2 foundation	Steel caisson	13.5
	Concrete	931.5
Pier 3	Reinforced concrete	1486
	Granite	16.2
Pier 3 foundation	Steel caisson	13.5
	Concrete	931.5
Pier 4	Reinforced concrete	1019
	Granite	16.2
Pier 4 foundation	Steel caisson	13.5
	Concrete	931.5
West abutment	Reinforced concrete	3898
	Sheet piles	6.12
	Granite	7.4
East abutment	Reinforced concrete	4845
	Sheet piles	5.4
	Granite	6.2
Steel arches	Steel sections	2034

245

246

Equation 2: Example calculation for composite concrete deck slab for bridge deck

247

Dimensions: length = 236m; width = 18m; depth = 0.4m (measured from section drawings)

248

Total volume of reinforced concrete used for constructing bridge deck = length × width × depth

249

$$\text{Concrete deck slab volume} = 236 \times 18 \times 0.4 = 1700\text{m}^3$$

250 **3.2 Baseline and circular embodied carbon results**

251 Baseline EC emissions of the case study were measured using the calculator. Material tonnage is
 252 calculated then multiplied with its corresponding EC value (sourced from the Inventory of Carbon and
 253 Energy Database) to generate a total emissions count. Table 3 summarises the baseline EC emissions
 254 from the case study. A similar method was followed for the circular scenario that instead uses low
 255 carbon alternatives. Table 4 details the materials substitution and projected emissions.

256 **Table 3: Baseline embodied carbon emissions for a cradle-gate LCA boundary**

Material	Volume (m ³)	Density (tonne/m ³)	Embodied carbon per unit (tCO ₂ e/tonne)	Embodied carbon emission (tCO ₂ e)
Concrete (CEM I)	19,179	2.4	0.161	7,410.8
Steel	2,099.5	7.7	1.27	20,531.0
Granite	78.4	2.7	0.70	148.2
Asphalt (4.5% binder)	318.6	1.7	0.00532	2.9
Total baseline embodied carbon emissions, tCO₂e				28,093

257

258 **Equation 3: Example calculation for total EC emissions from CEM I (RC 35/45) concrete**

259 $EC\ emissions = Volume \times Density \times EC\ value$ $EC\ emissions = 19,179 \times 2.4 \times 0.161 = 7,410.8\ tCO_2e$

260 **Table 4: Projections of circular-alternative embodied carbon emissions**

Material	Volume (m ³)	Density (tonne/m ³)	Embodied carbon per unit (tCO ₂ e/tonne)	Embodied carbon emission (tCO ₂ e)
Concrete (25% GGBS replacement)	19,179	2.4	0.129	5,937.8
Steel	2,099.5	7.7	1.27	20,531.0
Granite replacement	78.4	2.7	0.09	19.1
Asphalt (3% binder)	318.6	1.7	0.00501	2.7
Total circular embodied carbon emissions, tCO₂e				26,490.6

261

262 **Equation 4: Example calculation for total EC emissions from 25% GGBS (RC 35/45) concrete**

263 $EC\ emissions = Volume \times Density \times EC\ value$ $EC\ emissions = 19179 \times 2.4 \times 0.129 = 5,937.8\ tCO_2e$

3.3 Baseline and circular cost analysis outputs

Baseline costing was computed by multiplying material volumes with unit cost (sourced from CES materials database) to obtain the actual cost in GBP (Table 5). The same approach was completed for the circular scenario costing, but the rates were sourced for material substitutes with greater recycled/replacement content. Table 6 details costing for alternative materials.

Table 5: Baseline costing through material substitution

Material	Volume (m ³)	Cost per unit (£/m ³)	Cost (£)
Concrete (CEM I)	1,9179	66.8	1,281,157.2
Steel	2,099.5	1,598	3,355,001
Granite	78.4	1,080	84,672
Asphalt	318.6	33.4	10,641.24
TOTAL COST, £			4,731,471.44

Equation 5: Example costing for total EC emissions from CEM I (RC 35/45) concrete

$$\text{GBP value} = \text{Volume} \times \text{Unit material cost} \quad \text{GBP value} = 19,179 \times 66.8 = 1,281,157.2 \text{ GBP}$$

Table 6: Circular-alternative costing

Material	Volume (m ³)	Cost per unit (£/m ³)	Cost (£)
Concrete (30% GGBS replacement)	1,9179	38.42	736,857.2
Steel	2,099.5	Average scrap steel price per tonnage was used (£130/tonne)	2,101,599
Replace granite for limestone	78.4	1,080	84672
Asphalt	318.6	33.4	10,641.24
TOTAL COST, £			2,933,770

Equation 6: Example costing for total EC emissions from 25% GGBS (RC 35/45) concrete


$$\text{GBP value} = \text{Volume} \times \text{Unit material cost} \quad \text{GBP value} = 1,9179 \times 38.42 = 736,857.2 \text{ GBP}$$

278 **4. Discussion of case study results**

279 The results of the case study will be explored in this section.

280 ***4.1 Embodied Carbon saving through the framework***

281 An environmental impacts assessment of the case study was completed with the implementation of the
282 framework’s production criteria of ‘Quantifying Embodied Carbon’. Comparison of the case study’s
283 baseline and circular emissions proves that implementing circularity in construction offers opportunities
284 for carbon savings and data obtained from this quantitative tool demonstrates this (see Figure 4).



285 **Figure 4: Summary of Embodied Carbon emissions for baseline and circular scenarios**


286 The case study’s baseline EC emissions totalled to 28,093 tCO2e. Measuring EC footprints of existing
287 infrastructure captures the prerequisite of improving data collection of quantified environmental
288 impacts and monitoring which buildings/infrastructure are accountable for the greatest impacts. This
289 assessment allows designers to understand which factors (e.g. material type, material tonnage, material
290 properties) contribute most to increasing emissions footprint, and how this can be pre-empted by
291 considering substitutes. The proposed circular-alternative design was calculated to emit 26,490 tCO2e
292 which offers emissions savings of 1,603 tCO2e or a 6% reduction from the baseline.

293 Although the percentage savings can be criticised as insignificant, it is noted there were no EC value
294 representative of recycled steel so the baseline values were reused. Virgin steel is responsible for
295 significant emissions and the lack of EC value data for low-carbon steel withheld the circular scenario

296 from obtaining higher carbon savings. For concrete, there was a 20% reduction in EC emissions by
297 substituting CEM I concrete with 25% GGBS replacement. Production of Portland clinker is estimated
298 to be responsible for 50% of CO₂ emitted by the cement sector. Nevertheless, any net reductions of EC
299 emissions is an encouraged step and deserving of commendation for implementing circularity to reduce
300 environmental impacts.

301 ***4.2 Material Consumption saving through the framework***

302 Comparison of the case study's baseline and circular costing proves that implementing a R0-R9
303 framework that is aligned with circularity has potential for both environmental and economic savings
304 (see Figure 5).



305 **Figure 5: Summary of costings for baseline and circular scenarios**

306 The case study's baseline costing totalled £4,731,471. The actual project value is unknown but the
307 equivalent cost of constructing this bridge in the 1930s would be £3,218,710 today. The discrepancy
308 worth £1,512,761 could be due to overestimations of the bridge dimensions, considering data was
309 manually extracted from structural drawings alone, which would affect the tonnage of material
310 calculated and therefore the final pricing.

311 Alternatively, the circular design estimates a budget of £2,933,770 which totals economic savings of
312 £1,797,701- a 38% reduction from the baseline price. Without changes to the project's structural

313 dimensions, cost savings were made possible through material reconsideration. This was achieved by
 314 specifying for concrete with 30% GGBS replacement, which was also cheaper priced and replacing
 315 granite finishes with limestone that is cheaper to supply and does not detract from desired aesthetics.

316 Conducting a costing analysis with a project that employed conventional, linear construction and
 317 comparing it with a modelled circular design, allows the inference that adopting circularity in
 318 construction projects can result in profound cost savings.

319 ***4.3 Waste management through implementing waste indexing***

320 Waste indexing was implemented under the framework’s waste management criteria. To interpret the
 321 index scores for each material, the higher the value, the better the material implements circularity since
 322 its circular output flows are higher than its linear waste outputs (see Table 7). Applying this to the case
 323 study indicates on how well circularity strategies are implemented in its waste management processes.

324 **Table 7: Waste index scores for materials used in the case study**

Material	Linear output flows (kg)			Circular output flows (kg)			Waste index
	Hazardous waste	Non-hazardous waste	Radioactive waste	Components for reuse	Materials for recycling	Materials for recovery	
Concrete	0.03	136.24	0.023	0.00	903.95	0.00	6.63
Steel	0.00	127.00	0.00	0.00	890.00	0.00	7.01
Granite	0.50	115.00	0.00	-	-	-	0.00
Asphalt	0.001	24.31	0.003	0.00	960.00	0.00	39.5

325

326 The case study’s index scores for concrete, steel, and asphalt suggests good potential for circular waste
 327 management since material recycling is the more popular end-of-life route. For a declared unit tonne of
 328 material, asphalt scores highest owing to being the most recyclable material with minimal loss to
 329 externalities. This information is key in projecting waste operations of construction projects at the end
 330 of its design life.

331 It shows good recycling potential for concrete, steel, and asphalt but to improve its implementation of
332 circular waste management, its end-of-life routes should be more inclusive to reuse and recovery
333 pathways. Reductions in the linear waste disposal also helps to improve materials waste index scores.

334 ***4.4 Recovery/Circularity: Implementing circularity indexing***

335 To interpret the circularity indexing under the framework's recovery/circularity criteria, positive values
336 favours circularity and negative values otherwise. This is applied to the case study to determine
337 effectiveness of circularity strategies across the materials' lifecycles. Table 8 summarises the circularity
338 index scores for the case study's construction materials and the coefficients inputted in the formula for
339 calculation.

340 Although the scores are positive to suggest some degree of circularity, strong favour towards circularity
341 in material LCAs is not evident. It verifies that more circular progress in materials lifecycles are needed
342 to accelerate a shift towards circularity and improve scores. Nevertheless, the indicators applied covers
343 a range of circularity factors from types of energy sources used during production to secondary materials
344 and end-of-life routes, positioning its validity in measuring materials circularity on a micro-scale using
345 a lifecycle approach. The intention of this circularity indexing tool is to holistically cover aspects of
346 secondary market formation, collaboration between manufacturers and recyclers as well as
347 implementing value retention techniques across material lifecycles (Rahman et al, 2020). The
348 information obtained from these results emphasises that more effort is needed to improve circularity at
349 larger and stronger scales from a materials performance perspective.

350

351

Table 8: Circularity index scores summary for case study

Material	Renewable energy resources	Non-renewable energy resources	Secondary materials	Reuse	Upcycle	Downcycle	Incineration with energy recovery	Landfill	Biodegrade	No. of operations covered	Circularity index
Concrete	0	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	0	9	0.11
Steel	0	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	0	9	0.11
Granite	0	-1	1	1	0	1	-1	-1	0	9	0.00
Asphalt	1	0	0	1	1	1	-1	-1	0	8	0.25

353 **5. Recommendations**

354 Based on the qualitative survey research and case study conducted, the following are recommendations
355 on how to improve circular performance in construction.

356 ***5.1 Adaptive reuse of buildings***

357 Renovation, refurbishment, retrofitting, and reuse projects reap the benefits of saving up to 70% of EC
358 emissions, instead of building new (AIA, 2017). The potential to extend useful lifespans, remediate
359 brownfields and restoring value to poor-performing infrastructure yields enormous benefits of
360 preserving emissions and materials, improving land use management, reflecting the changing needs of
361 communities, revitalising cities and so forth (Foster, 2020).

362 ***5.2 Conscientious selection of materials***

363 As in the report's findings, specifying concrete mixes with lower carbon impacts and higher cement
364 replacements (e.g. fly ash or blast-furnace slag) can significantly reduce EC emissions. Other forms of
365 cement content savings can be achieved through use of higher-quality aggregates and reducing water
366 content (CCC, 2018). Organisations must strive to comply with BES 6001 in responsible sourcing of
367 concrete by opting for low carbon footprint specifications, local suppliers, and shorter supply chains
368 (Concrete Centre). Using materials with higher recycled content reduces demand for virgin resource
369 extraction, promotes material value retention within its system and reduces EC emissions.

370 ***5.3 Innovation: Using automated tools to aid circular implementation***

371 The construction sector's slow adoption of the fast-evolving technological advances within its field
372 risks regression of opportunities that drives circular transition. BIM has vast capacity to perform
373 analyses to optimise building systems yet remains an underutilised tool. Two suggestions of other uses
374 that aid circular progress include a Whole-life Performance Estimator (BWPE) and as a Construction
375 Waste (CW) Estimator. A study from Akanbi et al. (2018) developed BWPE to appraise the salvage
376 potential of structural components from design stages to influence initial decisions making from
377 designers and final decisions making from consultants when generating pre-demolition audits. Applying
378 BIM as a CW estimator allows information on building systems to scope CW disposal scheduling, cost

379 estimation, onsite reuse, and waste streams sorting (Bakchan et al, 2019). This tool can help oversee
380 opportunities for cost savings from reuse and recycling processes and identifying percentage errors
381 between estimated and actual waste quantities. Both schemes guide the decisions making of
382 construction practitioners for better CWM and resourcefulness.

383 **6. Conclusions**

384 This study developed a new CE framework that outlines actions plans to be implemented across all
385 stages of a building cycle. This was supported by a feasibility study of integrating a CE framework in
386 a real construction project. It identified the challenges of replacing conventional, linear practices and
387 raised awareness of its potential to bridge all dimensions of sustainability. The CE model demands an
388 accelerated transition in order to mitigate the climate emergency and other prominent issues on resource
389 and energy security, aging infrastructures, pollution, and the increasing development gap. Regardless
390 of technological advances, the success of adopting a CE model is largely dependent on supporting
391 policies and the cooperation of stakeholders involved. Without these enabling conditions, the identified
392 barriers will only continue to hurt progress towards circularity. A thorough qualitative assessment was
393 achieved by exploring factors that influence the extent to which CE policies are implementable. The
394 outcome ultimately favours the argument that the positive impacts of circularity outweigh its challenges.
395 Applying the framework to a real construction project allowed for the following to be ascertained:

- 396 (1) It evidenced the applicability of circularity practices within industry.
- 397 (2) It demonstrated the functions of the quantitative tools developed where its outputs measured
398 circularity progress and allowed for monitoring the status of CE implementation.
- 399 (3) The outcome of the results suggests that while there is some implementation of circularity in
400 practice (mainly recycling schemes), there is still a major lack of circular initiative in areas
401 proven to have abundant potential for environmental and economic savings.

402 To conclude, the policies and recommendations offered and the development of a CE framework most
403 fitting for industry purpose helped to form a concerted effort in guiding the direction of change needed
404 for improving implementation policies. The findings reclaim the confidence in circular economics being
405 the viable and holistic solution to unsustainable linearity.

406 **7. Data Availability Statement**

407 Some or all data, models, or code that support the findings of this study are available from the
408 corresponding author upon reasonable request

409 **1. References**

- 410 Adrian T.H Kuah, Pengji Wang (2020). Circular economy and consumer acceptance: An exploratory study in
411 East and Southeast Asia. Article in Journal of Cleaner Production, Volume 247, 2020
- 412 Amal Bakchan, Kasey M. Faust, Fernanda Leite (2019). Seven-dimensional automated construction waste
413 quantification and management framework: Integration with project and site planning. Article in Journal of
414 Resources, Conservation and Recycling, Volume 146, 2019, Pages 462-474, ISSN 0921-3449
- 415 American Institute of Architects (2017) Article: 10 steps to reducing embodied carbon
- 416 Ana Pires, Graça Martinho (2019). Waste hierarchy index for circular economy in waste management. Article in
417 Waste Management, Volume 95, 2019, Pages 298-305, ISSN 0956-053X
- 418 Ana Sánchez Levoso, Carles M. Gasol, Julia Martínez-Blanco, Xavier Gabarell Durany, Martin Lehmann, Ramon
419 Farreny Gaya (2020). Methodological framework for the implementation of circular economy in urban systems.
420 Article in Journal of Cleaner Production, Volume 248, 2020, 119227, ISSN 0959-6526,
- 421 Bruno Turnheim, Mike Asquith, Frank W. Geels (2020). Making sustainability transitions research policy-
422 relevant: Challenges at the science-policy interface. Article from Environmental Innovation and Societal
423 Transitions, Volume 34, 2020, Pages 116-120, ISSN 2210-4224
- 424 CES (2009) EduPack software, Granta Design Limited, Cambridge, UK, 2009
- 425 Construction Climate Challenge (2018): How to reduce ‘embodied carbon’ in the construction process.
- 426 Daniela Cristina Momete (2020). A unified framework for assessing the readiness of European Union economies
427 to migrate to a circular modelling. Science of The Total Environment, Volume 718, 2020, 137375, ISSN 0048-
428 9697
- 429 Defra (2020) UK Statistics on Waste
- 430 Dieter Boer, Mercè Segarra, A. Inés Fernández, Manel Vallès, Carles Mateu, Luisa F. Cabeza (2020). Approach
431 for the analysis of TES technologies aiming towards a circular economy: Case study of building-like cubicles.
432 Renewable Energy, Volume 150, 2020, Pages 589-597, ISSN 0960-1481,
- 433 Dr Craig Jones, Professor Geoff Hammond (2019) Inventory of Carbon and Energy V3 Database
- 434 Dr Paul Toyne (2016) Presentation on Circular economy in the built environment: A Balfour Beatty perspective

435 EASAC Policy Report 30 (2016) Indicators for a Circular Economy

436 E. Giama, A.M. Papadopoulos. Benchmarking carbon footprint and circularity in production processes. *Journal*
437 *of Cleaner Production*, Volume 257, 2020, 120559, ISSN 0959-6526

438 Ellen MacArthur Foundation (2013) *Towards the circular economy*, pages 7, 24

439 European Commission (2015) *Closing the loop- An EU action plan for the Circular Economy*

440 Gillian Foster. Circular economy strategies for adaptive reuse of cultural heritage buildings to reduce
441 environmental impacts. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, Volume 152, 2020, 104507, ISSN 0921-3449

442 Gustavo Moraga, Sophie Huysveld, Fabrice Mathieux, Gian Andrea Blengini, Luc Alaerts, Karel Van Acker,
443 Steven de Meester, Jo Dewulf (2019). Circular economy indicators: What do they measure? Article in *Resources,*
444 *Conservation and Recycling*, Volume 146, 2019, Pages 452-461, ISSN 0921-3449

445 Tlbrahim Yahaya Wuni, Geoffrey Qiping Shen (2020) Barriers to the adoption of modular integrated construction:
446 Systematic review and meta-analysis, integrated conceptual framework, and strategies. Article in *Journal of*
447 *Cleaner Production*, Volume 249, 2020, 119347, ISSN 0959-6526

448 Jim Hart, Katherine Adams, Jannik Gieseckam, Danielle Densley Tingley, Francesco Pomponi (2019). Barriers
449 and drivers in a circular economy. *Procedia CIRP*, Volume 80, 2019, Pages 619-624, ISSN 2212-8271,

450

451 Kieran Campbell-Johnston, Walter J.V. Vermeulen, Denise Reike, Sabrina Brullot. *The Circular Economy and*
452 *Cascading: Towards a Framework*. *Resources, Conservation & Recycling: X*, Volume 7, 2020, 100038

453 Kyrö R., Jylhä, T. and Peltokorpi, A. (2019) *Embodying circularity through usable relocatable modular buildings,*
454 *Facilities*, Vol. 37 No. 1/2, page 75-90

455 London Metropolitan Archives. *Rolled drawings: New Lambeth Bridge (LCC/CE/RB/03/020)*

456 Lukman A. Akanbi, Lukumon O. Oyedele, Olugbenga O. Akinade, Anuoluwapo O. Ajayi, Manuel Davila
457 Delgado, Muhammad Bilal, Sururah A. Bello. *Salvaging building materials in a circular economy: A BIM-based*
458 *whole-life performance estimator*. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, Volume 129, 2018, Pages 175-186

459 Martin Geissdoerfer, Paulo Savaget, Nancy M.P. Bocken, Erik Jan Hultink. *The Circular Economy – A new*
460 *sustainability paradigm?* *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Volume 143, 2017, Pages 757-768, ISSN 0959-6526

461 Mayara Regina Munaro, Sérgio Fernando Tavares, Luís Bragança. Towards circular and more sustainable
462 buildings: A systematic literature review on the circular economy in the built environment. Article in Journal of
463 Cleaner Production, Volume 260, 2020, 121134, ISSN 0959-6526

464 Meliha Honic, Iva Kovacic, Helmut Rechberger. Improving the recycling potential of buildings through Material
465 Passports (MP) Article from Journal of Cleaner Production, Volume 217, 2019, Pages 787-797, ISSN 0959-6526

466 Michael Saidani, Bernard Yannou, Yann Leroy, François Cluzel, Alissa Kendall. A taxonomy of circular economy
467 indicators. Article from Journal of Cleaner Production, Volume 207, 2019, Pages 542-559, ISSN 0959-6526

468 Noha Gawdat Atia, Makram A. Bassily, Ahmed A. Elamer. Do life-cycle costing and assessment integration
469 support decision-making towards sustainable development? Article from Journal of Cleaner Production, Volume
470 267, 2020, 122056, ISSN 0959-6526

471 Patrizia Ghisellini, Catia Cialani, Sergio Ulgiati (2016) A review on circular economy: the expected transition to
472 a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. Article in Journal of Cleaner Production, Volume
473 114, 2016, Pages 11-32, ISSN 0959-6526

474 Potting, José & Hekkert, M.P. & Worrell, Ernst & Hanemaaijer, Aldert. (2017). Circular Economy: Measuring
475 innovation in the product chain

476 S.M. Mizanur Rahman, Junbeum Kim (2020). Circular economy, proximity, and shipbreaking: A material flow
477 and environmental impact analysis. Journal of Cleaner Production, Volume 259, 2020, 120681, ISSN 0959-6526

478 Sönnich Dahl Sönnichsen, Jesper Clement (2020). Review of green and sustainable public procurement: Towards
479 circular public procurement. Journal of Cleaner Production, Volume 245, 2020, 118901, ISSN 0959-6526

480 Stefan Seuring, Martin Müller(2020). From a literature review to a conceptual framework for sustainable supply
481 chain management. Journal of Cleaner Production, Volume 16, Issue 15, 2008, Pages 1699-1710, ISSN 0959-
482 6526

483 The Concrete Centre: Specifying Sustainable Concrete pages 5, 10

484 The International EPD System: EPD Database <https://www.environdec.com/EPD-Search/>

485 United Nations Environment Programme, Global Status Report 2017: Towards a zero emission, efficient, and
486 resilient buildings, and construction sector. Figure 7

- 487 World Economic Forum (WEF) (2016) Shaping the Future of Construction, A Breakthrough in Mindset and
488 Technology Section 1: The Construction Industry, page 11
- 489 Yuliya Kalmykova, Madumita Sadagopan, Leonardo Rosado (2018). Circular economy – From review of
490 theories and practices to development of implementation tools. Resources, Conservation and Recycling, Volume
491 135, 2018, Pages 190-201, ISSN 0921-3449