

COMMERCIAL EPC & MEES

Upgrade Plan

Brookfield House
22 Wellington Road, Stockport
Offices and Workshop Businesses · 2,340 m²

CURRENT	2031 TARGET	GAP	MEASURES
D · 88	B · ≤50	38 pts	5

This is a worked example, not a real property.

Brookfield House is illustrative – built from the patterns we see across the Energy Performance of Buildings Register so the whole method can be shown without publishing a client's building. The benchmark data it is measured against is real.

Summary

CERTIFICATE

Expires June 2027

Nine months. You cannot grant a new tenancy or sell without a valid one.

METHODOLOGY

Assessed under the old rules

Lodged June 2017, before the June 2022 methodology change. A re-assessment would not start from this number.

HEATING

Natural gas

Drags the rating down under current methodology. Over 1,000 m², so electrification is on the route to B.

MEES POSITION

Meets E today, below B

No breach now. Over 1,000 m², so the 2031 standard applies.

Contents

01	Overview	The gap, what it depends on, and what it does not claim.
02	As recorded	The building as the certificate describes it, not always the one you own.
03	Why your score	Which inputs were evidenced, which assumed, and what that is worth.
04	Evidence pack	The documents that settle each assumption, in priority order.
05	Your route	Every measure, when it can be done, and how its cost is established.
06	Missed measures	Measures the readings qualify for that the certificate did not list.
07	Funding	What applies to this building, and explicitly what does not.
08	Lease & tenant	Who pays, who must consent, and the conversation to have in writing.
09	Exemptions	Every ground, assessed against this building.
10	Improve or sell	The same building as an asset decision, not a compliance one.
11	Benchmark	Against real register data for the district and the sector.

Overview

D · 88	B	38 pts	5
Current band and asset rating	Standard that applies from 2031	Gap to the 2031 standard	Measures on the proposed route

Brookfield House is a 2,340 m² office building rated **D at 88 points**. Because it is over 1,000 m², it is expected to be caught by the **EPC B standard in 2031**. It currently meets the E minimum, so there is no breach today – the exposure is entirely forward-looking, and the building has roughly one lease cycle in which to deal with it.

The gap is **38 points** – that much is arithmetic, because band B ends at 50 and this building sits at 88. What it costs to close is not something this page can tell you, and we will not pretend otherwise: 5 measures are on the proposed route, and the price of each comes from three quotations against a specification, with the saving valued at the tariff this building actually pays.

No prices on this page, and that is deliberate

evenEco do not put a figure to a building outside a properly costed remediation. Published cost ranges get used as budgets, and on commercial work access, height, occupancy, asbestos and out-of-hours working move real prices by multiples. What a real plan carries is your quotations; what this sample shows is the method they feed.

Before spending anything, deal with the assumptions

This certificate records the wall construction as unknown and carries a default air permeability figure. On the evidence we would expect this building to hold, re-assessment alone could move the rating several points before any work is done. That changes the size of the problem, and it costs a fraction of the cheapest measure. See *Why your score*.

What this plan depends on

- **Access to the demises.** Two tenants on FRI leases. Lighting inside the demises is sequenced to the 2027 break and the 2030 expiry, not to a date we chose.
- **The 2029 roof covering renewal proceeding.** Insulating alongside a re-cover that is happening anyway is a different proposition from doing it as a standalone project later.
- **The evidence surviving.** If the O&M manual and the 2019 refurbishment file cannot be found, the re-assessment case weakens and the works gap stays at 38 points.
- **Cost recovery.** The leases are silent on improvement. See *Lease & tenant*.

If the route stalls, the fallback is a registered exemption – but on this building nothing supports one today, because the measures on the route have to be tested against the seven-year rule first, and the ones that pass it are ones you are required to do rather than ones you may decline. See *Exemptions*.

As recorded

This is your building *as the certificate describes it* – which is not always the same as the building you own. Every row here is an input to the model that produced your rating.

The certificate record	
RECORDED ON THE CERTIFICATE	VALUE
Address	Brookfield House, 22 Wellington Road, Stockport
Use class recorded	Offices and Workshop Businesses
Total floor area	2,340 m ²
Asset rating	88 – band D
Certificate lodged	12 June 2017
Certificate expires	11 June 2027
Assessment method	SBEM, via iSBEM
Main heating fuel	Natural gas
Building environment	Heating and natural ventilation
Building levels	3

The floor area is the number that decides which standard applies

At 2,340 m² this building is comfortably over the 1,000 m² threshold, so the 2031 EPC B standard is expected to apply. If the recorded area were wrong – and it sometimes is – the entire compliance position would change. Check it against your own measured area before accepting it.

What the certificate does not record

The certificate says nothing about how the building is occupied, what it actually costs to run, or what has been done to it since 2017. All three matter to the plan and none of them are in the model.

Why your score

The single most useful page in this plan. Each input below is classified by how it was established – and the ones marked *assumed* are the ones where evidence, not building work, may move your rating.

Evidenced, observed or assumed – how each input on this certificate was established			
INPUT	HOW IT WAS ESTABLISHED	RECORDED AS	OPPORTUNITY
Wall construction	Assumed	Unknown construction, age-band default, uninsulated	High – a 2019 refurbishment is understood to have included cavity fill
Air permeability	Assumed	Default leakage rate for an untested building	High – a test certificate may exist in the O&M manual
Lighting	Observed	Generic fluorescent luminaires, manual switching	Medium – partial LED replacement in 2021 is not reflected
Roof construction	Assumed	Age-band default	Medium – as-built details may exist
Glazing	Observed	Double glazed, aluminium frame, thermal break assumed	Low
Heating plant	Observed	Gas boiler, default seasonal efficiency for type and age	Medium – commissioning certificate would give the actual figure
Controls	Assumed	No credit – controls not demonstrated at survey	High – zoning added in 2019 earns no credit in the current model
Ventilation	Not applicable	Natural ventilation	None

Evidence can replace an assumption without any work being done to the building

Four inputs on this certificate carry defaults recorded because nothing was produced on the day of the survey. The wall is rated as an uninsulated unknown; the building is rated as untested for air-tightness; and a zoning strategy installed in 2019 earns no credit at all because it was not demonstrated.

None of that is a criticism of the assessor. They may only enter what they can see or are shown, and where construction is concealed and no documentation is offered, the conventions require a cautious default. The variable here is the information, not the assessor – which is precisely why a different assessor on the same evidence would reach the same 88.

What this is worth

On buildings of this age and history, we would expect evidence alone to be worth several points, and occasionally considerably more. We deliberately do not quote you a precise figure: **SBEM publishes no per-measure point value**, so anyone promising you an exact uplift from a document is guessing. What we can say is that this is the cheapest lever on the building, and it should be pulled before anything is specified.

It may also confirm bad news. If the wall really is uninsulated, the evidence will say so, and you will have established that for the cost of a file search rather than a survey.

The full explanation of how this works →

Evidence pack

Assemble this **before** commissioning the re-assessment, and hand it over at the start of the visit. An assessor who has the evidence before modelling never has to enter a default and revisit it.

Evidence pack for Brookfield House, in priority order			
DOCUMENT	SETTLES	LIKELY LOCATION	PRIORITY
Air permeability test certificate	Infiltration rate – currently a default	O&M manual; building control completion file	First
2019 refurbishment specification and cavity fill guarantee	Wall construction – currently 'unknown, uninsulated'	Asset file; the contractor; service charge records	First
BMS schematics, points list, commissioning record	Credit for the 2019 zoning strategy	Controls contractor; FM provider	First
2021 lighting schedule with luminaire data	Lighting efficacy	Fit-out contractor; M&E consultant	Second
Boiler commissioning certificate and manufacturer data	Plant seasonal efficiency	O&M manual; maintenance contractor	Second
As-built roof details	Roof construction – currently age-band default	Original build file; architect	Second
Window schedule and glazing performance data	Glazing U-values	Supplier; refurbishment file	Third

If nothing survives

Buildings bought second-hand often have no handover file at all. Two routes are usually open and both are cheap relative to the works they may avoid:

- **An air permeability test** – one day, and on a building of this age frequently the single highest-value piece of evidence available.
- **An opening-up inspection** – small, repairable, and it settles the wall construction question definitively rather than by assumption.

Keep the pack afterwards

It serves the next assessment in ten years, any exemption bundle you may need, and the due diligence pack on a sale or refinancing. It is an asset, not a one-off exercise. More on preparing for re-assessment →

Your route

Ordered by **when the work can actually be done**, not by cost or by points. The constraint on this building is access, and access is set by the leases.

Every measure the recommendation report raises, and where each is established			
MEASURE	PRACTICAL WINDOW	STATUS	COST AND PAYBACK
LED lighting throughout with presence and daylight controls	Landlord areas now; demises at the 2027 break	On the route	From three quotations, tested at your own tariff
Heating controls, zoning and optimum start	Occupied – no access constraint	On the route	From three quotations, tested at your own tariff
Building management system upgrade	Occupied	On the route	From three quotations, tested at your own tariff
Air -tightness and draught -sealing works	2027 void, ground and first	On the route	From three quotations, tested at your own tariff
Roof insulation, with the 2029 covering renewal	2029 – bundled with planned lifecycle works	On the route	From three quotations, tested at your own tariff
Solar PV, roof mounted	Any, subject to roof works completing	Considered, parked	From three quotations, tested at your own tariff
Air source heat pump, full plant replacement	Plant end -of -life	Considered, parked	From three quotations, tested at your own tariff

Which of these you are *required* to do is decided by the payback test

There is no cost cap on commercial property. Any measure that pays back inside seven years is a relevant energy efficiency improvement and you must install it, whatever it costs – and any that does not is outside the test, which does not make it a bad investment, only one the law does not compel. That verdict cannot be reached from a web page: it needs the installed cost from three quotations and the saving at your own tariff. Test a measure on your numbers → · How the test works →

Sequenced against the dates you already have

The route mapped onto Brookfield House's lease and capital events		
WHEN	EVENT	WHAT HAPPENS

WHEN	EVENT	WHAT HAPPENS
Now – Q2 2027	No access constraint – landlord areas and plant	LED and controls to common parts and plant rooms; heating controls, zoning and optimum start; BMS upgrade
Mar 2027	Tenant A break date – 1,180 m ² ground and first	The void. LED and controls through the demise, air-tightness and draught-sealing. The cheapest access this building will get.
2029	Roof covering renewal – planned lifecycle	Insulate with the re-cover. Doing this as a separate project later costs materially more.
Nov 2029	Facility matures – refinancing	Target: evidenced band B, with the plan and the evidence file as the lender document
Sep 2030	Tenant B expiry – 760 m ² second floor	Remaining demise works; contingency if anything above slipped
2031	EPC B standard applies	Compliance evidenced, not asserted

The real deadline is March 2027, not 2031

The 2027 break is the last scheduled void on the larger demise before the standard bites. Miss it and the same lighting and air-tightness work has to be done around a trading tenant, at a premium, or wait until 2030 – which leaves no contingency at all. This is why we sequence against lease events rather than counting back from the regulatory date. Work back from your own dates →

Sequencing logic

- **Fabric and controls before plant.** Air-tightness and controls change what the heating system needs to be. Sizing new plant first means paying for capacity you were about to remove.
- **Bundle with work that is happening anyway.** The roof insulation is affordable because there is already a re-cover scheduled. Alone it is a different proposition.
- **Landlord areas first.** They need nobody's permission, which makes them the only part of the programme you fully control.

Missed measures

Measures this building's own recorded characteristics qualify it for, which do **not** appear on the certificate's recommendation report. Assessors work to a standard recommendation set, and it does not catch everything.

Measures the certificate did not list		
MEASURE	WHY IT QUALIFIES HERE	WHY IT IS NOT ON YOUR CERTIFICATE
Destratification fans	Three-storey building with a naturally ventilated volume and gas heating	Outside the standard non-domestic recommendation set
Variable speed drives on pumps	Wet heating system with constant-speed circulation recorded	Recommended only where the assessor records pump data specifically
Pipework and valve insulation in plant areas	Plant room recorded but insulation status not assessed	Not an assessed element
Sub-metering by floor and by service	Two demises on a shared supply	Not an EPC measure at all – it is an operational one
Hot water point-of-use replacement	Central hot water serving intermittent office demand	Only recommended where the assessor records HWS distribution losses
Void and riser sealing	Three floors with vertical service risers	Captured under air-tightness only if a test was carried out

We do not claim a points value for these

SBEM publishes no per-measure point value, so quoting one would be dishonest. Several of these are operational rather than asset measures, which means they may reduce your energy cost without moving the certificate at all. That is worth knowing in both directions.

Funding

Including, explicitly, the schemes that do **not** apply – so you are not chasing funding you cannot use.

Funding routes assessed against this building		
ROUTE	APPLIES HERE?	WHY
Full expensing / AIA	Yes	Lighting, controls, BMS and heating plant are qualifying plant and machinery. Most of this programme is integral features.
Green / sustainability-linked lending	Yes	The facility matures November 2029. A costed, dated, evidenced plan is exactly the document a margin ratchet is priced against.
Local growth hub grant	Check	Small capital grants exist in some regions for SME-occupied premises. Worth a call; do not build the budget on it.
Salix Finance	No	Public sector only. This is a privately held commercial building.
Industrial Energy Transformation Fund	No	Industrial process energy. An office does not qualify.
Boiler Upgrade Scheme	No	Covers domestic and <i>small</i> non-domestic buildings. At 2,340 m ² this building is outside it.
ECO4 / GBIS / Warm Homes	No	Domestic schemes, funded by domestic supplier obligations. Not available for commercial property at all.

The lending argument usually dwarfs the works

Whatever the programme costs, a building that cannot lawfully be let has no rental value to capitalise – so the valuation effect of missing 2031 is of a different order from the capital needed to meet it. That is the argument the plan exists to carry to a valuer or a lender, and it is why the costed remediation matters more as a document than as a total. More on commercial funding →

Lease & tenant

The regulatory duty is yours. The energy saving is your tenants'. Almost every stalled commercial MEES programme stalls on that sentence, and this is the tab that deals with it.

Lease position on each demise		
	TENANT A – GROUND & FIRST	TENANT B – SECOND FLOOR
Demise	1,180 m ²	760 m ²
Lease	FRI, expiry 24 March 2028	FRI, expiry 28 September 2030
Break	24 March 2027	None
Service charge	Repair and maintenance only – silent on improvement	Same
Right of entry	To inspect and repair; not expressly to improve	Same
Pays energy	Directly	Directly
Position	Consent needed for in-demise works before the break	Consent needed, or wait until 2030

What this means in practice

- **You cannot recover the cost through the service charge.** Both leases permit repair and maintenance and are silent on improvement. Energy efficiency works are improvement.
- **You cannot force entry to the demises** to carry out improvement works. A right to enter to repair is not a right to enter to improve.
- **Dilapidations will not help.** The building is in repair; upgrading it is your regulatory burden, and section 18(1) of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1927 would cap any claim at the diminution in the value of the reversion in any event.

Which is why the 2027 break is the whole plan

At a break you need nobody's consent. If Tenant A operates the break you have vacant possession and the demise works cost what they should. If they do not, you have a negotiation – and you have something to trade.

The conversation to have with Tenant A, in writing

1. **Name the measure and the benefit.** "We propose LED lighting and controls throughout your demise, at our cost, and it reduces the electricity you pay for." Put the modelled saving in only once you have one worth standing behind. The saving is theirs; say so.

2. **Offer the trade.** They want term certain; you want access. A re-gear that removes the 2027 break in exchange for the works being done during a short agreed shutdown serves both.
3. **Ask for a decision and a date.** Set a reasonable deadline and say what happens if you do not hear.
4. **Get any refusal in writing.** Confirm a phone refusal by email the same day and invite correction.

A refusal is not a dead end – it is the exemption

A properly sought, properly documented refusal is the foundation of a five-year third-party consent exemption. Either you get the access or you get the lawful position. What you must not do is get neither, which is what happens when a "no" is taken over the phone and never recorded.

For every future lease

You cannot fix the subsisting leases, but nothing stops you fixing the next ones. A sustainability provision covering access for statutory compliance works, and cost sharing where the tenant benefits, should be in the Tenant A re-gear and in every renewal after it. More on recovery and access →

Exemptions

Assessed honestly: **no exemption is available to this building today**, and we would rather tell you that than sell you a filing exercise.

Every exemption ground, assessed against this building		
GROUND	AVAILABLE HERE?	WHY
Seven-year payback	No	The ground requires that <i>no</i> measure passes the seven-year test. On a building with lighting, controls and air-tightness still to do, that is very unlikely to be the case here.
All relevant improvements made	Not yet	Becomes available only after the five required measures are installed and the building is still below standard. On our modelling it will reach B, so this should never be needed.
Third-party consent	Possible, later	Only if a tenant refuses in-demise works in writing. Not a current position – nothing has been asked yet.
Devaluation over 5%	No	Nothing in this programme touches the elevation or reduces lettable area. A RICS valuer would not support it.
Wall insulation damage	No	No wall insulation is proposed – the cavity is understood to be filled already.
New landlord	No	Not a recent acquisition.

If a consent refusal does arrive, act on it immediately

Register within the six months you have, with the full bundle: the written request, the written refusal, the recommendation report, three quotations for the affected measures, and a dated file note. Then diarise the five-year expiry, because nothing will remind you. How to register →

Improve or sell

The compliance answer is only part of the question. Here is the same building framed as an asset decision.

The asset decision		
OPTION	WHAT IT GETS YOU	WHAT IT RISKS
Improve to B	Lettable beyond 2031, evidenced. The energy saving accrues to the tenants who pay the bills, and supports rent on review. A clean refinancing in 2029.	Capital committed against a standard that could still move
Do only what the payback test compels	The floor. Whatever passes the seven-year test is mandatory, so this is not a cheaper strategy – it is the strategy with the optional items removed.	Leaves no margin if a measure underperforms or the standard tightens
Improve and re-gear	Access at the 2027 break, longer term certain, works done in a void rather than around a trading tenant	Incentive cost; the tenant may not come to the table
Refinance first, improve after	Nothing. The facility matures in 2029 and the valuer will ask about 2031 by then.	Materially worse terms. The option that looks cheapest and is not.
Sell	Transfers the problem	A purchaser prices the same works, plus a discount for the uncertainty and for having to run them themselves

The point most owners miss

Some of these measures are not a choice. Where the seven-year payback test is satisfied they are legally required, so the real decision is not *whether* but *when* – and whether the work is done in a void you planned for or around a tenant you did not. That timing difference is usually worth more than any line in the specification.

This is decision framing, not investment advice. We are energy assessors, not regulated financial or investment advisers, and the judgement is yours and your advisers'.

Benchmark

Compared against real register data – every commercial property in Stockport, and every offices & workshops property in England and Wales.

Benchmark against comparable stock				
	THIS BUILDING	STOCKPORT	OFFICES & WORKSHOPS	ENGLAND & WALES
Asset rating	88	80	83	74
Band	D	Average D	Average D	Average C
Floor area	2,340 m²	547 m²	633 m²	659 m²
Share below EPC B	–	83.5%	81.3%	76.1%
Properties analysed	1	4,810	259,596	998,164

How to read this

At 88 points this building is close to the Stockport average and to the national office average – which is precisely the problem. **83.5%** of commercial stock in Stockport is below EPC B, and 81.3% of offices nationally. Being typical is not a defence; it means most of the market has the same 2031 problem and will be trying to solve it with the same contractors at the same time.

There are **385** buildings in Stockport over 1,000 m² and below EPC B. Moving early is partly a procurement argument.

Stockport in full

Band distribution, sector mix and the at-risk cohorts for 4,810 properties.

[See the data →](#)

Offices & workshops nationally

How 259,596 properties in this sector perform.

[See the data →](#)