

2 Wind, sound and noise

Contents

Contents	106
2.1 GLOBAL ATMOSPHERE	107
2.1.1 Air, its mass and density.....	107
2.1.2 Wind, its force and power.....	107
2.1.3 The atmosphere	108
2.1.4 Climate.....	109
2.1.5 The urban impacts of wind	110
2.1.6 Measures, targeted impacts per level of scale.....	112
2.2 NATIONAL CHOICE OF LOCATION	113
2.2.1 National distribution of wind velocity	113
2.2.2 Closer specification of wind statistics	113
2.2.3 The energy profit of wind turbines	116
2.2.4 Energy losses from buildings	118
2.2.5 Temperature impacts.....	119
2.2.6 Comfort of outdoor space.....	120
2.2.7 Dispersion of air pollution	121
2.2.8 Summary national comparison	121
2.3 REGIONAL CHOICE OF LOCATION.....	122
2.3.1 Roughness of surrounding grounds	123
2.3.2 Impact of new urban area lose from or adjacent to town in case of Westerly wind	125
2.3.3 Impact of new urban area lose or adjacent in case of Easterly wind.....	126
2.3.4 Impacts on energy losses by ventilation behind the edge in the interior of town	127
2.3.5 Highways, railways, green areas and forests.....	127
2.4 LOCAL MEASURES.....	129
2.4.1 Local shelter of residential areas.....	129
2.4.2 Increase of wind velocity by height.....	130
2.4.3 The form of a town.....	131
2.4.4 Dispersion of urban area	136
2.4.5 The form of town edge.....	137
2.4.6 Wind directions, temperature and built form.....	139
2.5 DISTRICT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD VARIANTS	141
2.5.1 From calculable 'rough surface' into allotments in a wind tunnel	141
2.5.2 Wind tunnel experiments	141
2.5.3 Pressure differences between front and back façades	143
2.5.4 District lay out	144
2.5.5 Neighbourhoods	146
2.6 ALLOTMENT OF HECTARES	149
2.6.1 From wind tunnel experiments into methods of calculation	149
2.6.2 Impact of trees.....	151
2.6.3 Comparing repeated allotments 100x100m	151
2.6.4 Wind behaviour around high objects	153
2.7 SOUND AND NOISE	155
2.7.1 Music	155
2.7.2 Power or intensity	157
2.7.3 Sound and noise.....	160
2.7.4 Birds.....	161
2.7.5 Traffic noise	162

2.1 Global atmosphere

2.1.1 Air, its mass and density

Pull the closed end of a garden hose out of a bucket filled with water and take it with you upstairs to the fifth floor. Above 10m, water is replaced by vacuum like vapour (mercury has vacuum above 76cm). Apparently, atmospheric air pressure on the bucket (1 bar, 100 000Pa, 100 000N/m² or old fashioned: 0.987 atm, 10 197.162 kgf/m²)⁵⁸ can not push it higher. So, the mass of approximately 500km air above 1m² Earth's surface should equal approximately 10m³ water or 10 000kg. Because the surface of the Earth is ample half a billion km² there is ample 5×10^{18} kg air, less than a millionth of the Earth's mass (6×10^{24} kg). At sea level density ρ of air is 1 290g/m³⁵⁹ which equals 3×10^{25} particles (Fig. 215).

2.1.2 Wind, its force and power

So, if your own cross section is 1m², then in one second at a wind velocity of 1m/sec (3.6km/hr), $1\text{m} \cdot 1\text{m}^2 = 1\text{m}^3$ air (1.29kg) would hit you. Fortunately much of this mass immediately starts flowing sideward around you (see chapter 2.6.4). Otherwise it would not 'pass by' and a train of many m³ (many times 1¼ kg) moving air in front of you had to be resisted. But you are only changing its direction and velocity, braking it by 'negative acceleration', which is felt as a force, because force=mass·acceleration as we learned from Newton.




Fig. 213 Wind force (= air mass x velocity/sec)
Air mass = density x volume and air volume = height x width x length. Because air length = velocity x sec, velocity occurs two times in the formula for wind force, so force increases parabolically by square of velocity.




Fig. 214 Wind velocity increasing by height depending on roughness of foreland.
Wind load on a building has to be calculated on every layer of height and summed up to total height. Sideward flow is neglected here^a

But, to keep calculations simple we suppose you have to resist 1m³ of air per second, that is 1.29kg/s at 1m/s, which is a force of 1.29kg·m/s² or 1.29N. It is per m², so you can also say a 'pressure' of 1.29N/m² or 1.29 pascal (1.29Pa). In storm (10m/sec) it will increase to 129N/m² (Fig. 213), because now 10m³ air or 12.9kg hits you in one second also with ten times higher velocity! To get an impression: that force corresponds to the force produced by a child+bike (30kg) hitting you cycling at 15km/hour.

^a Jong (2001) <http://team.bk.tudelft.nl> > Publications 2006 > Windvelocity(height) .zip

So, to calculate the force or pressure (force/m²), you have to take velocity *two times* into account. One time you need velocity to calculate the air *mass* hitting you in one second and the second time you need velocity to calculate *acceleration* (velocity per second) to determine force because $\text{force} = \text{mass} \cdot \text{acceleration}$. So, wind force increases parabolically by *square* of wind velocity (see Fig. 213)⁶⁰. However, these figures are valid on 1m height average, where 'storm' in grass land corresponds to 10m/sec (36km/hr), but at 10m and 20m height it corresponds to 24 and 26m/sec at the same time. The velocity increases with the altitude first like a parabole, then logarithmically and at last exponentially in the 'boundary layer' influenced by the 'roughness' of the Earth (see Fig. 214).

Buildings are wider and heigher than you are, taking up much more m² surface. But you can not simply multiply the surface by the force you have to resist on ground level to get the force a building has to resist, firstly because the velocity increases by height. You have to calculate the wind load on an building on every level and sum all these force contributions up to total altitude (see Fig. 214). Download the Windvelocity(height) program with 8 pictures in the same directory and it will estimate the force in layers of 1cm be it neglecting sideward effects. The environment on the ground (roughness) has great influence, determining differing parameters you have to use. Get a feeling how it works by changing wind velocity and roughness in the program. It is a fast and rough approximation. To be more precise you should calculate it at any spot by vector integration in 3 dimensions, including sideward movements, decelerations and accelerations depending on the shape of the building⁶¹.

2.1.3 The atmosphere

However, air density also decreases from 1290g/m³ at ground level into 1g/m³ at 50km height (see Fig. 215)⁶². So, aeroplanes meet less resistance the higher they fly (until 20km), but propellers and wings will work less effective as well. That is why jet engines are used at higher altitudes with higher velocities.




Fig. 215 Pressure, Density, Particles/m³(height)
A bar is 100000N/m² or 100000Pa or approximately 1 atmosphere
1.E+03 in Excel means 10³

The air temperature has three turningpoints according to the altitude (see Fig. 216)⁶³. The smallest wave lengths of ultraviolet sunlight entering the atmosphere from 500km altitude are directly absorbed heating the thin air more than 1000°C until it equals heat loss by own radiation. That influence reaches until approximately 100km altitude. Around 50km (mesosphere) the rest of UV light is nearly fully captured by ozone heating the air until 20°C at 50km with decreasing influence between 50 and 10km (stratosphere). On 10km the atmosphere measures - 50°C. However, the main stream of visible and infrared light is not captured and heats up the Earth's surface, on its turn heating up the atmosphere by convection from below until 10km (troposphere) or radiating it back to universe as invisible infrared light, only captured by CO₂.




Fig. 216 Air temperature(altitude)




Fig. 217 Air temperature(log(altitude))

An air bubble heated by the Earth's surface climbs up in the troposphere expanding by decreasing environmental pressure. The acquired heat content is dispersed in a larger volume. So, its temperature decreases until it matches the environmental slower decreasing main temperature and rising stops. Meanwhile from a specific temperature onward damp could condensate to steam and ice resulting in cumulus clouds rising with drying air. They show a flat bottom indicating a temperature boundary for condensation is passed⁶⁴. By condensation solar heat is released, giving the steaming air bubble an extra push upward.


Fig. 218 Cumulus clouds with flat bottom^a

Fig. 219 Air bubble condensating

2.1.4 Climate

The Earth turns Eastward 360° in 24 hours. The equator is 40 000km long⁶⁵, as Napoleon ordered to determine the length of a metre. So, at the equator we have a velocity of 1 670km/hour and we are 3g lighter than at the poles by centripetal force. That force has stretched the Earth's radius 22km outward compared with the radius toward poles when Earth was yet a turning droplet from a sneezing sun. The same still happens to equatorial atmosphere: it is thicker there than at the poles⁶⁶.

Equatorial air heated and saturated from moist by tropical temperatures climbs fast and high (see Fig. 220). Shortages on the ground are supplied by 'trade winds' from South East and North East⁶⁷. Coming from North and South they are not used to equatorial high speed Eastward. Seen from the ground their inertia give them a Westward drift. But they are pulled along with rough grounds. Then, once heated they climb higher than everywhere else on Earth, because of centripetal forces. Moreover, environmental density and temperature decrease slower here with so much competing air bubbles around, stimulated by an extra push from condensation causing tropical showers below.

But they continue to loose heat by expansion and radiation into the universe and reach the point they can not rise anymore because their temperature matches the environment. Where to go? Pressed by their upward pursuers they fly back high Northward and Southward getting colder and colder by radiation as an outburned balloon. They land in a subtropical latitude slower Eastward turning as if they came from South East causing subtropical high pressure and cyclones in struggle with winds departing direction South West into tropics as they did themselves in their youth. They join them at last causing a horizontally rolling spiral movement at larger scale between tropics and subtropical regions

^a Bont, G.W.Th.M. de; Zwart, B.; KNMI (1985) *De wolken en het weer* (Zutphen) Terra

or they travel direction pole participating in a second rolling movement as South-Western winds we know so well in The Netherlands.




Fig. 220 Global wind circulations^a

From the poles cold, heavy sinking air is swung by a turning Earth in all directions as polar winds. Parallel whirlings drag each other like gearwheels in turning cells. Nobel prize winner and founder of chaos theory Prigogine (1977) boiled water in a very regular and stable pan like Bénard did in 1904 and saw regular cells emerging as structured 'order' out of chaos. Something like that could happen on a very stable, regularly heated Earth. But the Earth is turning and nodding (see Fig. 37), shaking its atmosphere like busdrivers their passengers. And it has continents heating up faster than oceans, having less water to evaporate. Disturbed by so much global and local causes meteorologists never can predict the weather of next week because little events have great consequences in the world of chaos like the proverbial butterfly causing a tornado some years later elsewhere. What is cause? However, in the long term we find some regularities (three 'rolling' cells from equator to pole) in the sum of turbulences called wind.

2.1.5 The urban impacts of wind

Local velocity of wind affects:

1. wind loads on buildings, plantation and objects in streets and gardens.
2. the energy use of buildings;
3. the potential profit of wind turbines;
4. the dispersion of air pollution;
5. the comfort of outdoor space;

In Fig. 213 we already showed the parabolic course of impact 1.

In Fig. 221 up to Fig. 224 on the vertical axis estimates of the other impacts are represented as a working of average wind velocity classes from 0,5 (0-1) up to 19,5 (19-20) m/sec on the horizontal axis.

^a After Bucknell (1967)




Fig. 221 Ventilation characteristic

Ventilation losses from dwellings increase according to the velocity of wind particularly in non airtight houses⁶⁸. However, from 4 m/sec people close their windows. So, in this interval more wind *decreases* ventilation losses.




Fig. 222 Powercharacteristic

The produced power of this standard wind turbine increases up to 60 kW on a wind velocity of 16 m/sec. Most wind turbines brake on higher velocities to avoid damage⁶⁹.




Fig. 223 Air dispersion characteristic

This tentative diagram represents air pollution disperses best by storm, but that impact is already reached on moderate wind.




Fig. 224 Comfort characteristic

In this tentative diagram is supposed that a weak wind with an average velocity of 1-3m/sec is appreciated most.

Fig. 221 is used by Vermeulen (1986), point of departure in this chapter. In that time, high rise buildings were much more airtight than low rise buildings. That difference will be less today, but to show the impact of wind on energy use of buildings the 1985 span is most illustrative and still relevant. When after all, convection losses, losses by precipitation (drying up of buildings) neglected by Vermeulen and Jong (1985) would be calculated as well, an equivalent and even stronger positive relation than for former low rise buildings could be actual. An actual total energy loss characteristic then, could have an other form, but the line of reasoning remains the same. Minimisation of energy losses desires minimisation of wind velocity anyway. The fourth impact requires rather optimisation (not too much, but not too little as well). For higher velocities the aim is also minimisation of wind velocity. However, the second and third impact on the contrary require maximisation of local wind velocity. So, their aim is contrary to the first and last impact. In this representation temperature influences (relevant for Fig. 221 and Fig. 224) are still neglected.

Local average wind velocity can be influenced by environmental planning and design on national ($r=100\text{km}$), regional ($r=30\text{km}$) and different local levels ($r=\{10, 3, 1, 0.3 \text{ en } 0.1\}\text{km}$). Measures on these levels are discussed in this chapter. They are not all equally applicable. Sometimes they have a theoretical or experimental character with little profit. Then they have a didactic value useful for discussing next values. If that occurs, the measures and their impacts are discussed in a conditional sequence: any measure should be seen within boundary conditions of preceding measures. So, one can not miss a paragraph: measures on a local level could be understood only within boundary conditions of regional scale and these for their part from those on national level.

Here sometimes fades the boundary between 'measure' and 'given circumstances'. Is the current Dutch coast the consequence of human measures or should one speak of 'given circumstances'? A once performed measure then is a given circumstance, a condition for subsequent measures. To keep this chapter clear and readable anything deviating from a reference situation will be concerned as 'measure'. Every time two states will be compared: the reference and its deviation by application of the 'measure' concerned. The impacts of that measure are assessed. Though we will try to formulate the 'measures' as context independent as possible the impact assessment remain context sensitive. To be able to apply such measures in other circumstances successively added theoretical insights are necessary.

The choice of reference in such a method of 'experimental impact assessment' is important. Choosing 'the average Dutch outskirts, filled with low-rise dwellings' as a reference produces a rather practical image of measures, but it is not well applicable for inner cities and high-rise areas. However, we are attached to raise some theoretical insight in aerodynamics. So, we will change references to show impacts that can not be assessed in a standard reference. So, the reference sometimes will have a theoretical character like 'a city in the sea' or 'a sea in the city' to clarify impacts by extremes. In practice after all, a measure lies between these extremes. By attention for extremes not only one specific measure is discussed, but a range of measures with gradually changing impacts.

2.1.6 Measures, targeted impacts per level of scale

The measures discussed in this chapter can be taken on the level of

- national choice of location (100km radius, page 107)
- regional choice of location (30 km radius, page 113)
- arrangement of rural areas, form of conurbations (10 km radius, page 125)
- local choice of location (10 km radius, page 122)
- form of town and town edge (3 km radius, page 131)
- lay-out of districts and district quarters (1 km radius, page 129)
- allotment of neighbourhoods and neighbourhood quarters (300 m radius, page 146)
- allotment and urban details and ensembles divided in 4 hectares (100 m radius, page 141)
- buildings (radius 30m), and
- the micro climate, important for humans, plants and animals (radius 10m).

The conditionality into two directions is self evident. To be able to compare variants on one level a reference on any other level is presupposed. That creates difficulties in comparing measures on different levels of scale, because references have to change to reach more general insight in impacts. Moreover, for every several impact (on energy saving, energy production, air pollution and comfort) other characteristics of wind are relevant. For instance for energy saving wind statistics of the winter season are relevant, for other impacts those of the whole year, eventually specified per season. If not otherwise mentioned this chapter counts on wind statistics of the whole year.

2.2 National choice of location

2.2.1 National distribution of wind velocity

What kind of difference does it make choosing a new housing estate near Amsterdam or Eindhoven concerning energy use, the possibility to extract energy from wind, the dispersion of air pollution and the comfort of outdoor space?

To weigh different building locations concerning these impacts on a national level a simple calculation of wind statistics per location is needed. Here we give a description of such calculations.

On more than 50 locations in The Netherlands wind velocity is regularly measured (Fig. 225).



Selection from Wieringa, Rijkoort et al. (1983) page 28
Fig. 225 Wind stations in the period 1945-1980



Selection from Wieringa, Rijkoort et al. (1983) page 84
Fig. 226 Year average potential wind velocity⁷⁰

Wind stations register gusts of more than 5 seconds duration. All measurements are averaged for one hour resulting in the 'hour average wind velocity'⁷¹. From these hour averages a year average can be calculated, the 'year average wind velocity'⁷². Obstacles around the wind station introduce a deviation by which these data are not immediately applicable in neighbouring locations. The correction into a 'standard ground roughness 3' (grass land) and a standard height of 10 metre produces the 'year average potential wind velocity' given in Fig. 226. Using local ground data (roughness classes) from the year average potential wind velocity one can calculate back the year average wind velocity of neighbouring locations on different heights.

2.2.2 Closer specification of wind statistics

However, in the year average wind velocity some data are lost relevant for energy use, potential energy profit, dispersion of air pollution and comfort of outdoor space as impact of different wind velocities.

Firstly we miss a specification of wind direction and a statistical distribution into different wind velocities throughout the year. For that purpose we still have to go back to the sources the 'distributive frequency division of the hour average wind velocity per wind direction, reduced to 10 metre height above open ground' per wind station. In Fig. 227 this frequency division of wind station Schiphol in the years 1951 - 1976 is given in numbers per 10 000 observations.

Velocity Still or Class* variable		E**												S		W		N		TOTAL
m/sec	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12							
vk	w																			
0,5	348	10	8	11	10	12	16	14	16	15	9	13	14	148						
1,5	78	39	43	50	51	58	72	53	66	51	36	44	55	618						
2,5	15	59	82	98	80	97	132	111	119	84	68	79	102	1111						
3,5	2	88	118	133	94	118	155	160	125	106	84	94	107	1382						
4,5		86	132	136	86	124	150	170	113	110	77	87	87	1358						
5,5		82	110	101	55	86	121	157	113	112	74	76	71	1158						
6,5		74	112	82	46	71	100	163	119	109	73	76	66	1091						
7,5		46	88	52	22	47	73	113	123	98	58	62	42	824						
8,5		38	59	29	8	27	51	92	90	77	48	37	26	582						
9,5		21	44	17	5	17	32	68	84	59	40	29	15	431						
10,5		13	29	14	3	10	21	52	70	45	30	17	7	311						
11,5		8	14	6	1	4	13	32	53	32	19	10	4	196						
12,5		4	8	3		2	8	25	45	26	14	7	3	145						
13,5		1	3	1		1	4	15	30	17	7	4	2	85						
14,5		1	2	1			1	8	20	9	4	3		49						
15,5			1				1	6	12	6	3	1		30						
16,5								3	8	4	3	1		19						
17,5								2	8	4	2			16						
18,5								2	5	3	1			11						
19,5								1	2	1	1			5						
20,5									2	1				3						
21,5									1	1				2						
22,5									1					1						
TOTAL	443	570	853	734	461	674	950	1247	1225	970	651	640	601	10000						
* Here the middle of the class ± 0,5 is mentioned only.																				
** Here the wind direction in 'hours of the clock' are given; 12 hour indicates North.																				
'12 hour' contains all wind directions between -10 en 10 degrees from North.																				

Vermeulen, Hoogeveen et al. (1983) Enclosure 4.27

Fig. 227 Frequency division w of wind velocity per class vk Schiphol 1951 until 1976 per 10 000.

Frequency divisions like Fig. 227 are available from every wind station mostly specified per summer (may – october) and winter (november – april) half year and sometimes even per month.
 Calculating the average wind velocity in Schiphol from Fig. 227 as

$$vg = \frac{\sum w * vk}{\sum w} = \frac{54420}{10000} = 5.442 \frac{m}{sec}$$

fits in the velocity class 5 – 5.5 m/s of location Schiphol indicated in Fig. 226.

In the last row of Fig. 227 all observations are specified by wind direction (Fig. 228).




Fig. 228 Compass card, per 10 000 observations

Because there are 10 000 observations, one can directly read from Fig. 228 that 12% of the wind in Schiphol comes from directions 7 and 8. Together that is roughly 25% from South – West.

Fig. 229 shows Fig. 227 as a diagram of frequency divisions of wind velocity per class in total and per direction.




Fig. 229 A diagram of Fig. 227

Fig. 230 Weibull-distribution

The form of the graphs is highly similar to the mathematical graph of a *Weibull* probability distribution⁷³ like

$$P(v, C, a) := a \cdot C \cdot v^{C-1} \cdot e^{-a \cdot v^C}$$

represented in Fig. 230 with C and a as form and scale parameters specific for every location (Fig. 231).


	form	schale	% from direction ('hours' from North, 0 is calm or variable):												
						E			S			W			N
	C	a	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Beek	2,01	0,042	2	7	9	7	3	4	10	20	17	8	4	4	4
Den Helder	2,00	0,014	1	6	7	8	6	5	10	13	12	10	8	8	7
Eelde	1,74	0,059	3	6	8	8	7	5	9	14	14	10	7	5	4
Eindhoven	1,86	0,052	8	7	8	5	6	6	7	13	16	9	6	5	4
Schiphol	1,86	0,032	4	6	9	7	5	7	10	12	12	10	7	6	6
Vlissingen	1,95	0,025	1	9	9	6	4	5	9	13	13	11	6	7	7

Fig. 231 Weibull parameters en contribution per wind direction for 6 stations.

By this formula with tables like Fig. 231 we can avoid long tables like Fig. 227 and calculate back a stepless distribution of wind velocities in 12 directions on any location with the roughness of grassland. That represents local wind characteristics we need to connect to the impact characteristics from page 111. Later on we will show how per direction local landscape characteristics other than grassland are calculated in.

2.2.3 The energy profit of wind turbines

The number of observations of wind blowing with a given velocity and direction $w(v,d)$ in Fig. 227 per number of observations 10 000 for many years in the past, is equivalent to its probability $P(v,d)$ for the future. $P(v,d)$ is proportional to the number of hours $h(v,d)$ that kind of wind blowing from the total number of hours in a year. So $h(v,d) = 8\,766 \times P(v,d)$. That number of hours determines the energy profit of wind turbines in an year. For example, if you know the power a wind turbine delivers on every velocity (power characteristic, see Fig. 222) you can find the profit by multiplying the number of expected hours that velocity will occur in an environment of grass land (Fig. 232).



Westra and Tossijn (1980), page 37

Fig. 232 The way of calculating energy profit of a wind turbine

Comparing national locations concerning the profit of wind turbines, direction of wind does not yet play the rôle it does concerning energy losses in buildings or comfort of outdoor space. The turbine after all can turn with the wind where buildings can not. On lower levels of scale we have to make this calculation for every direction separately reduced by its specific roughness other than grass land.

However, this diagram of calculation can be used to estimate the impact of national choice of location on energy use of buildings, the comfort of outdoor space and the dispersion of air pollution as well. So, we will elaborate it for the difference in energy profit of wind turbines in the environment of Schiphol and Eindhoven.

In Fig. 233 left the velocity frequencies per direction of wind from Fig. 227 and Fig. 229 are summarised into a total frequency division while the contribution of every separate direction remains (cumulatively) recognisable. Point of departure still is a standard height of 10 metres and a ground roughness comparable to open grass land. On lower levels of scale we will vary them as well.




Fig. 233 Calculating the energy profit of a specific wind turbine in the environment of Schiphol

Left in Fig. 233 the expected number of hours per velocity is given. The power characteristic of the wind turbine per velocity in the middle of Fig. 233 is equivalent to Fig. 222. Multiplying the number of hours of every subsequent velocity by the corresponding power produces the energy profit right in Fig. 233.

Apparently the wind turbine delivers most energy on directions 6, 7, 8 and 9 'hour'. So in that directions we have to keep the site open. However situating a wind turbine South East of town shields the turbine from an also considerable contribution from North West (1, 2 and 3 'hour'). So you can situate it better somewhat above West of town.

Comparing national locations can be done more simple by a rule of thumb for the energy profit of wind turbines with a height of 10m surrounded by open grass land⁷⁴:

$$E = 2 \cdot v_g^3 \cdot O$$

E = total yearly energy production in kWh/ m²-year
 v_g = year average wind velocity averaged per hour
 O = surface of rotor

In Fig. 234 the energy profits presupposing a height of 10m in open grass land near Schiphol and Eindhoven are compared this way.

Schiphol:	$2 \cdot 5,4^3 = 315 \text{ kWh/ m}^2$	$\times 340 \text{ m}^2 = 107\,000 \text{ kWh}$
Eindhoven:	$2 \cdot 4,25^3 = 154 \text{ kWh/ m}^2$	$\times 340 \text{ m}^2 = 522\,000 \text{ kWh}$

Fig. 234 The energy profit of wind turbines in Schiphol and Eindhoven by rule of thumb

The total profit of a reference turbine of 340m² of 10m height in all directions surrounded by grass land is in the environment of Schiphol approximately 100 000 kWh per year and in Eindhoven approximately 50 000 kWh.

We neglected amongst others height and wind direction differentiating velocity and local roughness. Wind supply is reduced from different directions, but most wind turbines are erected higher, reducing this impact. In Fig. 235 is indicated how wind velocity in open grass land (the international standard for local wind velocity measures) increases by height z. We will discuss this factor more precisely in paragraph 2.4.2.




Fig. 235 Wind velocity factor for height

Fig. 236 Contribution per wind direction 10m height

Because the energy profit of wind turbines increases proportional to the third power of wind velocity (see rule of thumb on page 117) you can adapt the average wind velocity v_g by this factor to the third power. The wind velocity on 20m according to Fig. 235 is $\times 1,13$ higher than on 10m. To the third power this factor becomes 1,44. By this factor you can multiply the profit on 10m to get the profit on 20m (for Schiphol and Eindhoven approximately 155 000 kWh and 75 000 kWh per year respectively). The absolute differences of both locations increase, as well as the contributions of different wind directions (Fig. 236).

2.2.4 Energy losses from buildings

The way of calculation in Fig. 232 can be applied to energy losses of buildings, the distribution of air pollution and the comfort of outdoor space as well. In that case you do not multiply the expected occurrences of wind velocities by those in the power characteristic of wind turbines, but by those of the respective other characteristics mentioned on page 111.

Energy losses from buildings by wind not only consist of ventilation losses, but we will neglect other ones (convection, precipitation) as less important (see Vermeulen and Jong, 1985). For ventilation losses from dwellings we will restrict ourselves to wind data from the heating season, not importantly differing from better accessible data concerning the winter half year. The average wind velocity in a winter half year is approximately 10% higher than throughout the year (Fig. 237 and Fig. 238).




Fig. 237 Winter half year velocities Schiphol

Fig. 238 Winter half year velocities Eindhoven

Fig. 239 Winter probabilities Schiphol

Fig. 240 Winter probabilities Eindhoven

The probability (number of hours) of wind from all directions is approximately the same in winter as throughout the year for all directions (Fig. 239 and Fig. 240).

In Fig. 241, Fig. 221 is repeated: the ventilation characteristic of an average one family low rise dwelling and an average more airtight one family high rise apartment. In this graph the average

occupant's behaviour to open windows at wind velocities lower than approximately 5 m/s is recognisable. This behaviour sometimes makes wind suppressing measures decreasing wind velocity less than 5 m/sec useless.




Fig. 241 Ventilation characteristic




Fig. 242 Ventilation losses per dwelling

As expected Fig. 242 shows low rise family dwellings lose more in Schiphol (6861 kWh) than in Eindhoven (5557 kWh, 1300 kWh less). However, high rise dwellings lose *less* in Schiphol (2516 kWh) than in Eindhoven (2626 kWh, 110 kWh more). In Eindhoven with lower wind velocities people open up their windows more often and that counts negative in high rise buildings.

2.2.5 Temperature impacts

On which side you can shelter a dwelling best: the side of the coldest Easterly wind or the South-West side where most wind is coming from?

Answering this question requires input of temperature data. We choose an approach based on wind and temperature data Gids (1986) from wind station Eelde (with a wind characteristic between that of Schiphol and Eindhoven). We consider a period of the year between beginning December and the end of February. This approach gives a weight factor spreading heat losses by ventilation over 12 wind directions. Multiplied by the earlier mentioned figure for total energy losses of two dwellings in Schiphol en Eindhoven this produces contributions per wind direction as represented in Fig. 243 and Fig. 244.




Fig. 243 Ventilation losses weighting temperature per wind direction Schiphol

Fig. 244 Ventilation losses weighting temperature per wind direction Eindhoven

Sheltering on East (3 "hour" or 90°) appears to be nearly as effective as sheltering West South West (8 "hour" or 240°), though highest velocities come from South West⁷⁵.

2.2.6 Comfort of outdoor space

The same approach without temperature impacts, this time using the tentative graph Fig. 224 reproduced in Fig. 245 would produce Fig. 246.




Fig. 245 Tentative comfort characteristic

Fig. 246 Tentative appreciation comfort

In Fig. 246 the appreciation of every velocity is multiplied again by the respective probable velocity per direction. For all directions together Schiphol would get 11 000, Eindhoven 16 000 points. Schiphol would probably like shelter in directions with a Westerly component. Eindhoven probably does not need any shelter but eventual complaints are most probably caused by wind from North West (10 or 11 "hour")⁷⁶.

2.2.7 Dispersion of air pollution

The higher the wind velocity the better air pollution is dispersed, though increasing velocities have diminishing returns. This impact is tentatively represented in Fig. 223 repeated in Fig. 245.




Fig. 247 Tentative air pollution characteristic

Fig. 248 Tentative air pollution dispersion

The impact having an overall positive relation to wind velocity, it shows pronounced similarity with the compass chart of Fig. 228. In Schiphol air pollution is better dispersed. The multiplication produces approximately 16 000 in Schiphol and 12 500 in Eindhoven.

2.2.8 Summary national comparison

Comparing Schiphol and Eindhoven on these criteria with most reservations concerning the tentative ones, Fig. 249 shows which location scores best⁷⁷.

CRITERION		WIND DIRECTION						7 8 9 10				11 12 TOT		
1	minimise ventilation loss	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
2	maximise wind energy	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
3	maximise dispersion of air pollution	S	S	S	S	S	S	X	E	S	S	S	S	S
4	optimise outdoor space comfort	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E

S: Schiphol better E: Eindhoven better X: No difference

Fig. 249 Comparison Schiphol and Eindhoven on 4 criteria

Temperature impacts are neglected. The evaluation of dispersion of air pollution is highly similar to the energy profit of wind turbines and the evaluation of outdoor space comfort is similar to that of ventilation losses from non airtight buildings. The difference for such buildings is substantial (1 300 kWh/year in favour of Eindhoven), but in the case of airtight buildings the much lower difference (110 kWh/year) is paradoxically in favour of Schiphol by the behaviour of inhabitants (more closed windows). In the next paragraphs we will restrict to energy profits of wind turbines and ventilation loss in airtight and non airtight buildings. In case of non airtight buildings we can use the conclusions mostly for outdoor comfort as well and in case of energy profits of wind turbines in the same time we can think of dispersion of air pollution.

2.3 Regional choice of location

On a regional level you no longer can take grassland in all directions as a standard of comparison. Wind is hampered by vegetation and buildings. On a regional level we not yet see them individually, but roughly as 'roughness'. New buildings are sheltered by vegetation or existing (sometimes less air tight) buildings. However, they shelter other locations themselves. So, locating new buildings sheltered is not always obvious, especially when they are airtight. There are arguments to locate new buildings South West of town as well (sheltering old less airtight ones, comfort of existing outdoor space, dispersion of air pollution, possibilities to yield wind energy at location).

In this paragraph we restrict ourselves to regions comparable to Schiphol as far as wind statistics are concerned. We concentrate on roughness of surrounding grounds. Due to the Weibull approach (Fig. 230) we do not need tables with all occurring velocities like Fig. 227. We can use the average velocity (like Fig. 237) and its probability (Fig. 239) per direction, summarized again in Fig. 250.







WIND DIRECTION :	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOT*
in degrees from North :	30	60	90	120	150	180	210	240	270	300	330	0	
			E			S			W			N	
whole year													
m/sec average	5,30	5,68	4,89	4,19	4,71	5,08	6,14	6,97	6,51	6,14	5,44	4,67	5,43
hours/ year	500	747	643	404	519	832	1074	1072	850	574	563	528	8766
*inclusive periods of calm or variable direction													

Fig. 250 Potential wind velocities and their probabilities Schiphol

In this paragraph we consider wind velocities in winter to be 10% the year average from Fig. 250 (important for calculating ventilation losses and comfort of outdoor space). The probability from a specific direction we take equal to half the values from Fig. 250.

2.3.1 Roughness of surrounding grounds

In wind surveys classes of roughness are distinguished (Fig. 251)

Classes of roughness			
1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • open sea • pond with free brush length of at least 1km 	
2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land surface without obstacles or vegetation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ shallow ○ beach ○ ice plain ○ snow landscape without trees • pond with free brush length of approximately 1km 	
3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flat land with shallow vegetation (grass) and isolated, rarefied obstacles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ air strip ○ grassland without trees ○ fallow fields 	
4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • farm land with regular low (<0,5 m) crops • grassland with ditches on mutual distance less than 20 x their width • dispersed obstacles on mutual distance of more that 20 x their own height: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ low hedges ○ singular row trees without leaves ○ singular farms 	
5		<p>$H < 2 \text{ m}$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • farm land with alternating high and low crops • vineyards, maize fields <p>$2\text{m} < H < 5\text{m}$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low orchards • influential obstacles with mutual distance 15 x their own height: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ rows of trees with leaves 	
6		<p>$3\text{m} < H < 10\text{m}$:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • groups of obstacles with a mutual distance of 10x their typical height: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ large farmsteads ○ parcels of forest ○ dispersed shrubs ○ young densely planted woods ○ orchards 	






Classes of roughness	
7	 <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>10<H<15m</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  </div> </div>
8	

Fig. 251 *Classes of roughness*

The standard class supposed in wind data is class 3⁷⁸. Wind characteristics on locations surrounded by other classes of roughness are derived mathematically from the data provided in class 3. We will now concentrate on a location of a residential area (class of roughness 7) Leidscheveen between Zoetermeer and Voorburg - Leidschendam⁷⁹. The experimental question is, to compare wind climate without Leidscheveen, with Leidscheveen and when Leidscheveen would have been built adjacent to Zoetermeer ('VoZo'). In paragraph 2.3.5 we will compare several arrangements of green and buildings (roughness 6, 7 and 8) between Zoetermeer and Delft with or without a residential area Rokkeveen adjacent to Zoetermeer.




Fig. 252 Study area Den Haag – Zoetermeer – Delft

2.3.2 Impact of new urban area lose from or adjacent to town in case of Westerly wind

Fig. 253 shows a 30° cutout from ‘zero point’ in Zoetermeer direction West (‘9 hour’). Fig. 254 shows the calculated average wind velocity on 20m height in the reference. Below the graph the reference is styled as sequence of different roughnesses. The numbers refer to the classes of roughness in Fig. 251. Such calculations utilise the parameters from the last two columns of Fig. 251.




Fig. 253 Voorburg -> Zoetermeer reference

Fig. 254 Average wind velocity Fig. 253

Fig. 255 Voorburg with Leidscheveen lose

Fig. 256 Zoetermeer with VoZo adjacent

Fig. 255 shows Leidscheveen 1km lose from Voorburg. This urban area with approximately 8 500 dwellings slows down wind on 20m height roughly from 5 to 4 m/sec, but it has little impact on the built up area of Zoetermeer 3,5 km further on without obstacles inbetween. Fig. 256 shows an imaginary variant with VoZo adjacent to Zoetermeer. In Fig. 254 (reference) on zero point (right) an imaginary wind turbine has 10 530 kWh/year energy profit due to Westerly wind only; equivalent energy losses from a non airtight dwelling are 750 kWh/year. In Fig. 255 they decrease by 760 and 20; in Fig. 256 by 3 010 and 170 kWh/year.

2.3.3 Impact of new urban area lose or adjacent in case of Easterly wind

Fig. 257 to Fig. 260 show reference and experiments to clarify the impact in case of Easterly wind on 'zero point' Voorburg. They are less realistic to remain comparable with the previous experiment.




Fig. 257 Zoetermeer -> Voorburg reference

Fig. 258 Average wind velocity Fig. 257

Fig. 259 Zoetermeer -> Voorburg with Leidscheveen

Fig. 260 Zoetermeer -> Voorburg variant

Fig. 258 immediately shows the lower average wind velocity from East compared with West. So, the impact is less as well. On the new zero point an imaginary wind turbine has 3070 kWh/year energy profit due to Easterly wind only; equivalent energy losses from a non airtight dwelling are 460. In Fig. 259 they decrease by 1000 and 23 in Fig. 260 by 710 and 60 kWh/year.

2.3.4 Impacts on energy losses by ventilation behind the edge in the interior of town

Fig. 261 shows the impacts of regional alternatives behind the Westerly edge of Zoetermeer. They decrease fast within 100m. Fig. 262 shows the same behind the Easterly edge of Voorburg. They are smaller because Westerly wind blows more often and stronger (see page 118) and the foreland of Voorburg already had a higher roughness than Zoetermeer, but lower temperatures neglected here could increase the impact.




Fig. 261 Impact Westerly wind on Zoetermeer

Fig. 262 Impact Easterly wind Voorburg

So, the total impact on ventilation losses is small, though they have some significance for comfort of outdoor space. That is why we pay not much intention to calculating these impacts more precise now, but they are point of departure and give insight for calculating measures on lower levels of scale. Not only temperature could affect the outcome, but also impacts perpendicular on the direction of wind. These 'lateral impacts' depend on the total form of the conurbation. They will be studied closer in 2.4.3 page 131. Furthermore we have to realise that these calculations are based on average roughnesses. Wide ways, open allotment and lay-out of the edge could increase wind loads inside of town locally substantially. We should conclude that in calculating the impact of measures on lower levels of scale the regional lay-out adjacent to towns are most important. So, we have to examine them in more detail.

2.3.5 Highways, railways, green areas and forests

Fig. 263 shows a 10km long cutout of 30° this time seen from zero point Zoetermeer in wind direction '8 hour' to Delft. The largest zone is farm land (roughness 4) increasing wind velocity up to 6.67 m/sec on the edge of town Zoetermeer in Fig. 264.




Fig. 263 Delft -> Zoetermeer reference

Fig. 264 Average wind velocity in reference of Fig. 263

Fig. 265 Delft -> Zoetermeer simplified reference

Fig. 266 Delft -> Zoetermeer with Rokkeveen

Fig. 265 simplifies Fig. 264 by gathering Delft and Delftse Hout as a zone with roughness 6. This simplification increases wind velocity at the edge of town Zoetermeer from 6,67 m/sec in Fig. 264 to

6,74 m/sec in Fig. 265. Such differences at more than 5km distance apparently do not matter much. So, Fig. 265 becomes our reference. In Fig. 266 Rokkeveen is added⁸⁰. Though this residential area has a great impact on the wind velocity profile, for the town edge of Zoetermeer the impact is surprisingly less than we would expect because after slowing down above Rokkeveen the wind accelerates within 500m very fast above railways and highway A12 between Rokkeveen and existing Zoetermeer⁸¹. So, the impact of Rokkeveen reduces wind velocity from 6,74 to 5,92 m/s, reducing ventilation loss on the edge of town Zoetermeer by only 90 kWh/dwelling-year (1 m³ natural gas).

In Fig. 267 before Rokkeveen a green structure replaces farm land (roughness 6 see page 123).




Fig. 267 Delft -> Zoetermeer with green structure

Fig. 268 Delft -> Zoetermeer 1km regular forest added

Fig. 269 Delft -> Zoetermeer 1km heavy forest added

Fig. 270 The same, with farm land instead of green structure

In Fig. 268 except this green structure 1km forest (roughness 7) is added as well. Both cases do not make much difference on the old town edge. The impact is more than undone by railways and highway. Wind velocity is compared to the reference decreased from 6,74 to respectively 5,45 and 5,35 m/sec, but the largest amount was already caused by Rokkeveen. At the old town edge ventilation losses caused by this direction of wind are decreased by approximately 150 kWh/dwelling-year and for adjacent directions something comparable but smaller.

In Fig. 269 regular forest is replaced by heavy forest (roughness 8). Wind velocity at the old town edge then decreases somewhat (5,25 m/sec), but not significant though the wind profile changes substantially. The fast increase above Rokkeveen is remarkable.

In Fig. 270 the impact of a lower roughness on larger distance is studied by replacing Delft, Delftse Hout and green structure by farm land. By these measures wind velocity at the old town edge still increases from 5,25 to 5,71 m/sec.

2.4 Local measures

2.4.1 Local shelter of residential areas

From Chapter 2.2 we learned that the impact of relatively small linear open spaces as railways and highways perpendicular on wind is substantial. Wind sheltering action has to be taken as close to the residential area as possible. That is why we shift our attention some kilometres into a cutout with its zero point in Rokkeveen itself (8 'hour' South West see Fig. 252). This residential area is not separated from its foreland by a highway or wide water. So, shelter can adjoin immediately to residential area.




Fig. 271 *Reference windvelocity*

Fig. 272 *Delft -> Rokkeveen with 6km green structure*

Fig. 273 *Delft -> Rokkeveen with 1km regular forest*

Fig. 274 *Delft -> Rokkeveen with 1km heavy forest*

In Fig. 271 we suppose above Delft a stable velocity of less than 4 m/sec. Above 1km Delftse Hout it climbs up and stabilises on 4.5 m/sec in a few hundred metres. Then above 5 km farmland it starts to climb up fast continuing to increase more slowly to 6.52 m/sec. Then above Rokkeveen it slows down fast to 4.61 m/sec and outside the graph slowly to 4.2 km/sec above above suburban built up area. In Fig. 272 farmland is replaced by green structure (roughness 6). Then wind velocity at the edge of Rokkeveen decreases substantially from 6.52 to 4.73 m/sec. Energy loss per non airtight dwelling per year as far as due to wind from this direction decreases 190 kWh only (from 987 kWh to 797 kWh). If the last km before Rokkeveen would have been replaced by green structure only, velocity would reduce to 5.23 m/sec. Ventilation loss would still reduce by 141 kWh. Would 1km roughness higher than 6 have more impact?

In Fig. 273 and Fig. 274 only the last km before Rokkeveen farmland (roughness 4) is replaced by regular forest (roughness 7) and heavy forest (roughness 8). From these thought experiments we conclude 1km regular forest has approximately the same impact as 6km green structure. However, 1km heavy forest with rather high trees (15m) reduces wind velocity substantially to 2.90 m/sec at the edge of town. Energy loss per non airtight dwelling per year as far as due to wind from this direction there decreases 324 kWh from 987 kWh to 663 kWh. However, above suburban built up area wind velocity increases again fast stabilising on approximately 4.2 m/sec.

Fig. 275 and Fig. 276 compare regional remote (see 2.3.5) and locally adjacent (see above) impacts.




Fig. 275 Impact regional layout on Zoetermeer separated by railways and highway

Fig. 276 Impact locally adjacent shelter on Rokkeveen

Represented impacts are restricted to 1 of 12 wind directions. Figures may be multiplied by a factor 3 to 5 if more directions are sheltered. The impact is decreasing fastly up to 100m in the urban area.

2.4.2 Increase of wind velocity by height

Preceding calculations are tacitly restricted to velocity differences in direction of wind itself (x-direction) and not perpendicular on x (in width y and height z). In Fig. 235 we casually mentioned the importance of velocity differences in height (z-direction), but then the view restricted to a height of 10m (international standard measuring wind) and passing chapter 2.2 to 20m (where wind is not disturbed substantially by single buildings).

On differences in wind velocity perpendicular to wind direction in width (lateral differences in wind velocity) we did not say more than mention them (2.3.4). Tacitly we supposed styled roughnesses and velocities to be continued endlessly perpendicular to the surface of drawing.

However, on this level of scale we can not maintain these simplifications. A separated built up area ('roughness island') undergoes substantial impacts from wind parallel to its edges. Wind survey yielded experimental results by which we can estimate these lateral impacts. However, that requires some insight in increase of wind velocity by height.

To calculate wind velocity v as a working of height z ($v(z)$, wind profile, see Fig. 214, Fig. 278 and Fig. 279) we divide the atmosphere from the largest height $z=d_3$ where wind still is influenced by Earth's surface to the ground in tree layers:

90% 'boundary layer' from d_3 to $0.1 \times d_3$;

9% 'wall layer' from $d_2 = 0.1 \times d_3$ to $d_1 = 0.01 \times d_3$;

1% 'viscous layer' from d_1 to ground level.

The wind velocity of these layers can be approximated by three different formulas (Voorden 1982, Appendix B):

(1) where $d_3 > z > d_2$: $v_3(z) = v_{d3} \cdot (z/d_3)^\alpha$;

(2) where $d_2 \geq z \geq d_1$: $v_2(z) = (v_{d3} \cdot 0.4 / (\text{Sqr}(25 + (\ln(d_3/d_0))^2)) / 0.4) \cdot \ln(z/d_0)$;

(3) where $d_1 > z > 0$: $v_1(z) = v_2(d_1) \cdot ((2 \cdot z/d_1) - (z^2/d_1^2))$.

If we know velocity v at d_3 (v_{d3}) the exponential formula (1) produces a velocity for every z in boundary layer below d_3 supposed we know d_3 and exponent α . Exponent α and d_3 are parameters dependent on roughness, we can take them from Fig. 277. For the wall layer the logarithmic formula (2) needs an other parameter d_0 different for every roughness as well (Fig. 277). In an urban environment with much local turbulence the lowest viscous layer has theoretical value only. But for roughnesses lower than 5

we can approximate wind velocities by parabolic formula (3). Within formula (3), formula (2) is used to calculate $v_2(d_1)$.

Rough-ness class	α	d_3	d_2	d_1	d_0	parameters used elsewhere	
						$D(h)$	β
		m	m	m	m		
1	0.104	250	25.0	2.50	0.0002	0	0.07
2	0.144	275	27.5	2.75	0.005	0	0.08
3	0.181	300	30.0	3.00	0.03	0	0.09
4	0.213	350	35.0	3.50	0.1	0	0.11
5	0.245	400	40.0	4.00	0.25	0.3 0.7	0.14
6	0.273	450	45.0	4.50	0.5	0.7	0.16
7	0.313	475	47.5	4.75	1	0.8	0.18
8	0.363	500	50.0	5.00	2	0.8	0.20

Fig. 277 parameters dependent from roughness in formulas used in wind surveys.

If we do not know v_{d3} , but we know v_{10m} or v_{20m} , we can vary the upper scroll bar of the computer programme Windvelocity(height), - downloadable from <http://team.bk.tudelft.nl> publications 2003 - to get the right profile.




Fig. 278 Exponential $v_3(z)$ and Logarithmic $v_2(z)$ increase of wind velocity by height




Fig. 279 Logarithmic $v_2(z)$ and Parabolic $v_1(z)$ increase of wind velocity by height

Jong (2001)

In the logarithmic formula (3) factor $v_{d3} \cdot 0.4 / (\text{Sqr}(25 + (\ln(d_3 / d_0))^2))$ is known as 'wall shearing stress velocity'.

2.4.3 The form of a town

Fig. 280 shows the result of a wind tunnel experiment described in Vermeulen (1986). This experiment serves as a reference for thought experiments to follow.

Above a roughness island like a town or forest in a smooth environment discontinuities in wind velocity appear. The wind meets the edge of the roughness island for the first time ($x = 0$) still having a regular velocity profile like described on page 131. Above the roughness island a specific velocity profile is established with lower velocities than the surrounding smooth surface. However, on some height above the roughness island the old profile remains. The height up to where the new profile establishes its impact is called 'internal boundary layer thickness (Δi)'. The development of this boundary layer is

drawn by dots in Fig. 280. Behind the roughness island the old profile recovers up to a second boundary layer height. In the used model $x=300\text{cm}$ from the first change of roughness, the first boundary layer height (D_1) amounts $16,5\text{ cm}$, the second (D_2) $9,5\text{ cm}$.




Fig. 280 Wind velocity profiles in height

Fig. 281 Wind velocity profiles in width

Fig. 280 shows wind profiles from the beginning ($x=0$) above and behind (up to $x=300$) the roughness island in cross section in case that island would extend endlessly perpendicular to the surface of drawing. Fig. 281 shows wind profiles 3.9cm above the roughness island in front view limited on two sides on a distance of $x=\{0, 50, 100, 150\text{cm}\}$ from the front edge. At $x = 0$ wind still behaves undisturbed like above a smooth surface. After 50cm above the rough surface wind velocity has slowed down, but on both sides the velocity of the smooth surface remains. Between both velocities a lateral transitional zone develops. In the experiment the width of the transitional zone appears to be 1.2 times the internal boundary layer thickness D_1 .

Fig. 280 shows, the thickness of the internal boundary layer D_1 is approximately 1/10 times the distance to frontal edge x .

So, behind $x=1000\text{m}$ (where D_1 is approximately 100m) a transitional zone can penetrate the air above the roughness island already 120m from the side edges. When the island is 240m width the transitional zones meet each other. So, the wind velocity from this point on could increase by interacting lateral impacts to the back of the island in spite of the underlying roughness. For example, above an elongated separated urban area with its narrow front to South, Southerly wind not only slows down in its own direction, but produces on the Westerly and Easterly edges a side effect. This increases wind velocity by interaction above the Northern part of the area.

To examine this interaction in more detail a windtunnel experiment on a narrow roughness island is carried out. Fig. 282 shows a map of the model with hypotheses concerning the transition zone, and Fig. 283 a front view with the result of measurements.




Fig. 282 Hypothetical interaction above an elongated roughness island.

Fig. 283 Measurements above an elongated roughness island $x=100\text{cm}$.

Fig. 283 shows results of measurement near the point where interaction hypothetically should begin ($x=100\text{cm}$). Behind this point (shaded area in Fig. 282) wind velocity should increase anew. Examining these results next deviations draw attention:

- 1 wind velocity decreases more than expected (8,6 m/sec instead of 9,25 m/sec);
- 2 transition zone outside the roughness island is wider than $1,2 \cdot D_1 = 10,2 \text{ cm}$;
- 3 transition zone inside the roughness island is narrower than 10,2 cm.

We can explain these deviations concerning the possibility wind swerves out meeting a narrow roughness island (initial interaction). Fig. 284 represents this additional supposition. As a result of the crooked flow and the material used in the experiment in the very start wind meets a higher roughness than on perpendicular flow. That may explain the first effect. The other effects are caused by a slightly outward initial change of direction of the transition zone as a whole.




Fig. 284 Supposed initial interaction

Fig. 285 Arithmetical approach of lateral interaction with and without initial interaction

Fig. 285 shows how to calculate wind velocity in transition zones. Starting points are undisturbed velocities above smooth (v_{smooth}) and rough (v_{rough}) surfaces and their internal boundary layer thicknesses d_3 . The difference between both velocities has to be bridged. Above the island already 65 % is bridged, the remaining 35 % is bridged above the smooth surface. A wide roughness island has no initial interaction. The difference is bridged symmetrically in a distance of $1,2 \cdot D_1$. A roughness island narrower than $200 \times Z_0$ (roughness length, not the length of the island) causes initial interaction. Wind velocity difference is bridged over a much larger distance outside the island and above the rough surface over a somewhat smaller distance. The island of Fig. 283 was

25 cm wide, 80 times the roughness length $z_0 = 0,3$ cm, much less than 200. By initial interaction 65 % was bridged above the island over a distance D_1 (8,5 cm), the remaining 35 % over a distance $2 \cdot D_1$ (17 cm).

Returning to the thought experiment of page 125 concerning Leidscheveen we can put Fig. 255 on top of its background Fig. 254 as shown in Fig. 286.




Fig. 286 Westerly wind in and around Leidscheveen from Fig. 254 and Fig. 255

Fig. 287 Leidscheveen as a roughness island

Fig. 287 shows Leidscheveen styled as a square of 2x2km. It has no initial interaction because it is wider than 200 times the roughness length $Z_0 = 1$ belonging to class 7. So, the transition zone will penetrate the built up area $1 \cdot 2 \cdot D_1$ m.

Fig. 288 and Fig. 289 are distorted details of Fig. 286 and Fig. 287.

Fig. 288 shows velocities outside and above Leidscheveen in more detail. Below their difference is represented. 65 % of the difference is bridged above rough urban area (Fig. 288). That is the way you find wind velocity on the edge in between the curves above. In the South East corner of Leidscheveen wind velocity is increased up to 5 m/sec by lateral impacts, while earlier calculations (Fig. 286) indicated there 3,7 m/sec. This velocity is not reached on the East edge until 300 meter ($1 \cdot 2 \cdot D_1$) from the South edge (Fig. 289).




Fig. 288 Given (continues lines) and calculated (dotted) wind velocities outside and above Leidscheveen as distorted detail from Fig. 286

Fig. 289 Transition zone penetrating from South in normal decrease of Westerly wind velocity above Leidscheveen as distorted detail from Fig. 287

From Fig. 280 we learned D_1 (the height where the undisturbed wind velocity meets the disturbed one) is approximately $1/10$ of x . So, we can approximate the distance from the South edge (Fig. 285) $1.2 \times D_1$ in Fig. 289 by drawing a straight line into the South West corner of the island, but here it is calculated according to a method by Vermeulen (1983). From Fig. 288 we know the velocity above Leidscheveen without lateral effect at the East edge (3.7m/sec) and the penetrating velocity in the South East corner (5m/sec). Inbetween the velocity increases proportional (Fig. 285) to the distance from the South edge. The velocities on the South edge we know from Fig. 288 as well. Connecting points of equal wind velocity at the East and South edge we get 'altitude' lines of equal wind velocity.

The below left quadrant of Fig. 290 is a copy from Fig. 289 mirrored 1km above and extrapolated 4km into the East. Width (1km) and length (4km) are not proportionally drawn. Now interaction appears behind the point where $1.2 \cdot D_1$ -lines cross. According to Vermeulen (1986) the 'altitude' lines within the interaction area you can simply connect.




Fig. 290 Elongated island head in wind (length drawn shortened)

Fig. 291 Head and flank in wind (proportionally drawn)

Fig. 291 'head in wind' shows the same model in true proportions: an elongated island with 'altitude lines' 4, 4,5 en 5m/sec adopted from Fig. 290. Wind velocity in heart line primarily drops from 4.8 to 3.8m/sec, but then increases up to 5m/sec on the East edge due to lateral impacts. Drawing the case 'flank in wind' the first left km from Fig. 290 is used only extrapolating the middle parts. In that case the urban area is surprisingly exposed to lower wind velocities because lateral impacts play practically no rôle. That conclusion is controversial to the usual intuition that elongated urban areas should be located with 'head in wind'. 'Flank in wind' appears to be better from a viewpoint of shelter. However, the question is how much this measure yields. Fig. 292 compares them by a grid of hectares.




Fig. 292 Wind velocities per hectare

Suppose there are 40 dwelling per hectare. From ventilation losses of non airtight dwellings due to Westerly wind we now can calculate the total difference.

Windvelocity	head	flank	Ventilation loss in kWh due to Westerly wind			
m/sec	ha	ha	Per dwelling	Per ha.	Total head	Totaal flank
3,75	88	252	504	20160	1774080	5080320
4,00	98	90	521	20840	2042320	1875600
4,25	12		539	21560	258720	
4,50	120	58	557	22280	2673600	1292240
4,75	34		577	23080	784720	
5,00	48		597	23880	1146240	
Totaal	400	400			8679680	8248160

Fig. 293 Difference in ventilation loss head and flank in wind

The difference due to western wind amounts $8679680 - 8248160 = 431\,520$ kWh per year (approximately 27 kWh average per dwelling). However, this amount can not be charged as profit by giving an elongated urban area a turn by 90° . On every orientation after all, the impact of at least four wind directions have to be analysed. Then the profit is the difference in impact from two wind directions head and two flank.

2.4.4 Dispersion of urban area

Is a non elongated ('compact') town better than a whether or not favourably oriented elongated or dispersed one? This question can not be answered for all cases because elongatedness is substantially dependent from orientation. Anyway, for Westerly wind in case of Leidscheveen the following is valid. Fig. 294 and Fig. 295 show three classes of wind velocity on a hectare grid.




Fig. 294 Compact town

Fig. 295 Dispersed town

From the ventilation loss per dwelling due to Westerly wind of 3,75, 4 en 4,50 m/sec we can calculate a difference (Fig. 296).

Windvelocity m/sec	Ventilationloss in kWh due to westerly wind					
	Compact ha	Spread ha	per woning	per ha	totaal compact	totaal gespreid
3,75	250	160	504	20160	5040000	3225600
4,00	72	128	521	20840	1500480	2667520
4,50	78	112	557	22280	1737840	2495360
Totaal	400				8278320	8388480

Fig. 296 Difference in ventilation loss in compact and dispersed towns

The difference in favour of building compact towns amounts $8388480 - 8278320 = 110\,160$ kWh per year only (approximately 7 kWh average per dwelling). Velocity and probability of Western wind amounts a little above the average. So, you can multiply this figure by approximately 10 to estimate the total profit.

Comparison with elongated forms is more difficult by orientation sensitivity. A fast method of multiplying the profit of westerly wind does not make sense then. For every several case the calculation has to be repeated for all 12 wind directions. We will not elaborate that.

The intended profit of this paragraph to be used in next paragraphs is insight in the importance of lateral wind effects as such.

2.4.5 The form of town edge

The acquired insights make rough study of town edge design possible. By doing that in the same time we reach the lowest level of scale roughness based calculations can be useful. On lower levels of scale the average image of roughness is disturbed too much by local form variations essential for urban design. However, they remain indispensable as input for predictions on lower levels of scale. The next chapter will examine levels of district and neighbourhood further by carefully designed wind tunnel experiments. They will link up connections between urban design and wind behaviour in more detail.

However, on the level of town edge design the roughness approach (grain approximately 100m radius) still makes sense for rough conclusions. We restrict to the impacts of large gaps in the city edge. They occur by large access roads with noise zones or green lobes penetrating the city.

Fig. 297 shows a model of a small town (approximately 50 duizend inwoners) with lobes like that.




Fig. 297 Small town with green lobes

Fig. 298 Wind velocity profile cross section A

Fig. 299 Wind velocity profile doorsnede B

Fig. 300 Difference profile A en B

Fig. 298 and Fig. 299 show the wind velocity profiles of cross section A and B in case it would be Leidscheveen blown by Western wind. Fig. 300 shows above the last 3000m of both profiles projected on top of each other. Below the difference between both profiles is represented; 65% has to be bridged laterally above urban area over a distance $1,2 \cdot D_1$. This determines wind velocity on the edge.

From these data we estimate again an average wind velocity per hectare.




Fig. 301 'Open' towns edge

Fig. 302 'Closed' towns edge

Fig. 301 shows lobes penetrating from four directions. In Fig. 302 the lobes are filled with forest of the same roughness as the urban area keeping the urban surface equal.

From the ventilation losses belonging to wind velocity 3,75, 4, 4,5 and 5m/sec due to westerly wind, Fig. 303 calculates the difference.

Windvelocity	Open	Closed	Ventilationloss in kWh due to westerly wind			
m/sec	ha	ha	per dwelling	per ha	total open	total closed
2,75	154	305	504	20160	3104640	6148800
4,00	184	74	521	20840	3834560	1542160
4,50	106	82	557	22280	2361680	1826960
5,00	21	4	597	23880	501480	95520
Totaal	465	465			9802360	9613440

Fig. 303 Difference in ventilation loss by 'open' and 'closed' town edge

The difference is $9\,802\,360 - 9\,613\,440 = 188\,920$ kWh per year (Approximately 10 kWh per dwelling). Multiplying Westerly wind impact by 10 the total average profit is approximately 100 kWh x 1860 dwellings.

2.4.6 Wind directions, temperature and built form

In chapter 2.2 we restricted our thought experiments to two wind directions and in this chapter even to one (Westerly wind). Assuming an average temperature for all wind directions we reported virtual ventilation losses of non airtight, low rise buildings due to Westerly wind as an indicator. Their *differences* clarified an impact of environmental roughness useful for other impacts as well. We exclusively varied regional and local environment applying different roughnesses, keeping the rest constant. Otherwise the impact of environmental roughness on itself could not be clarified. It would be mixed up with other causes (possible measures). To clarify other causes the reverse we have to keep environmental roughness constant. If we take one layout of roughnesses in the environment – the one we will use in next chapters for experiments in the wind tunnel (Fig. 308) – we can compare the contribution of every several wind direction and their temperature properly (Fig. 304). We calculated energy losses by ventilation for every wind direction in the same way we did above (column A and B) and for airtight dwellings (column C and D).

		without temperature influence				temperature influence		with temperature influence			
		non airtight		airtight		non airtight	airtight	non airtight		airtight	
wind direction		A	B	C	D	E	F	A x E	B x E	C x F	D x F
'hours'	degrees	kWh		kWh				kWh		kWh	
1	30	322	6%	154	6%	70%	66%	227	4%	101	4%
2	60	492	9%	228	9%	116%	111%	570	10%	254	10%
East 3	90	405	7%	201	8%	168%	151%	681	12%	304	12%
4	120	246	4%	129	5%	205%	174%	504	9%	225	9%
5	150	369	7%	186	8%	64%	57%	238	4%	106	4%
South 6	180	530	10%	259	10%	71%	65%	377	7%	168	7%
7	210	729	13%	232	9%	100%	141%	731	13%	326	13%
8	240	769	14%	315	13%	107%	116%	819	15%	365	15%
West 9	270	591	11%	253	10%	107%	111%	631	11%	281	11%
10	300	389	7%	172	7%	90%	91%	349	6%	156	6%
11	330	366	7%	173	7%	71%	67%	260	5%	116	5%
North 12	0	329	6%	167	7%	45%	40%	149	3%	67	3%
Total		5537	100%	2469	100%			5536	100%	2469	100%

Fig. 304 Contributions per wind direction to total energy loss by ventilation

In the lowest row 'Total', column A shows we can multiply the loss of Westerly wind by 10 to have an idea of total loss from all directions indeed. The totals without temperature influence are the same as those including temperature influence, because in columns A, B, C and D we assumed an average temperature of all directions.

Columns E and G show tentative weight factors for temperature, based on Visser (1986). Multiplying A, B, C and D by these factors produces the necessary correction to get a better idea about the real losses per direction. They are used in next chapters as well.




Fig. 305 Contributions per wind direction to total energy loss by ventilation without temperature influence (A and C in Fig. 304)

Fig. 306 Tentative correction factors for temperature influence (E and F in Fig. 304)

Fig. 305 and Fig. 306 show Easterly winds being less probable but colder have a larger impact on energy losses by ventilation than South Westerly winds. To understand why Southerly winds contribute more in airtight buildings (Hoogbouw in Fig. 306) than in non airtight ones (Laagbouw) you have to look at Fig. 221.

2.5 District and neighbourhood variants

2.5.1 From calculable 'rough surface' into allotments in a wind tunnel

Changing location and size of a homogenous undirected roughness, influences every external wind direction in the same way. However, changing form on a lower level of scale introduces internal directions within that field of roughness behaving differently even for one single external wind direction. And design can vary form within form. This complication you can imagine as 3 potter's wheels turning around the same centre. If we consider 12 directions, there are 12 x 12 x 12 combinations (Fig. 307).




Fig. 307 Three levels of schale where orientation has to be taken into account




Fig. 308 Supposed wind tunnel context by standard Northerly wind

The external wheel represents 12 local wind statistics (W1, W2, W3 ... concerning probability, velocity and temperature) as it applies outside and at the edge of the urban fragment we consider. The second wheel represents the considered fragment with its own arrow indicating North (β_1). In this chapter the direction of the allotment as a whole ($\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \dots$) is variable. The middle wheel represents façades within the allotment having variable orientations ($\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \dots$), causing different ventilation losses locally. In previous paragraphs α and β were neglected. Ventilation losses were averaged over all directions of allotments and façades.

In this chapter α and β are varied by interpreting tests of 18 different allotments in the wind tunnel of Visser (1986) from 7 different angles ($0^\circ - 90^\circ$ by steps of 15°) with a standardised W and foreland roughness (Fig. 308). From these 7 measured angles, 4 ($0^\circ - 90^\circ$ by steps of 30°) appeared to be sufficient to draw conclusions about all directions of allotment.

2.5.2 Wind tunnel experiments

On the level of districts and neighbourhoods 4 configurations 1 x 1 km Jong (1986) - fully elaborated in models 1:500 - are tested by Visser (1986). In each of the four models 30 x 2 measuring points were installed at front and back side of different building blocks to measure pressure differences (Fig. 309).

Right above in each configuration (Fig. 309) each time you find a quarter of a district centre. So, any configuration could be thought mirrored twice around this centre into a full district 2x2km consisting of 4 district quarters. Each configuration consists of 9 neighbourhood quarters 300x300m (one central, 8 peripheral). Each neighbourhood quarter consists of 9 ensemble quarters (hectares 100x100m one central, 8 peripheral). District roads are planted with trees; neighbourhood and ensemble roads are not.

The configuration is outside blown along from North to East (90° from North). At South and West side the configuration as a district quarter is part of an imaginary district filled up with equal roughness. In this paragraph we study the differences between the four configurations not trying to develop calculation models.




Fig. 309 District configurations in wind tunnel with measuring points indicated

Concerning the average result of all measuring points the differences between the configurations are remarkably small. However, there are substantial differences between locations within configurations. (Fig. 316 and Fig. 319). Fig. 310 shows hectare allotments applied in the tested configurations.







In configuration 1 and 2				
	Vrije sect. 30w/h 10m	Hoek1a 22w/ha 22m	Hof1 96 w/ha 15,5m	Hof4 53,3w/h 10m
In configuration 2			In configuration 3 and 4:	
	Lijn10 84w/ha 17m			Lijn12 53w/ha 10m

Fig. 310 Hectare allotments applied in the tested configurations

In paragraph 2.6.1 we study the results of 14 wind tunnel experiments by Visser (1986) on hectare level; 7 with green and 7 without. In these experiments a number of theoretical repeating point, line, corner and courtyard allotments 500x500m elaborated in models 1:250 are tested. The force these allotments undergo by standard wind is measured. From these tests TNO developed a calculation method for allotments repeating in two dimensions. By this method more types of allotment are calculated.

2.5.3 Pressure differences between front and back façades

Ventilation loss of a dwelling not only depends on wind statistics derived from year average wind velocity v_g on $z=10m$ height in the nearest wind measuring station ($v_g(10)$, for example 5,4m/sec near Schiphol). It depends also on the environment and orientation of the building block. On these more local factors pressure differences between front and back façades follow determining ventilation losses at last.

Pressure differences are proportional to driving pressure of wind: $0,5 \times \rho \times v_g(10)^2$. In this formula ρ (' ρ ') is the density of air. Pressure differences between front and back façades determining ventilation are measured in wind tunnel. Dividing such pressure differences by the local driving pressure of wind produces a factor $\Delta C_p(10)$ representing the resistance of an allotment independent from wind velocity. The result of wind tunnel tests are expressed in $\Delta C_p(10)$. Fig. 311 shows the relation between ventilation loss near Schiphol and $\Delta C_p(10)$ in any wind direction Visser (1986). Airtight buildings in $v_g(10)$ lose less energy by increasing pressure because inhabitants close windows they opened in less pressure!

Inside urban areas energy yield of wind turbines is less relevant. However, pressure difference is important as well for comfort of outdoor space, dispersion of air pollution and wind loads. But we have measured ventilation losses and will use it as an indicator.


Fig. 311 Ventilation loss related to $\Delta C_p(10)$ if $vg(10) = 5,4m/sec$ Fig. 312 $\Delta C_p(10)$ in measure points of configuration 1 in 4 directions

Fig. 312 shows $\Delta C_p(10)$ measured in every measure point of configuration 1 four times while wind was blowing 0° to 90° from y-axis each time turning the model 30° (any direction could be North). Measuring points 23 and 24 (high rise at a crossing, see Fig. 309 conf. 1) suffer the largest pressure differences, 23 on 0° , 24 on 60° and 90° . This kind of details we study in paragraph 2.5.5. This paragraph studies the averages in lowest row compared with the averages of the other configurations.

2.5.4 District lay out

The averages in lowest row of Fig. 312 seem to show the direction of wind does not matter but this is only the case in configuration 1. It is explained best because half of the measured blocks there are oriented perpendicular to the other half. So, the minimum ventilation loss of one building block compensates the maximum of the other one. Configuration 2 is less balanced that way and configurations 3 and 4 have only one orientation of building blocks (Fig. 313).




Fig. 313 Average $\Delta C_p(10)$ in different configurations two times mirrored around the centre.




Fig. 314 Average ventilation loss of a non airtight dwelling in kWh per allotment direction if standard Northerly wind would blow from all directions

Comparing the impact of locations and allotment directions we should use an equal standard wind (here Northerly wind, representing approximately 2.69% of the virtual total ventilation loss per allotment direction) for every allotment direction (Fig. 314). The virtual total ventilation loss then is 100%. Fig. 315 shows averages multiplied into such a virtual total. In configuration 1 it is 5 344 kWh for non airtight dwellings. That is less than we calculated by roughness 7 in Fig. 304 (5 536 kWh in column A X E), and for airtight dwellings it is more (3 266 kWh instead of 2 469 in column C x F). Perhaps the roughness class of configurations is closer to 8 than class 7 we used in paragraph 2.4.6 and supposed in Fig. 308.

	Configuration 1			Configuration 2		Configuration 3		Configuration 4	
	calculated								
	roughness	average	virtual	average	virtual	average	virtual	average	virtual
	100%	2,69%	100%	2,69%	100%	2,69%	100%	2,69%	100%
non airtight	5536	144	5344	141	5233	129	4787	131	4862
airtight	2469	88	3266	89	3303				
$\Delta C_p(10)$		0,14		0,14		0,05		0,06	

Fig. 315 Estimating average ventilation losses from 4 allotment directions multiplied into a virtual total.

Average pressure difference in configuration 2 (high rise on the edge) is the same ($\Delta C_p(10)=0.14$) as in configuration 1 (low rise on the edge). But there are differences per *allotment direction*. So, you can not yet conclude both configurations should have the same ventilation loss. *Wind directions* deliver different contributions and their reduction depends on the North direction arrow of the allotment in the compass card of *wind directions*. Because configuration 3 (edge green) and configuration 4 (central green) have lower pressure differences in *all* directions (Fig. 314) we can conclude they will have less ventilation loss than configurations 1 and 2 indeed. However, the difference between a lay out with green on the edge or within the centre is negligible!

Configuration 1 (low rise on the edge) has more ventilation losses from non airtight low rise dwellings and less from airtight high rise ones than configuration 2 (high rise on the edge). Fig. 311 shows airtight highrise has less ventilation loss by more wind pressure. Inhabitants close their windows earlier.

Slant flow along (30° of 60°) causes in all cases maximum loss (Fig. 313). Perhaps we should orientate allotments with two perpendicular directions East or South West sheltering one of them best and the other not at all. This yields more than both half. We tested that hypothesis by calculating perpendicular and slant flowing along for 12 North direction arrows but the result disappointed because adjacent wind directions score high as well by slant flow. They dim the aimed impact into a negligible result.

That is of course not the case in parallel blocked configurations 3 and 4.

So, measures on the level of district or neighbourhood have more local than general impacts. Big local impacts level out in the district as a whole in such a way that differences in its layout become marginal.

2.5.5 Neighbourhoods

We restrict ourselves to perpendicular flow with Northerly wind character (2.7%) from 0° and 90° out of y-axis. In both cases wind meets on 300m from town edge a 30m wide neighbourhood road and on 600m a 70m wide district road with trees.

A roughness approach (paragraph 2.4.6) would show decreasing loss until 100m from town edge stabilising on approx. 150kWh for non airtight low rise and for airtight high rise increasing stabilising on 75 kWh. Fig. 316 shows wind tunnel results elaborated into kWh (paragraph 2.4) from configurations 1 (low rise on the edge) and 2 (high rise on the edge) as a working of distance to town edge.




Fig. 316 Ventilation losses of non airtight low rise and airtight high rise dwellings by standard Northerly wind (2.7% of virtual total) as a function of distance to town edge in configurations 1 and 2

Wind tunnel experiments now specified to location give a clearer distinction between low rise and high rise on the edge then leveled out over the district. The largest low rise loss in configuration 1 appears in measure point 15 (197kWh), a 15.5m high building located on a 15m wide road without trees and a foreland of 10m high dwellings. The smallest appears in measure point 13 (116kWh), a courtyard dwelling. The difference is approx. 80 or virtually 3000kWh.




Fig. 317 Measure points in configuration 1 in a radius of 300m

Measure points 1(186kWh), 6(190kWh), 7(190kWh), 9(163kWh), 15(197kWh) and 32(182kWh) score high by wind over a 40m neighbourhood road without trees. Measure points 5(145kWh), 17(143kWh) and 29(150kWh) get wind over a much wider district road (80 to 100m) with 6m high trees. The local importance of trees in large urban spaces is indicated here. The difference is approx. 40 or virtually 1500kWh.

In configuration 2 measure points 7(147kWh), 11(170kWh) en 14(131kWh) lie on a 40m wide neighbourhood road without trees. Measure point 14 scores low because it is sheltered by 22m high high rise buildings on the other side of the road. The low rise minimum measure point 10(116kWh) lies on 10m wide ensemble streets. The maximum in measure point 25(180kWh) is most likely explained by its position on the edge of the used model.




Fig. 318 Measure points in configuration 2 in a radius of 300m

Fig. 319 shows the same figures as Fig. 316 for configuration 3 en 4 without high rise.




Fig. 319 Ventilation losses of non airtight low rise dwellings by standard Northerly wind (2.7% of virtual total) as a function of distance to town edge in configurations 3 and 4

In configuration 3 measure point 27(150kWh) lies on a 40m wide neighbourhood road without trees. Measure points 20(156kWh), 18(152kWh), 15(150kWh) and 16(143kWh) score approximately equally high lying on a 70m wide district road with trees. Minima 2(116kWh), 17(116kWh), 19(116kWh) and 21(116kWh) get wind from a backyard lying on 10m wide ensemble roads.




Fig. 320 Measure points in configuration 3 and 4 in a radius of 300m

In configuration 4 measure point 18(194kWh) scores extremely high. It gets wind from 300m wide open green area in the centre of district quarter. Even district road trees do not help much on this location. Minima 21(116kWh), 6(119kWh), 5(119kWh) and 17(119kWh) again lie on small ensemble streets. Measure point 19(143kWh) lies on a small street as well, but that is the first street behind the green behind measure point 18(194kWh), and that is still apparent there.

	height	vert.surf.	without green					with green 6m high					with green 10m high				
	m	F/O	N	+30	+60	+90	av.	N	+30	+60	+90	gem.	N	+30	+60	+90	av.
Punt01	10	0,24	0,14	0,13	0,09	0,00	0,09	0,13	0,12	0,09	0,00	0,09	0,12	0,11	0,08	0,00	0,08
Punt02	10	0,24	0,14	0,13	0,09	0,00	0,09	0,13	0,12	0,09	0,00	0,09	0,12	0,11	0,08	0,00	0,08
Punt03	10	0,24	0,19	0,17	0,13	0,00	0,12	0,18	0,17	0,12	0,00	0,12	0,12	0,19	0,11	0,00	0,11
Punt05	10	0,16	0,19	0,17	0,12	0,00	0,12	0,18	0,17	0,12	0,00	0,12	0,12	0,19	0,11	0,00	0,11
Punt06	10	0,30	0,14	0,13	0,10	0,00	0,09	0,14	0,13	0,09	0,00	0,09	0,13	0,12	0,08	0,00	0,08
Punt07	15,5	0,14	0,23	0,21	0,15	0,00	0,15	0,22	0,20	0,14	0,00	0,14	0,20	0,19	0,13	0,00	0,13
Punt08	15,5	0,21	0,16	0,15	0,11	0,00	0,11	0,16	0,14	0,10	0,00	0,10	0,14	0,13	0,03	0,00	0,08
Punt09	22	0,09	0,20	0,19	0,13	0,00	0,13	0,20	0,10	0,10	0,00	0,10	0,20	0,19	0,13	0,00	0,13
Punt10	22	0,18	0,19	0,18	0,13	0,00	0,13	0,19	0,18	0,10	0,00	0,12	0,18	0,12	0,12	0,00	0,11
Lijn01	10	0,24	0,21	0,19	0,14	0,00	0,14	0,20	0,18	0,13	0,00	0,13	0,18	0,12	0,12	0,00	0,11
Lijn02	10	0,24	0,21	0,19	0,14	0,00	0,14	0,20	0,19	0,13	0,00	0,13	0,18	0,17	0,12	0,00	0,12
Lijn05	10	0,32	0,14	0,13	0,03	0,00	0,08	0,13	0,12	0,08	0,00	0,08	0,12	0,11	0,09	0,00	0,08
Lijn06	15,5	0,25	0,20	0,19	0,13	0,00	0,13	0,19	0,18	0,10	0,00	0,12	0,18	0,16	0,12	0,00	0,12
Lijn07	11	0,18	0,28	0,26	0,18	0,00	0,18	0,27	0,24	0,18	0,00	0,17	0,24	0,22	0,16	0,00	0,16
Lijn08	22	0,35	0,12	0,11	0,08	0,00	0,08	0,12	0,11	0,08	0,00	0,08	0,11	0,10	0,07	0,00	0,07
Lijn09	22	0,35	0,12	0,11	0,08	0,00	0,08	0,12	0,11	0,08	0,00	0,08	0,11	0,10	0,07	0,00	0,07
Hoek01	22	0,18	0,28	0,26	0,18	0,00	0,18	0,28	0,26	0,18	0,00	0,18	0,27	0,24	0,19	0,00	0,18
Hoek02	22	0,35	0,28	0,26	0,18	0,00	0,18	0,28	0,26	0,18	0,00	0,18	0,27	0,24	0,18	0,00	0,17
Hof01	15,5	0,25	0,14	0,13	0,09	0,00	0,09	0,13	0,12	0,09	0,00	0,09	0,12	0,11	0,08	0,00	0,08
Hof01>	15,5	0,19	0,25	0,23	0,17	0,00	0,16	0,24	0,22	0,16	0,00	0,16	0,22	0,20	0,15	0,00	0,14
Hof02	10	0,16	0,22	0,20	0,14	0,00	0,14	0,21	0,19	0,14	0,00	0,14	0,19	0,18	0,17	0,00	0,14
Hof02>	15,5	0,19	0,25	0,23	0,17	0,00	0,16	0,24	0,20	0,16	0,00	0,15	0,22	0,20	0,15	0,00	0,14
Hof03	10	0,16	0,22	0,20	0,14	0,00	0,14	0,21	0,19	0,14	0,00	0,14	0,19	0,18	0,10	0,00	0,12
Hof03>	10	0,12	0,33	0,30	0,21	0,00	0,21	0,31	0,28	0,20	0,00	0,20	0,28	0,26	0,10	0,00	0,16
Hof04	10	0,24	0,26	0,24	0,17	0,00	0,17	0,25	0,23	0,16	0,00	0,16	0,23	0,21	0,15	0,00	0,15
Hof05	15,5	0,37	0,19	0,18	0,13	0,00	0,13	0,18	0,17	0,12	0,00	0,12	0,17	0,15	0,11	0,00	0,11
average			0,20	0,19	0,13	0,00	0,13	0,20	0,18	0,13	0,00	0,12	0,08	0,17	0,12	0,00	0,12

Fig. 322 $\Delta C_p(z)$ for 4 flow along directions in 23 allotment types (> second measurement perpendicular)

Hof01, Hof02 and Hof03 have two main directions of front-back façades. So, ΔC_p had to be measured two times. Hoek01, Hoek04, Hof04 and Hof05 have two directions with the same characteristics perpendicular. So, the same measurement can be used the reverse (90° is 0° , 60° is 30° and so on) for the perpendicular part. Averaging the impact of both directions proportional to the number of dwellings you get numbers for corner and courtyard allotments comparable with point and line allotments.

Then we have to take other windstatistics than Northerly into account. The quarter we calculated is only very exceptionally equal to a quarter of all ventilation losses as well. This is for instance the case if that quarter (0° to 90° from y-axis) coincides with wind directions West to North. For every other North indicating arrow the calculated quarter will contribute more or less than 25% of the ventilation loss, dependent from the wind statistics exposed. This contribution is calculated for 12 North indicating arrows and completed into a 100% virtual total loss. The supposition that a dwelling surrounded by repeating allotments is equally sheltered into the other quarters is better justified than in previous paragraphs.

2.6.2 Impact of trees

Fig. 323 shows the result of this calculation on the average of Fig. 322 itemized for airtight high rise allotments and low rise ones supposed to be non airtight.

	without green					with green 6m height					with green 10m height				
main direction	0	30	60	90	virt.	0	30	60	90	virt.	0	30	60	90	virt.
average															
low rise	162	249	599	507	5162	161	247	594	506	5130	158	244	585	505	5075
high rise	90	136	343	414	3343	90	136	343	414	3343	90	136	343	414	3347

Fig. 323 Ventilation loss as a consequence of standard Northerly wind.

The impact of 6m high (young) trees is negligible. However, when for instance after 10 years trees reach a height of 10m there is some impact. However, locally the impact may be substantial (page 147).

2.6.3 Comparing repeated allotments 100x100m

Fig. 324 and Fig. 325 show some allotment types in sequence of virtual ventilation losses.




Fig. 324 Allotment types in sequence of loss

Fig. 325 Relation loss and block distance in m




Fig. 326 Allotment types in sequence of highest to lowest loss

Remarcably there is nearly no relation with dwelling density. Lijn05 and Lijn07 of equal dwelling density (64 dwellings in the hectare concerned) and nearly the same height (10 and 11m respectively) have lowest and highest loss. However, frontal density F/O (vertical surface F per horizontal surface O) is determining (see Fig. 322) reasonably related with distance between building blocks (drawn as polynome regression in Fig. 325), but diverging at higher distances.

Fig. 327 and Fig. 328 show the results for point and line allotments on any orientation.




Fig. 327 Ventilation loss of point allotments

Fig. 328 Ventilation loss of line allotments

Biggest loss is reached when you orientate façades of point and line allotments 7 due West. Smallest loss is reached by line allotments 5 or point allotments 1,2 and 6 orientated on North North West (330°). The virtual difference is more than 1000kWh/dwelling.

Fig. 329 shows courtyard allotments. Orientation sensitivity levels out most in hof04 and hof05 because perpendicular blocks have equal length. Higher blocks like hof01 and hof05 (15.5m high) lose less than lower ones like hof03 and hof04 (10m).




Fig. 329 Ventilation loss of courtyard allotments Fig. 330 Ventilation loss of high rise allotments

Fig. 330 shows losses of airtight high rise allotments on a much smaller scale. Total variation is less than 100kWh. Inhabitant's behaviour causes maxima where low rise non airtight allotments showed minima.

2.6.4 Wind behaviour around high objects

Wind behaviour on smallest scale is described more in detail by Voorden (1990). From that publication we derive some conclusions only. The accidental physical context and size or form of the objects cause unpredictable turbulences. Without windtunnel experiments calculations do not produce much general conclusions. However, scale models of free standing sharp edged buildings higher than 15m above the environment in a frontal flow of wind in the wind tunnel show some regularity in causing whirls windward and leeward recognisable on real scale (Fig. 331).




Fig. 331 Whirls around a free standing building

Windward and leeward a standing whirl arises causing unexpected wind directions on ground level. Walking or cycling along windward of the building, but especially through the wake area (zog-gebied) leeward you can experience sudden and diametral changes in wind direction. Protecting yourself with an umbrella against the wind from your left side you suddenly get wind from the right side. Fig. 331

(below) shows the same impact horizontally. The density of lines indicates wind velocity. At ground level near the edges of the building (no entrances there!) and 1H to 2H leeward, that velocity could be as high as at the top of the building. The whirls leeward are caused by low pressure on that side; the wind 'comes back' to fill the gap caused by high velocities at the edge pulling calm air with them. Openings in the building at ground level may avoid whirls there, but yield new wind velocities at ground level like Fig. 331 (below) now not considered as a plan but as a cross section.

Permeable walls like applied at the entrance of the Faculty of Architecture in Delft or dense shrubs avoid pressure differences causing whirls. They can slow down wind velocity at ground level and protect windy areas, supposed they can resist high wind velocities themselves. Networks of small wind turbines utilise local wind velocity, but they still have to be designed.

2.7 Sound and noise

2.7.1 Music

Comment [T.M.7]: Pagina:
164
kan uitgebreider

Movement of air is measured as wind when it is moving into one direction longer than 5 seconds (2.2.1). When it is flowing back in the next 5 seconds it is not even counted in wind statistics. But if the wind is blowing at average into one direction more than an hour we count it as wind and we calculate the 'hour average wind velocity' we used in chapters above. Wind is caused by slowly increasing temperature differences on the Earth's surface causing differences in air pressure. Sometimes these differences are leveled out by wind in an hour, sometimes in weeks and seldom the air is flowing back into the area it came from. If the air transported in a minute would flow back in the next minute and the reverse like water on a beach we would call it vibration. It would have a vibration time T of 60sec with a frequency f of $1/60 = 0.017$ vibrations per second or 0.017Hz (hertz).

Vibrations in the air from 16 vibrations per second (vibration time 0.063 sec) to 20 000 are accepted by our eardrums as sound. Vibrations slower than 16Hz are called infrasonic, faster than 20 000 ultrasonic. You can not hear infrasonic vibrations in the air until 16Hz, but you sometimes can feel them in your lungs Minnaert (1975). The frequencies used in music are nearly completely covered by the 88 keys of piano. It counts more than 7 octaves (Fig. 332) starting with 27.5Hz (the most left key A_1) and ending with 4186Hz (the most right key c_5 , part of the 8th octave, not fully covered).

code	A_1	A	a	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5	
frequency f	27.5	55	110	220	440	880	1760	3520	Hz
wave length λ	12.364	6.182	3.091	1.545	0.773	0.386	0.193	0.097	metres
$f \times \lambda$	340	340	340	340	340	340	340	340	m/sec

Fig. 332 Starting notes of octaves on the piano

Any next octave doubles the frequency. An octave is subdivided in 12 notes (named a, ais or bes, b, c, cis or des, d, dis or es, e, f, fis or ges, g, gis). Because $2^{1/12} = 1.0594630944$, the frequency of any next key is a factor 1.0594630944 higher than the previous one. So you can calculate the frequency of any note ($n=0\dots87$) by $f(n)=27.5 \times 1.0594630944^n$ (Fig. 333).




Fig. 333 The span of music

Michels (1993) page 24

The travel speed of sound c in air is in normal conditions 340m/sec (in steel 5064m/sec). And speed is the number of vibrations per second f times their length λ : $c=f \times \lambda$ (Fig. 332). So, the wave length λ of audible sound in air ($\lambda = c / f$) varies between $340/20\,000 = 21.25\text{m}$ and $340/16 = 0.017\text{m}$.

Take a drawing tube of $L = 0.65\text{m}$ closed at one side (width does not matter), drum on it and you hear primarily a sound of 130Hz, which is musical note c with wave length $4 \times 0.65 = 2.60\text{m}$. But it is mixed with a specific range of overtones (Fig. 334).




Fig. 334 Tones produced by a tube of 0.65m closed at one side.

The lines drawn in the tube represent the position of particles in extreme phases as if there were only some of them. The distance between the extreme phases (1-1, 2-2, 3-3 ...) are different, represented in the sinuses below. The closed left side of the tube forces a 'node' (line elongated into the sinus) where particles stand still as centres of condensing and thinning, the open side an 'antinode', where

they move most, enjoying the freedom of the end of the tube. So, possible wavelengths are restricted to $\lambda = 4/1, 4/3, 4/5 \dots \times L$ and frequencies to a proportion of 1:3:5.... In tubes open (antinodes) or closed (nodes) at both sides they are restricted to $\lambda = 2/1, 2/2, 2/3 \dots \times L$, supposed you do not force local antinodes by openings (like a flute does). The frequencies appear in a proportion of 1:2:3..., just like strings fixed at two sides do. A voice with less than 9 overtones sounds dim, a voice with more than 14 overtones sounds shrill.

The primary frequency of a string f_s depends on length L , tension σ and density ρ (1 290g/m³) according to $f_s = L/2 \sqrt{\sigma/\rho}$. A string with given density and tension tuned by the right force will give a lowest tone with wavelength $2 \times L$. Touching the string softly (flageolet, causing a node there without losing the lowest tone) half way you will hear a tone with wavelength L (one octave higher) as well. Touching at one third you will hear a tone with wave length $2/3 \times L$ as well, a combination called fifth (kwint, 2:3). Dividing further you get fourths (kwart, 3:4), tierces (ters, 4:5) and so on.

2.7.2 Power or intensity

Air particles between nodes move very fast around their quiet position like a sinus shown in Fig. 334 causing change in air density. Concentration causes increase of temperature and heat loss. However the particles move fast enough to prevent substantial energy loss by heat exchange (keeping the process reversible, adiabatic). The maximum divergence of particles is called amplitude A . The power of a sound wave (called intensity 'I' and expressed in W/m²) depends on that amplitude, but also on frequency f , air density (normally 1.290kg/m³), and travel speed (normally 340m/sec) according to $I = \rho \times (2 \times \pi \times f \times A)^2 \times c/2$. So, in normal p and c conditions power depends on amplitude A and frequency f according to $I = 8658 \times (f \times A)^2$.

A speaking voice produces 10^{-5} W. A globe with a radius of 28cm has a surface of 1m². So, at 28cm distance that voice has a power of 10^{-5} W/m². It is composed by adding $8658 \cdot (f \times A)^2$ for every frequency and its accompanying amplitude in the voice. But suppose it produces tone c only, without overtones (in reality produced by electronic device only), then frequency is 131Hz, and amplitude A should be 0.000003m. A piano produces maximally 0.2W/m² and if it would be produced by tone c only the amplitude should be 0.0000367m. For an extended symphony orchestra and a loudspeaker the figures would be 5W/m² ($A=0.0000183$ m) and 100W/m² ($A=0.00082$ m). Fig. 336 shows the dependency of intensity I on these particular amplitudes and on musical frequencies from 27.5 to 4000Hz).




Fig. 335 Intensity (frequency, amplitude)




Fig. 336 Represented logarithmically

The logarithmical representation (Fig. 336) shows the range from soft to loud better. Dividing the intensity by a standard of 10^{-12} W/m² (comparing it with that standard) we get positive logarithms from 0 to 14 only, starting with what is just audible. Multiplying it by 10 we get a useful range of decibells (dB) from 0 to 150 (Fig. 337).





Fig. 337 Changing intensity into decibells

Fig. 338 Represented logarithmically

Changing the frequency axis in a logarithmical scale (Fig. 338) we get beautiful straight lines of growing decibells by increasing frequencies for every amplitude. Fig. 339 is the same graph with the boundary of what we think to hear.



Creemers, Atteveld et al. (1983) page 186

Fig. 339 Pain boundary (above) and impression of sound.

At 1000Hz our impression of sound could be approximated by deciBells. However, on both sides of this centre we hear less from the actual pressure of lower and higher tones on our eardrums. That can be dangerous. Lines of equal sound impression more or less parallel to the boundary below connect the same levels of sound impression (loudness) expressed in 'foons' in the same range of deciBells at 10^3 Hz. An often used rough correction is the audible deciBell dB(A) (Fig. 340).




Fig. 340 Corrections on deciBells to get audible dB(A).

2.7.3 Sound and noise

The combined tones of an instrument make a sound. When we complete the sinuses into $\lambda = 4 \times 0.65\text{m}$ and add the overtones of Fig. 334 with supposed smaller amplitudes neglecting the higher overtones we get a representation of the sound of the tube (Fig. 341).





Fig. 341 Combined complete sinuses of Fig. 334

Fig. 342 Fig. 341 added

However, especially string instruments have to improve the contact with the air by surfaces vibrating with the string to get a louder sound. These constructions resonate with the own velocities, amplitudes and frequencies of their material and form adding new wave lengths producing the typical sound of the instrument. The amplitudes per frequency are called the spectrum of the instrument (Fig. 343 and Fig. 344).



Michels (1993) page 16

Fig. 343 Supposed
amplitudes of the tube from
Fig. 334

Fig. 344 Spectra of other instruments

There are harmonious spectra with natural proportions of frequencies and chaotic spectra called noise. When you are able to recognise the composing sinuses by Fourier analysis or measurement you can calculate the power of a spectrum summing all intensities per amplitude by integration to predict power. But there are deciBell meters to do it afterwards.

2.7.4 Birds

Fig. 345 shows the spectrum of an electric piano with little overtones for the tone 'A' in eight octaves with seconds on the x-axis. Here we clearly see the doubling from 27.5, 55, 110, 220, ... until 3520 kHz for pure tones. The tones of the piano fluctuate around these averages.




Fig. 345 Spectrum of an electric piano




Fig. 346 Oscillogramme and spectrum of a
bluetit (pimpelmees)

Fig. 346 we see the spectrum of a bluetit-song with frequencies reaching twice as high as our voice until 8 kHz. The oscillogramme above shows the amplitude or power. Enlargement would show the sinusoid waves. Their invisibly small wave-lengths determine the frequency below. Fig. 347, Fig. 348 and Fig. 349 show the oscillogrammes and spectra of three other birds often heard around your house. They show how characteristic birds' songs are. These songs are present in any city, but you don't hear them any more and few will recognise them.




Fig. 347 Great tit (koolmees)




Fig. 348 House sparrow (huismus)




Fig. 349 Magpie (ekster)

These spectra are made with the Raven Lite programme, free downloadable from <http://www.birds.cornell.edu/brp/raven/Raven.html>.

2.7.5 Traffic noise

There are many sources of noise in town. Traffic and aviation are the most important ones.

	speed	quantity	emission	
	km/h	mv/h	dB(A)	
light motor vehicles	50	300	69,48	
middle heavy motor vehicles	50	50	72,90	
heavy motor vehicles	50	50	77,70	
motorcycles	50	100	75,21	
Total		500	80,81+	
% truck traffic	10%			
road surface				
Road surface correction			3,63+	
distance to crossing	100m			
Crossing correction			0,80+	
%reflection other side of road	75%			
Reflection correction			1,13+	
distance to source	10m			
Distance reduction			10,00-	
Air muffling reduction			0,20-	
height of observer	1,5m			
height of source	0m			
%soft ground to road axis	0%			
Ground reduction			0,00-	
Meteo reduction			0,57-	
Total			75,59dB(A)	

Jong (2003)

Fig. 350 Calculating traffic noise

Traffic is a linear and fluctuating source. You can predict the average intensity in dB(A) from 7 o'clock during 12 hours day or night according to Volksgezondheid Volksgezondheid en Milieuhygiene (1981), SRM1, see Fig. 350. Backgrounds are discussed in Nijs (1995). Download Jong, T.M. de (2003) *TrafficNoise.xls* from <http://team.bk.tudelft.nl> publications 2003, say 'yes' to the macro's, fill in the yellow parts and try.

TRAFFIC NOISE

This calculation is valid only if:

- there are no noise protection screens or buildings;
- there are no slopes;
- the road is more or less straight;
- some other conditions,

otherwise you should use SRM2.

Fig. 351 shows some indications for traffic load you can use in designing stage.

Indication:

radius served	urban area	traffic lanes	width	mv/h
30m		1	3m	2
100m	street	2	10m	20
300m	neighbourhood	2	20m	200
1km	district	2	30m	1000
3km	town	4	40m	2000
10km	subregional	8	50m	10000
30km	regional	10	60m	16000
100km	subnational	16	70m	24000

Fig. 351 Indications of traffic load

National Law (see www.overheid.nl click Wet- en regelgeving, look for 'geluidhinder') demands in new plans for urban area less than 50 dB(A) within 200m from streets with 1 or 2 traffic lanes or within 350m from roads and highways with more than 2 traffic lanes causing that amount of noise. But Burgomaster and Aldermen can request the Provincial Council on the basis of a noise survey to increase the norm to 55 dB(A). In special cases named in the Law it can be increased until 70 dB(A). Comparable norms are given for other sources like industry.

To calculate noise from aeroplanes Kosten units (Ke) are used. They take into account maximum level of noise per movement, number of movements per year and time of the day.