

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

The drag force distribution within regular arrays of cubes and its relation to cross ventilation – Theoretical and experimental analyses

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

The drag force distribution within regular arrays of cubes and its relation to cross ventilation – Theoretical and experimental analyses / Buccolieri, R.; Sandberg, M.; Wigö, H; Di Sabatino, S.. - In: JOURNAL OF WIND ENGINEERING AND INDUSTRIAL AERODYNAMICS. - ISSN 0167-6105. - STAMPA. - 189:(2019), pp. 91-103. [10.1016/j.jweia.2019.03.022]

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/690103> since: 2019-06-23

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2019.03.022>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Buccolieri, R.; Sandberg, M.; Wigö, H; Di Sabatino, S., The drag force distribution within regular arrays of cubes and its relation to cross ventilation – Theoretical and experimental analyses. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, V. 189, 2019, PP. 91-103.

The final published version is available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2019.03.022>

© 2019. This manuscript version is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

1 **The drag force distribution within regular arrays of cubes and its**
2 **relation to cross ventilation – theoretical and experimental analyses**

3 Riccardo Buccolieri^{a, b*}, Mats Sandberg^b, Hans Wigö^b, Silvana Di Sabatino^c

4
5 ^aDipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Biologiche ed Ambientali, University of Salento,
6 S.P. 6 Lecce-Monteroni, 73100 Lecce, Italy

7 ^bFaculty of Engineering and Sustainable Development, University of Gävle, SE-80176
8 Gävle, Sweden

9 ^cDepartment of Physics and Astronomy, ALMA MATER STUDIORUM - University
10 of Bologna, Viale Berti Pichat 6/2, 40127 Bologna, Italy

11
12 **Corresponding author: Riccardo Buccolieri*

13 Email: riccardo.buccolieri@unisalento.it

14 Tel. +39 0832 297 062; fax +39 0832 297 061

15
16 **Abstract**

17 A novel set of wind tunnel measurements of the drag force and its spatial distribution
18 along aligned arrays of cubes of height H and planar area index λ_p (air gap between
19 cubes) equal to 0.028 ($5H$) to 0.69 ($0.2H$) is presented and analysed. Two different
20 types of measurements are compared: one type where the drag force is obtained using
21 the standard load cell method, another type where the drag force is estimated by
22 measuring the pressure difference between windward and the leeward façades. Results
23 show that the drag force is nearly uniformly distributed for lower λ_p (0.028 and 0.0625),
24 it decreases up to 50% at the second row for $\lambda_p=0.11$, and it sharply decreases for larger
25 λ_p (from 0.25 to 0.69) where the force mostly acts on the first row. It follows that for the
26 lowest λ_p the drag force typically formulated as a drag area corresponds to the total
27 frontal area of the array, whereas for large λ_p the drag area corresponds to the area of the
28 first row. By assessing the driving pressure for ventilation from the drag force, the
29 analysis is extended to estimate the cross ventilation as an example of application of this
30 type of measurements.

32 **Keywords:** drag distribution; standard load cell; cubic building arrays; drag area;
33 interference factor; cross ventilation

34

35 **1. Introduction**

36 Several studies of the modification of the flow due to an array of obstacles exposed
37 to a boundary layer flow have been carried out in the past. These studies can be broadly
38 subdivided into two main categories. One category is based on the classical fluid
39 mechanical approach where the focus is on the evolution of the approaching velocity
40 profile when passing through the array. Usually the array is long enough that an
41 equilibrium is established. An excellent recent example of this approach is given by
42 Thomas et al. (2017), where references to similar studies are provided.

43 The other category is where the main concern is the ventilation of the array taking
44 into account individual buildings. In this case the focus is on understanding how both
45 the whole array interacts with the approaching wind and how the individual buildings
46 interact with the airflow through the array. The overarching goal of this paper is to
47 contribute to this understanding. This paper is essentially a continuation of our previous
48 work (Buccolieri et al., 2017), where the total drag force was measured in a wind tunnel
49 by using a standard load cell. The focus was to study the effect on the drag force of
50 different building packing density of an array consisting of buildings (represented by
51 cubes) of equal size and shape. A novel method for assessing the distribution of the drag
52 force was introduced by formulating the total drag force as a drag area and then
53 matching this area with the physical façade area of the buildings. One scope here is to
54 validate this method by directly measuring the distribution of the drag force within the
55 array using the same standard load cell method. To provide insight into the quality of
56 the measurements and confidence for the obtained results, the drag force is also
57 assessed by an independent method based on measurements of the surface pressure at
58 the windward and leeward façades of the buildings.

59 The results are analysed from the perspective that the introduction of an array in a
60 given turbulent flow is a perturbation of a reference case which we have chosen to be
61 the isolated cube. The introduction of new buildings to the reference case increases the
62 resistance (drag) and less air (less flow rate) penetrates into the array compared to the
63 reference case. Therefore it takes a longer time for the approaching air to pass through

64 the array. This delay has been quantified by Antoniou et al. (2017) for a region within
65 Nicosia in Cyprus by predicting the mean age of air in the city. The delay has a
66 consequence for air quality because the local mean age of air is directly proportional to
67 the concentration in case of homogeneous emissions, see Eq.10 in Buccolieri et al.
68 (2010). Low flow rate penetrating into the array means that less flow available for
69 ventilation of the buildings.

70 The argument above helps clarifying that the drag is an important parameter linked to
71 both air quality within the array and ventilation potential available for buildings in a
72 given neighbourhood or city. There are several wind tunnel studies reporting on
73 pressure distribution measurements at building façades as well as estimate of the drag
74 force either pressure-derived or using a balance. Cheng and Castro (2002) and Cheng et
75 al. (2007) estimated the drag force on individual cubes within an array by calculating
76 the integral of the pressure difference between the front and the back façades of the
77 cube. Other studies, relevant to the field of wind load on structures, utilized pressure
78 measurements to evaluate the pressure distribution on individual buildings (Kim et al.,
79 2012; Tecele et al., 2013). Zaki et al. (2011) employed surface pressure measurements of
80 the form drag on building arrays featured by both vertical and horizontal randomness as
81 well as different packing densities demonstrating a significant effect of building height
82 variation on aerodynamic parameters when the planar area index is larger than 17%. Li
83 et al. (2015) confirmed the dependence of building shape and position within the array
84 on the drag coefficient by surface pressure measurements. A comprehensive dataset of
85 wind pressure for isolated low- and high-rise buildings, as well as for non-isolated low-
86 rise buildings, is available from the Tokyo Polytechnic University ([wind.arch.t-](http://wind.arch.t-kougei.ac.jp/system/eng/contents/code/tpu)
87 [kougei.ac.jp/system/eng/contents/code/tpu](http://wind.arch.t-kougei.ac.jp/system/eng/contents/code/tpu)).

88 Cheng et al. (2007), Hagishima et al. (2009) and Zaki et al. (2011) directly measured
89 the drag force using a balance. Cheng et al. (2007) showed that the drag force exerted
90 on cube arrays and derived from measured Reynolds stresses can be underestimated by
91 as much as 25% compared to drag directly measured using a balance. Hagishima et al.
92 (2009) measured the drag force directly by a designed floating raft in a wind tunnel to
93 investigate the aerodynamic effects of various building arrays showing that both wind
94 direction and the height non-uniformity of buildings affect aerodynamic parameters
95 significantly.

96 More recently, few studies have reported measurements of the drag force distribution
97 within building arrays, as done in this paper. Chen et al. (2017) used a standard load cell
98 within arrays consisting of buildings with both the same height and different heights.
99 From the recorded drag force the vertical transport by both advection and turbulence
100 expressed as an exchange velocity was predicted based on methods presented in
101 Bentham and Britter (2003) and in Hamlyn and Britter (2005). Li et al. (2018) reported
102 wind tunnel measurements of the drag distribution within irregular arrays consisting of
103 buildings of different shapes but with the same height. The drag force was estimated
104 from the pressure difference between the windward and leeward façades of the
105 buildings and directly by using floating rafts. They presented drag force distributions
106 and an extensive discussion of estimation of measurements errors and how to conduct
107 this type of measurements is presented.

108 In this context, the novelties of the present paper are briefly summarised:

- 109 - a comprehensive dataset of recorded drag force including both the total drag force of
110 the whole array (shown in Buccolieri et al., 2017) and the distribution of the drag force
111 within the array for a large span of building packing densities has been created. The
112 dataset includes also data obtained from pressure measurements at the wind- and
113 leeward façades of the buildings;
- 114 - original analyses are presented showing that an interference between buildings exists
115 and this needs to be quantified in the derivation of the drag force by introducing the
116 wall to wall distance as interference parameter in addition to building area density;
- 117 - a further validation of the novel method presented in Buccolieri et al. (2017) for
118 assessing the drag force distribution starting from the drag force measurements of the
119 whole array is provided;
- 120 - an application of the potential usefulness of the dataset is provided by estimating the
121 potential for wind-driven cross ventilation. It is shown that measuring the drag force is
122 much simpler than measuring the pressure in several points.

123

124 **2. Description of wind tunnel experiments**

125 ***2.1. The physical models***



126 Measurements were carried out in a closed-circuit boundary layer wind tunnel with a
127 working section 11m long, 3m wide and 1.5m high at the University of Gävle (Sweden)

128 (Fig. 1a). An isolated cube and seven aligned arrays of cubes of planar area index (ratio
129 between the planar area of buildings and the lot area) λ_p from 0.028 to 0.69 were
130 considered. The cube height H was equal to 0.06m. The lot area was a square with a
131 side length of $13H$ (0.78m) (see Fig. 3a later in the text).

132 Drag force and pressure measurements were performed separately on one individual
133 cube (“target cube” hereinafter) placed along the middle column of the array (Fig. 1b).
134 Please note that when the number of columns was even (as for example for $\lambda_p=0.0625$ in
135 the figure), the measurements were performed along one of the two columns
136 constituting the middle of the array. The target cube was kept fixed on the wind tunnel
137 floor while its position within the array was changed by moving the other cubes.
138 Initially the target cube was located in the first row. In the next step the cubes from the
139 last row were moved to the front so that the target cube was located in the second row
140 of the array. This procedure was repeated until the target cube was positioned in the last
141 row of the array.

142 The employed geometries are the same as used in our previous paper (Buccolieri et
143 al., 2017), i.e. the lot area was kept constant (the denominator in λ_p) and the number of
144 cubes was increased to represent neighbourhoods of different λ_p . In this approach there
145 may exist conditions where flow adjustment occurs and conditions where the flow is
146 still evolving. These experiments intend to reproduce conditions in which the
147 surrounding terrain is almost uniform and there is a considerable transition from a given
148 roughness to a new roughness where the flow within the array may be still evolving.

149



150
151
152
153
154

Fig. 1 a) Sketch of the wind tunnel. b) Example arrays with planar area index $\lambda_p=0.0625$ and 0.25 , with indication of air gap between cubes and the target cubes (roof s highlighted in grey) placed in the centre of the turntable along the centre of the arrays.

155 2.2. The boundary-layer flow

156 A boundary-layer (BL) flow in the wind tunnel was achieved considering two
157 different conditions for the fetch: (i) the entire fetch was covered with cubes of 0.04m
158 side length representing roughness elements (“BL roughness” hereinafter); (ii) the fetch
159 was smooth with no roughness elements (“BL no roughness” hereinafter). The distance
160 between the final row of roughness elements and the front of the lot area was
161 approximately 0.4m. The roughness area in the working section of the wind tunnel had
162 a total length of 8m made of spires in the first part and then of 0.04m cubes (roughness
163 elements).

164 The boundary layer thickness δ was about 0.15m ($2.5H$) in the “BL no roughness”
165 case and about 0.8m ($13.3H$) in the “BL roughness” case, as estimated by taking the
166 height at which the velocity was equal to 99% of the free stream velocity. The blockage
167 coefficient ($\Phi = A_{model,proj.} / A_{wind_tunnel}$, where $A_{model,proj.}$ [m^2] is the projected area of the
168 cube along the main wind direction and A_{wind_tunnel} is the cross-sectional area of the

169 measurement section in the wind tunnel), was about 0.1% which fulfils the requirements
 170 of the VDI 3783 guidelines (2004).


171 The experiments were performed with one reference wind velocity $U(H)$ [ms^{-1}] at the
 172 cube height H , corresponding to 500 revolutions per minute (rpm) of the fan that drove
 173 the flow in the wind tunnel. The independence of the drag force on the reference
 174 velocity was tested in the previous work (Buccolieri et al., 2017). The error is within
 175 $\pm 5\%$ of the measured value. Undisturbed mean velocity and relative turbulence intensity
 176 profiles approaching the array (which are in equilibrium with the roughness in the
 177 fetch), both normalised by the corresponding value at $H=0.06\text{m}$ up to $z/H=2.5$, are (Fig.
 178 2):

$$179 \quad \frac{U(z)}{U(H)} \approx \left(\frac{z}{H}\right)^{0.16} \quad (1)$$

$$180 \quad \frac{I(z)}{I(H)} \approx \left(\frac{z}{H}\right)^{-0.06} \quad (\text{BL roughness}) \quad (2)$$

$$181 \quad \frac{I(z)}{I(H)} \approx \left(\frac{z}{H}\right)^{-0.46} \quad (\text{BL no roughness}) \quad (3)$$

182



183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

Fig. 2 a) Boundary layer (BL) wind velocity (left) and relative turbulence intensity (right) incoming profiles in the wind tunnel for rpm = 500. The profiles have been fitted using power laws in Eqs. 1, 2 and 3.

188 The velocity was measured with a TSI hot-film anemometer in the middle of the
 189 empty circular disk where the target cube was attached (see subsection 2.3). The
 190 turbulence intensity was calculated as the standard deviation of the velocity fluctuations
 191 divided by the mean velocity. Tab. 1 summarizes the cases investigated.

192

193

194 **Table 1**
 195 Summary of all test cases investigated in the wind tunnel. $U(H)$, $I(H)$ and Re are the incoming
 196 mean flow velocity and turbulence intensity at building (cube) height H and the Reynolds
 197 number, respectively.

No. of cubes	λ_p	Air gap between buildings (in the transversal and longitudinal directions)	Centre to centre distance between buildings (in the transversal and longitudinal directions)	$U(H)$ [ms^{-1}] - $I(H)$ [%] - Re [-]	
				BL roughness	BL no roughness
1	-	Isolated cube			
3x3	0.028	$5H$	$6H$		
4x4	0.0625	$3H$	$4H$		
5x5	0.11	$2H$	$3H$		
7x7	0.25	$1H$	$2H$		
9x9	0.44	$0.5H$	$1.5H$		
10x10	0.56	$0.33H$	$1.33H$		
11x11	0.69	$0.2H$	$1.2H$		
				5.2 - 27.6 - 20,800	9.5 - 7.1 - 38,000

198 *Note: the Reynolds number, based on the height of the cube H and the incoming undisturbed*
 199 *reference flow velocity $U(H)$ at cube height H , is lower in the “BL roughness” case as a*
 200 *consequence of the smaller $U(H)$.*
 201

202 2.3. Drag force measurements


203 The drag force F_D (balance) acting on the individual target cube was directly
 204 measured using the standard load cell method described in Buccolieri et al. (2017).
 205 Specifically, the target cube was connected to the load cell via two thin rods that went
 206 through a small opening in the turn table. There was an air gap of 1mm between the
 207 cube and the turn table. The load cell was mounted on a stable tripod standing on the
 208 floor of the laboratory hall (Fig. 3) so that the cube was mechanically isolated from the
 209 wind tunnel and the measured force was only due to air resistance. To measure the drag
 210 force distribution within the array, the force was singularly measured on the cubes
 211 located along the centre of the array (along the wind direction).

212 In the standard load cell the horizontal force, caused by the air movement, was
 213 transformed into vertical tensile and compressive force at its edges. Here it was Vetek
 214 108AA with glued strain gauges (Vetek, 2016) which measured the forces and provided
 215 an electrical output signal. The signal was then amplified through the Amplifier,
 216 converted to digital through the 16 bit AD-converter and finally read by the Lab View
 217 program (Fig. 3). In the program the signal offset (zero) and gain could be adjusted
 218 before further processing. The signal from the load cell was sampled at 1000Hz and
 219 then a mean value was calculated every second. Due to turbulence the measuring signal
 220 still fluctuated and further signal processing was necessary. To obtain stable

221 measurements a sliding average was considered using 60s. The force was read when the
222 sliding average was stable.

223 The load cell measured the force along the flow direction since it was mounted in
224 parallel with the main wind flow. The load cell had an internal compensation that
225 balances out the torque. Therefore, it measured the net force in the flow direction
226 regardless of where the force acted on the cube. The accuracy was tested and the total
227 measurement uncertainty is specified as the reading $\pm 7\%$. Further details, including the
228 calibration procedure, are given in Buccolieri et al. (2017).

229



230
231

232 **Fig. 3** Pictures showing an example of the array built in the wind tunnel and attached to the
233 circular disk, with indication of the target cube connected to the load cell.

234

234 **2.4. Pressure measurements and drag force estimation**

235 The static pressure at windward and leeward sides was measured via pressure taps
236 placed at the façades of the target cube (Fig. 4a,b). The diameter of the tap openings
237 was 0.8mm and the opening was oriented perpendicular to the wall. The pressure was
238 measured only at one half of the façades. All pressure taps were connected to a
239 multiplexer (scanner valve), which transferred each pressure to the Furness FCO12
240 pressure transducer. The signal was sampled with 1000Hz and the final reported

241 pressure was the average over 30s. The area was then divided into 40 sub-areas (A_i with
242 $i=1$ to 40) according to where the taps were located (Fig. 4c).

243 The drag force, acting perpendicular on the windward side of the target cube, was
244 then calculated as follows:

$$245 F_{D_windward}(\text{pressure}) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \times A_i \quad (4)$$

246 where the measured pressure p_i was assumed to be constant over the entire sub-area A_i .

247 On the leeward side of the target cube (area $A_{leeward}$) the pressure distribution was
248 almost uniform so the force was calculated from the average pressure $p_{average}$ as
249 follows:

$$250 F_{D_leeward}(\text{pressure}) = p_{average} \times A_{leeward} \quad (5)$$


251 Sensitivity tests using Eq. 4 for calculating $F_{D_leeward}(\text{pressure})$ showed a percentage
252 difference lower than 2%.

253 The total drag force $F_D(\text{pressure})$ acting on the target cube, along the flow direction,
254 was finally calculated as:

$$255 F_D(\text{pressure}) = F_{D_windward}(\text{pressure}) - F_{D_leeward}(\text{pressure}) \quad (6)$$

256 The direction of the force was determined by the sign of the pressure.

257



259
260
261
262
263

Fig. 4. a, b) Pressure taps position at windward and leeward façades of the target cube. c) Sub-areas of the windward façade employed for the calculation of the drag force via the pressure-derived method.

264

265 It should be noted that Eq. 6 represents an integration based on a finite number of
266 sampling points. One can expect the result to be dependent on the number of sampling
267 points and the location of the sampling points, since due to the acceleration of the air
268 flow towards the edges, on the windward side of the building the static pressure varies a
269 lot across the surfaces (see. Fig. 9 later in the text). Therefore, as shown in Fig. 4a, after
270 several tests (not shown here) with different number of sampling points on both the
271 windward and leeward façades, some pressure taps were also placed near the edges of
272 the wall, resulting in good agreement between the calculated (by the pressure-derived
273 method) and measured (with the balance) drag force (see Fig. 7 later in the text).

274

275 3. Drag area and cross ventilation

276 3.1. The drag area

277 The drag coefficient based on the drag force F_D generated by the target cube, the
 278 reference velocity $U(H)$ and the physical frontal area of the cube A_{cube} is defined as:

$$279 \quad C_D = \frac{F_D}{\frac{1}{2}\rho U(H)^2 A_{cube}} \quad (7)$$

280 With the aim of determining the effective area of cubes generating the drag force, we
 281 use the definition of the drag area (Buccolieri et al., 2017) by setting the drag coefficient
 282 equal to 1 and solving for the area. The drag area of the target cube (A_D) becomes:

$$283 \quad A_D = \frac{F_D}{\frac{1}{2}\rho U(H)^2} \quad (8)$$

284 The rationale for introducing a drag area is that it can be compared with the physical
 285 area of the cubes in the array. The drag coefficient becomes the ratio between the drag
 286 area and the physical area of the cube:

$$287 \quad C_D = \frac{A_D}{A_{cube}} \quad (9)$$

288 Regarding the magnitude of the drag area there are two extreme cases:

289 *Long distance between the cubes (low λ_p) – No interference between the cubes*

290 The cubes behave as independent bodies and the total drag force acting on the whole
 291 array (F_{D_total}) is equal to the number of cubes N multiplied by the drag force F_D
 292 generated by the single target cube:

$$293 \quad F_{D_total}(\text{for low } \lambda_p) = NF_D \quad (10)$$

294 which, by Eq. 8, leads to the total drag area of the array (A_{D_total}):

$$295 \quad A_{D_total}(\text{for low } \lambda_p) = \frac{F_{D_total}}{\frac{1}{2}\rho U(H)^2} = N \frac{F_D}{\frac{1}{2}\rho U(H)^2} = NA_D \quad (11)$$

296 *Short distance between the cubes (large λ_p) – Strong interference between the cubes*

297 The extreme case is when total force F_{D_total} is on the cube at the front ($F_{D_front_cube}$)

298 which, by Eq. 8, leads to total drag area:

$$299 \quad A_{D_total}(\text{for large } \lambda_p) = \frac{F_D}{\frac{1}{2}\rho U(H)^2} = \frac{F_{D_front_cube}}{\frac{1}{2}\rho U(H)^2} = A_{D_front_cube} \quad (12)$$

300 To generalize, if F_D^i is the drag force generated by cube i within the array and A_D^i is
 301 the corresponding drag area, the total drag force exerted by the whole array is equal to:

$$302 \quad F_{D_total} = \sum_{i=1}^N F_D^i \quad (13)$$

303 and the total drag area A_{D_total} (see Eq. 8) becomes:

$$A_{D_total} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N F_D^i}{\frac{1}{2}\rho U(H)^2} = \sum_{i=1}^N A_D^i \quad (14)$$

By dividing the total drag area by the total physical frontal area for each λ_p , $\frac{A_{D_total}}{\text{Frontal area}}$, it can be evaluated which is the most appropriate reference area (drag area) to be used for the calculation of the drag coefficient C_D , i.e. when the ratio tends to one.


3.2 Assessment of wind-driven cross ventilation based on the drag force

Wind-driven natural ventilation of buildings occurs either as cross ventilation or single-sided ventilation (Etheridge and Sandberg, 1996). Single-sided ventilation occurs when all openings are located on one side (Warren, 1977). Cross ventilation occurs when there are openings on different sides of a building.

Cross ventilation has been studied by several authors using different approaches. Some examples are provided by Karava et al. (2007, 2011), Chu and Chiang (2014) and Shetabvish (2015). More recently Shirzadi et al (2018) have investigated cross ventilation for buildings embedded in arrays using computational fluid dynamics. When the pressure inside the building is uniform (Kobayashi et al., 2010), cross ventilation is assumed to be driven by the difference of the static pressure between outside and inside of the building which generates a velocity through the openings. If the building is a bluff body, the drag force is generated by the pressure difference between the windward and the leeward façades .

In the present paper, in order to assess the potential for cross ventilation it is assumed here that the cubes in the investigated arrays are provided with two openings opposite to each other (Fig. 5) and for simplicity the area of both openings are taken to be equal. By entrainment into the air stream flowing into the room there is a gradual expansion of the air stream. If the distance L , to the leeward wall, is larger than about six times the linear dimension of the opening, the cross section of the air flow have expanded so it is larger than the opening in the leeward wall. Then the whole air stream cannot continue straight through the opening on the opposite side. This is the prerequisite for the pressure inside the building to be uniform.

332



333
 334 **Fig. 5.** A cube with two openings located opposite to each other.
 335

336 The flow rate $Q_{opening}[\text{m}^3\text{s}^{-1}]$ through the opening is, by assuming that the velocity
 337 profile is uniform across the opening, given by:

338
$$Q_{opening} = A_{opening}U_{opening} \quad (15)$$

339 The velocity in the opening, $U_{opening}$, is driven by the pressure difference $|\Delta\bar{p}_{Out-In}|$
 340 between outside of the building and the inside of the building according to the orifice
 341 equation (Etheridge and Sandberg, 1996):

342
$$U_{opening} = C_{discharge}\sqrt{\frac{2|\Delta\bar{p}_{Out-In}|}{\rho}} \quad (16)$$

343 where $C_{discharge}$ is the discharge coefficient which takes into account several factors as
 344 e.g. area contraction of the stream tube when passing through the opening and losses.

345 For the opening on the windward façade $\Delta\bar{p}_{Out-In} = (\bar{p}_{windward} - \bar{p}_{inside})$ and for
 346 the opening on the leeward façade $\Delta\bar{p}_{Out-In} = (\bar{p}_{inside} - \bar{p}_{leeward})$. The unknown
 347 quantity is the pressure \bar{p}_{inside} within the cube which we assume to be constant within
 348 the cube. This condition is fulfilled if the openings are not too large. The pressure
 349 variation inside a building related to the size of the openings is shown in Kobayashi et
 350 al (2010). This pressure inside the cube is obtained from the flow balance that dictates
 351 that the flow rates through both openings are the same. For simplicity, we set the

352 discharge coefficients for the openings on the windward and the leeward façades the
 353 same. This implies that the pressure difference across both openings is the same and the
 354 pressure within the cube is equal to the average of the pressure on the windward and the
 355 leeward façades. Therefore, the pressure difference across both openings becomes equal
 356 to half the pressure difference between the leeward and the windward side:

$$357 \quad \Delta \bar{p}_{Out-In} = \frac{1}{2} (\bar{p}_{windward} - \bar{p}_{leeward}) \quad (17)$$

358 This pressure difference can be assessed from the drag force F_D (balance) measured
 359 with the standard load cell and the physical surface area of the cube F_D (balance) as
 360 follows:

$$361 \quad (\bar{p}_{windward} - \bar{p}_{leeward}) \approx \frac{F_D(\text{balance})}{A} \quad (18)$$

362 Inserting this into Eq. 16 the velocity through the opening $U_{opening}$ in relation to the
 363 reference velocity $U(H)$ can be written as:

$$364 \quad \frac{U_{opening}}{U(H)} = \frac{C_{discharge} \sqrt{\frac{F_D(\text{balance})}{\rho A}}}{U(H)} \quad (19)$$

365 The discharge coefficient $C_{discharge}$ reported in the literature varies a lot. This is due
 366 to that apart from different conditions at the tests, the discharge coefficient takes into
 367 account many factors. In many practical applications the discharge coefficient is an
 368 adjustment factor that links flows at complex conditions to the orifice equation.
 369 According to Karava et al. (2004) the discharge coefficient varies between 0.14-0.65
 370 and according to Cruz and Viegas (2016) it varies between 0.47-0.81. In our assessment
 371 a precise estimation of the discharge coefficient is not available and thus we set it equal
 372 to 1 because the whole analysis is only an order of magnitude estimate. This implies
 373 that we, if the orifice equation is valid, overestimate the potential. After setting the
 374 discharge coefficient equal to 1, Eq. 19 leads to:

$$375 \quad \frac{U_{opening}}{U(H)} = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{F_D(\text{balance})}{\rho A}}}{U(H)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho A}} \frac{\sqrt{F_D(\text{balance})}}{U(H)} \quad (20)$$

376 Please note that if an estimate of the discharge coefficient is available, this can be
 377 easily be taken into account by multiplying Eq. 20 by the new discharge coefficient and
 378 the results will be qualitatively similar to those presented in subsection 4.4 (see Fig. 10
 379 later in the text).

Eq. 20 is used here to evaluate the potential for cross ventilation driven by a static pressure difference. The façade area $A = H^2$ is constant while the reference velocity at roof height $U(H)$ is dependent on the type of boundary layer generated (roughness elements in the fetch or not). According to Eq. 20 the velocity in the opening $U_{opening}$ approaches zero when the force approaches zero, which occurs when the difference in mean pressure (Eq. 18) approaches zero. Now other mechanisms for exchange of air between the interior of the building and the ambient come into play (Haghighat et al., 1991). One mechanism is the penetration of turbulent eddies through the openings and another one is flow driven by pressure fluctuations. Pressure fluctuations are generated by e.g. vortex shedding (Zu and Lam, 2018). These mechanisms give rise to penetration phenomena with strong variations in time and therefore the exchange between the indoor and the ambient cannot always be estimated from the flow rate in the opening based on the velocity field (air exchange rate). Instead the exchange must be based on an exchange of a passive contaminant present indoor. This exchange is retained from concentration data. This exchange rate is the purging flow rate (Etheridge and Sandberg, 1996) and is maximized by the air exchange rate. An example of predicting the purging flow rate from concentration data can be seen in Kobayashi et al (2018).

It should be noted that there is a direct relation between the velocity in opening $U_{opening}$ according to Eq. (20) and the assessment of the in-canopy velocity U_C according to Bentham and Britter (2003) relation (2):

$$U_C = \sqrt{2}U_{opening} \quad (21)$$

This relation is obtained from the relation (2) in Bentham and Britter (2003) by substituting the left hand side with the drag force and in the right hand side setting the drag coefficient equal to 1. Eq. 21 implies that it is possible to read off the variation in in-canopy velocity from the variation in the velocity through an opening and vice versa.

4. Results


4.1. Evaluation of the drag distribution

4.1.1 Interaction between the approaching flow and the array

Fig. 6a shows a sketch of the flow pattern when the wind approaches the array. For the approaching wind the array constitutes a resistance consisting of a blockage by cubes generating a drag force, while for the air stream passing through the street

412 canyons the resistance is generated by a friction against the surfaces forming the street
413 canyons. At the frontal façades of cubes there are stagnation points and for the air
414 stream passing along the street canyons there are corresponding retardment points
415 defined as the points with the highest static pressure (Sandberg et al., 2004). Due to the
416 increased resistance only a fraction of the approaching flow can penetrate into the array
417 because the street canyons have a lower flow capacity (Hang et al, 2010) than the
418 surrounding non occupied terrain. The fraction (dashed line in the figure) that does not
419 entrain into the array continues above the array. At the downstream end of the array
420 there is a corresponding change from a higher to a lower resistance that causes the flow
421 capacity downstream to increase. This change generates a downward flow at the
422 downstream end of the array. Fig. 6b shows the evolution of the static, dynamic and
423 total pressure in the approach flow continuing through the street canyon.

424



425

426 **Fig. 6.** Flow towards the cubes in the front row. a) Sketch of the flow pattern and b) pressure
 427 coefficient by static, dynamic and total pressure along the line indicated in a) (adapted from
 428 Sandberg et al., 2004).

429

430 **4.1.2 Interaction between the cubes and the boundary layer**

431 For an isolated cube a shear boundary layer is developed and by flow separation a
 432 characteristic flow pattern is generated around the cube with a wake on the leeward
 433 side. With respect to a reference pressure the isolated cube experiences a positive
 434 pressure on the windward side and a negative pressure in the wake on the leeward side.
 435 The difference between these pressures generates a drag force on the cube. For an array
 436 of cubes, the introduction of surrounding cubes creates an air gap around all cubes
 437 located within the interior region of the array. The air gaps constrain the flow and
 438 consequently the windward and leeward pressures to be changed relative to an isolated

439 cube. There are many physical phenomena that may affect the drag force on individual
440 cubes which depends on their location within the array. The velocity in the wake is less
441 than the free stream velocity and therefore the cube behind the first cube will be
442 sheltered and subsequently exposed to a lower velocity than the first cube. The result is
443 a lower drag force. If the cubes come very close to each other the cube downstream will
444 be fully submerged within the wake of the first cube which results in a force directed
445 opposite to the wind direction. The second cube may also affect the cube upstream by
446 that the location of the point of separation on the sides of the upstream cube is changed.
447 If the cubes are very close to each other there may be no separation from the first cube.

448 The introduction of surrounding cubes will thus lead to an interference. Based on
449 field measurements and modelling results, Oke (1988) identified three flow regimes for
450 wind direction perpendicular to the street axis in neutral stratification. For widely
451 spaced buildings (aspect ratio between the building height H and the street width $W <$
452 0.3), the flow fields associated with the buildings do not interact (isolated roughness
453 flow regime). At closer spacing ($0.3 < H/W < 0.7$) the wake behind the upwind building is
454 disturbed by the recirculation created in front of the windward building (wake
455 interference flow regime). Further reducing spacing ($H/W > 0.7$) results in the skimming
456 flow regime, where a stable recirculation is developed inside the canyon and the
457 ambient flow is decoupled from the street flow.

458 The degree of interference can be expressed as an “interference factor” defined as
459 $F_D/F_{D_isolated_cube}$, i.e. the ratio between drag force of the target cube surrounded by
460 cubes and the drag force generated by an isolated cube. There are thus three cases: 1) no
461 interference (interference factor = 1); 2) Sheltering (interference factor < 1); 3)
462 Amplification (interference factor > 1).

463


464 **4.1.3 Measured drag distribution**

465 Fig. 7 shows the interference factor for the cases with a boundary layer generated
466 with roughness elements in the fetch. The cases with a boundary layer generated with
467 no roughness elements in the fetch exhibit a similar behaviour. Both the drag forces
468 measured by the balance and the pressure difference are presented. The balance
469 measured the total contribution to the drag due to the form drag and friction. By

470 definition the drag based on the pressure difference is the form drag. The cube is a bluff
471 body so we expect the form drag to dominate.

472 From the figure it can be argued that the standard load cell method and the pressure-
473 derived method provided similar distribution of the drag force within the array. This
474 provides confidence in the measurements. Only the target cube located at the first row
475 showed a normalized drag force based on the pressure about 10% larger than the drag
476 force based on measurements by the balance. It is likely that this difference is due to
477 that the pressure is measured in a finite number of points. Secondly, results confirm that
478 the change in distribution of the drag force when changing the building packing density
479 is in accordance with assessment of the distribution of the drag force based on
480 measurements of the total drag force of the whole array reported in (Buccolieri et al.,
481 2017). For further details see also the next subsection.

482 At the lowest packing density $\lambda_p=0.028$ (air gap between the cubes is $5H$) there is no
483 interference. And at $\lambda_p=0.11$ (air gap $2H$) the interference factor is 0.5, while at $\lambda_p=0.25$
484 (air gap $1H$) the force is almost totally exerted by the first cube. As discussed in
485 Buccolieri et al. (2017) the latter case corresponds to a maximum drag force generated
486 by the whole array (see Fig. 6 of their paper). With further increase of λ_p , the drag force
487 slightly decreases until it becomes almost constant. One can claim that at $\lambda_p=0.25$ the
488 array start to behave as one single unit. The effect of an increase of the frontal area is in
489 fact cancelled out by the reduction of mean wind velocity (see Buccolieri et al., 2010).
490 At $\lambda_p=0.44$ the air gap is $0.5H$ and the drag force on the cube located downstream of the
491 cube at the front of the array becomes negative. We interpret this as that the second
492 cube now is submerged (Gowda and Sitheeq, 1990) in the boundary layer generated by
493 the cube at the front. However it remains to verify this by flow visualization. A further
494 detail is that starting with $\lambda_p=0.11$ the drag force on the cube at the front is less than on
495 an isolated cube. This we interpret as that the cube downstream affect the drag force
496 exerted on the cube at the front. However for the largest packing density $\lambda_p=0.69$ (air
497 gap $0.2H$) there is an amplification of the drag force on the front cube in the row that we
498 cannot explain. Associated with the change in the distribution of the drag force with
499 changing packing densities there is a change in the air flow pattern. In Figure 7 of
500 Buccolieri et al (2010) it is shown that starting from packing density $\lambda_p=0.44$ there are
501 recirculation zones within the array.



503

504

505 **Fig. 7.** Profiles of $F_D / F_{D_{isolated_cube}}$ (interference factor) generated by the target cubes, BL
 506 roughness case. The x-axis represents the distance from the first target cube of the array (“0”) to
 507 the last target cube (“1”), see Fig. 1.

508

508 4.2. Assessment of the drag area

509


509 In Buccolieri et al (2017) the drag area distribution was assessed from the total drag
 510 force recorded over the whole array by calculating the ratio: Total drag area/Frontal

511 area, i.e. the ratio between the total drag area retrieved from the total drag force and the
512 physical frontal area of the whole array (see their Eq. 13).

513 Here the same relation is employed but using the drag force measured on the
514 individual target cube. The total drag area is thus estimated by adding the drag forces
515 measured with the balance generated by the single target cubes and the physical frontal
516 area is the total frontal area of the target cubes. Two extreme cases of the frontal area
517 are chosen, i.e., the physical frontal area of all the middle column of the array and the
518 physical frontal area of the first (upstream) target cube. Each cube has a frontal area
519 equal to 0.036m^2 .

520 The comparison is shown in Fig. 8. First it can be noted that the drag distribution
521 obtained from current measurements on individual cubes is similar to that obtained from
522 measurements over the whole array. This suggests that, when estimating the drag area
523 generating the drag force, the single middle column is representative of the whole array
524 for each λ_p , indicating that our choice of isolated array well represents the drag force
525 exerted by a portion of the city of a given λ_p . Second the figure shows that, as expected
526 by the drag force distribution shown in Fig. 7, for low packing density the total frontal
527 area is the most appropriate reference area (drag area) since the ratio is close to one,
528 whereas for large packing densities the frontal area of the first row only is the one to be
529 used as the appropriate reference area.

530



531 **Fig. 8.** Drag area/Frontal area as a function of the planar area index λ_p when using the frontal
 532 area of the first cube or of the first row of cubes (full rhombus and square, respectively) and the
 533 frontal area of the middle column or of all the cubes (empty rhombus and square, respectively)
 534 in the a) “BL roughness” and b) “BL no roughness” cases. Note: square symbols refer to drag
 535 force measurements over the whole array (Buccolieri et al., 2017).
 536
 537

538 **4.3 Pressure distribution on the surface of target cubes**


539 To show the spatial distribution of pressure, Fig. 9 shows the pressure contours on
 540 the windward side of the first, central and last target cubes for the BL roughness case
 541 obtained by interpolating the measured pressure. Results for the BL no roughness
 542 follow a similar behaviour. We remind here that the pressure was measured (i) on the
 543 same target cube as the drag force was measured by the balance; and (ii) on one half of
 544 the side only (see Fig. 4), and therefore eventual asymmetries in the horizontal direction
 545 is not revealed which of course is a limitation. The stagnation point is the point with the
 546 highest pressure and from this point the air approaching the façade is distributed over
 547 the façade. For an isolated cube the stagnation point lies on the vertical symmetry line.
 548 However when a cube is lying in the front row of an array the location of the stagnation


549 point is probably affected by the amount of air pressed into the street canyon, formed by
550 two neighboring rows.

551 Fig. 9 shows that for all packing densities the first cube (i.e. the cube at the upstream
552 first row of the array) has qualitatively the same pressure distribution as for the isolated
553 cube. Further, the pressure distribution for the lowest packing density ($\lambda_p=0.028$) is
554 qualitatively similar for all cubes in the row, that is the interference between the cubes
555 is low in this case. This is in contrast to the case with the highest packing density
556 ($\lambda_p=0.69$) where the pressure distribution on the cube at the centre and at the end of the
557 row is almost uniform. The general trend is that with increasing packing density the
558 gradient of the pressure distribution on the wall diminishes for the central and last
559 cubes. This is due to the fact that with increasing packing density the width of the air
560 gap between the cubes diminishes and this constrains the air motion. Because the
561 pressure distribution is a footprint of the air motion along the wall, this results in a more
562 uniform pressure distribution.

563

BL roughness





565
566
567
568
569


Fig. 9. Pressure contours on the windward façade of the first, central and last target cubes for each packing density λ_p , BL roughness case.

570 **4.4. Assessment of the potential for cross ventilation**

571 The potential for cross ventilation is shown in Fig. 10 as the ratio between the
572 velocity at the opening $U_{opening}$ and the reference velocity $U(H)$ at the height of the
573 cube according to Eq. 20. This velocity ratio is dependent on the square root of the drag
574 force multiplied with an expression which only varies with the type of boundary layer,
575 generated either with no roughness elements in the fetch or with roughness elements in
576 the fetch. We remind here that in Eq. 20 the force measured by the balance
577 $F_D(\text{balance})$ is employed.

578 The figure shows that for the first (upstream) target cube the velocity ratio becomes
579 about the same for both types of boundary layers and is approximately about 0.8.

580 Overall for cubes located downstream the velocity ratio with increasing packing density
581 shows a similar qualitative behaviour as that found for the drag force (see Fig. 7).
582 Specifically, when the packing density is $\lambda_p=0.25$ the velocity ratio has dropped to
583 approximately 40% and by further increasing the packing density to $\lambda_p=0.44$ the
584 velocity ratio drops to 20%. This shows that, as expected, cross ventilation is very much
585 affected by the packing density. One can expect that single sided ventilation is less
586 sensitive to the packing density because the ventilation is mainly generated by
587 fluctuations. On the other hand single sided ventilation is in general much less than
588 cross ventilation. For the same object the relation between cross ventilation and single
589 sided ventilation has been studied in wind tunnel tests reported in Hayati et al. (2018).
590



591
 592 **Fig. 10.** Cross ventilation assessment through the ratio of velocity at the opening $U_{opening}$ and
 593 the reference velocity $U(H)$. The x-axis represents the distance from the first target cube of the
 594 array ("0") to the last target cube ("1"), see Fig. 1.
 595

596 5. Conclusions

597 The drag force distribution generated by regular arrays of cubes was measured in a
 598 wind tunnel. The force was measured using both a standard load cell and indirectly
 599 estimated by measuring the static pressure at windward and leeward façades. The

600 measurements with the two methods coincide within 10%. The drag force is presented
601 as an interference factor by dividing the measured drag force with the drag force from
602 an isolated cube. The main findings of the paper are summarized below:

- 603 - for the lowest packing density, the drag force is almost uniformly (within 15%)
604 distributed between the cubes within the array. With increasing packing density the
605 force exerted on the fraction of the cubes located downstream of the first row
606 progressively diminishes, and for the highest packing densities the whole force is
607 exerted on the first row, primarily. At the largest packing densities the force on the
608 second row is negative i.e. directed opposite to the wind direction;
- 609 - as the packing density increases the interaction between the buildings changes from a
610 collection of weakly interfering rows to become a single array, and finally as one row
611 only. This implies that for very low packing densities the total frontal area is the most
612 appropriate reference area (drag area) whereas for large packing densities the most
613 appropriate reference area is the frontal area of the first row;
- 614 - the methodology previously presented in Buccolieri et al (2017) is further verified
615 demonstrating that the distribution of the drag force within the array can be derived
616 from the total drag force, using a combination of the total drag force expressed as a drag
617 area and the physical frontal area of the cubes.
- 618 - the potential for cross ventilation is quantified as the velocity through a ventilation
619 opening which is proportional to the square root of drag force. It is shown that there is a
620 direct relation between the velocity through a ventilation opening and the in canopy
621 velocity. This is an observation that has not previously pointed out.
- 622 - the recorded pressure contours on the façades of the cubes is a footprint of the air
623 motions in the air gap between the cubes showing that with increasing packing densities
624 the gradient of the pressure decreases.

625 Measuring the drag force correctly is not only relevant for the field of wind load on
626 structures, but also for the derivation of improved description of the effect of the city
627 within atmospheric mesoscale models. Several mesoscale studies of the drag force
628 generated by arrays of buildings have been carried out with different methods. For
629 example, Gutierrez et al. (2015) implemented a mechanical drag coefficient formulation
630 depending on packing density following Santiago et al. (2010) into the Building Effect
631 Parameterization + Building Energy Model system coupled with mesoscale Weather

632 Research Forecasting model. The mesoscale model was applied over New York
633 obtaining an improvement of accuracy of mesoscale model in predicting surface wind
634 speed in complex urban area. We expect that in the future the drag force distribution
635 obtained for different wind directions (providing a sort of "drag force rose"), which may
636 lead to very significant changes in the total drag imposed by the surface (Claus et al.,
637 2012a,b; Santiago et al., 2013), can be the basis for a first order modelling of the
638 dispersion of pollutants within an urban area.

639

640 **Acknowledgements**

641 Authors would like to thank Mr. Leif Claesson from the University of Gävle for his help
642 in carrying out the wind tunnel experiments. One of the authors (SDS) kindly
643 acknowledges the iSCAPE (Improving Smart Control of Air Pollution in Europe)
644 project, which is funded by the European Community's H2020 Programme (H2020-
645 SC5-04-2015) under the Grant Agreement No. 689954.

646

647 **References**

- 648 1. Antoniou N, Montazeri H, Wigö H., Neophytou M K.-A , Blocken B, Sandberg M
649 2017. CFD and wind-tunnel analysis of outdoor ventilation in real compact
650 heterogeneous urban area: Evaluation using "air delay". *Building and Environment*
651 126, 355-37.
- 652 2. Bentham T., Britter R., 2003. Spatially averaged flow within obstacle arrays.
653 *Atmospheric Environment* 37, 2037-2043.
- 654 3. Buccolieri R, Sandberg M, Di Sabatino S., 2010. City breathability and its link to
655 pollutant concentration distribution within urban-like geometries. *Atmospheric*
656 *Environment* 44, 1894-1903.
- 657 4. Buccolieri R., Wigö H., Sandberg M., Di Sabatino S., 2017. Direct measurements of
658 the drag force over aligned arrays of cubes exposed to boundary-layer flows.
659 *Environmental Fluid Mechanics* 17, 373-394.
- 660 5. Chen L., Hang J., Sandberg M., Claesson L, Di Sabatino S., Wigo H., 2017. The
661 impact of building height variations and building packing density on flow
662 adjustment and city breathability in idealized urban models. *Building and*
663 *Environment* 118, 344-361.

- 664 6. Cheng H., Castro I.P., 2002. Near wall flow over urban-like roughness. *Boundary-*
665 *Layer Meteorology* 104, 229-259.
- 666 7. Cheng H., Hayden P., Robin A.G., Castro I.P., 2007. Flow over cube arrays of
667 different packing densities. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial*
668 *Aerodynamics* 95, 715-740.
- 669 8. Chu C.-R., Chiang B.-F., 2014. Wind-driven cross ventilation in long buildings.
670 *Building and Environment* 80, 150-158.
- 671 9. Claus J., Coceal O., Thomas T.G., Branford S., Belcher S.E., Castro I.P., 2012a.
672 Wind-direction effects on urban-type flows. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 142,
673 265–287.
- 674 10. Claus J., Krogstad P.-A., Castro I.P., 2012b. Some measurements of surface drag in
675 urban-type boundary layers at various wind angles. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*
676 145, 407-422.
- 677 11. Cruz H., Viegas J.C., 2016. On-site assessment of the discharge coefficient of open
678 windows. *Energy and Buildings* 126, 463-476.
- 679 12. Etheridge D.W., Sandberg, M., 1996. *Building Ventilation-Theory and*
680 *Measurement*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- 681 13. Gowda L.B.H., Sitheeq M.M., 1990. Effect of interference on the pressure
682 distribution on the ground plane around two low-rise prismatic bodies in tandem
683 arrangement. *Applied Scientific Research* 47,129-149.
- 684 14. Gutiérrez E., Martilli A., Santiago J.L., González J.E., 2015. A mechanical drag
685 coefficient formulation and urban canopy parameter assimilation technique for
686 complex urban environments. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 157, 333-341.
- 687 15. Haghighat F., Rao J., Fazio, P., 1991. The influence of turbulent wind on Air
688 exchange rate -a modelling approach. *Building and Environment* 26, 95-109
- 689 16. Hamlyn D., Britter R., 2005. A numerical study of the flow field and exchange
690 processes within a canopy of urban-type roughness. *Atmospheric Environment* 39,
691 3243-3254.
- 692 17. Hagishima A., Tanimoto J., Nagayama K., Meno S., 2009. Aerodynamic parameters
693 of regular of rectangular blocks with various geometries. *Boundary Layer*
694 *Meteorology* 132, 315-337.

- 695 18. Hang J., Sandberg M., Li Y., Claesson L., 2010. Flow mechanisms and flow
696 capacity in idealized long-street city models. *Building and Environment* 45, 1042-
697 1053
- 698 19. Hayati A., Mattsson M., Sandberg M., 2018. A wind tunnel study of wind-driven
699 airing through open doors. *International Journal of Ventilation*.
700 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733315.2018.1435027>
- 701 20. Karava P., Stathopoulos T., Athienitis A.K., 2004. Wind driven flow through
702 openings – A review of discharge coefficients. *International Journal of Ventilation*
703 3:3, 255-266.
- 704 21. Karava P., Stathopoulos T., Athienitis A. K., 2007. Wind-induced natural
705 ventilation analysis. *Solar Energy* 81, 20-30.
- 706 22. Karava P., Stathopoulos T., Athienitis A.K., 2011. Airflow assessment in cross-
707 ventilated buildings with operable façade elements. *Building and Environment* 46,
708 266-279.
- 709 23. Kim Y.C., Yoshida A., Tamura Y., 2012. Characteristics of surface wind pressures
710 on low-rise building located among large group of surrounding buildings.
711 *Engineering Structures* 3, 18-28.
- 712 24. Kobayashi T., Sandberg M., Kotani H., Claesson L., 2010. Experimental
713 investigation and CFD analysis of cross-ventilated flow through single room
714 detached house model. *Building and Environment* 45, 2723-2734
- 715 25. Kobayashi T., Sandberg M., Fujita T., Lim E., Umemiya N., 2018. Simplified
716 estimation of wind-induced ventilation rate caused by turbulence for a room with
717 minute wind pressure difference. *Proc. Roomvent & Ventilation 2018, Helsinki*
718 (Finland).
- 719 26. Li B., Liu J., Gao J., 2015. Surface wind pressure tests on buildings with various
720 non-uniformity morphological parameters. *Journal of Wind Engineering and*
721 *Industrial Aerodynamics* 37, 14-24.
- 722 27. Li B., Wang L., Liu Y., Liu J., 2018. Drag distributions of non-uniform buildings
723 from surface pressure measurements in wind tunnel. *Building and Environment* 143,
724 618-631.
- 725 28. Oke T.R., 1988. Street design and urban canopy layer climate. *Energy and Buildings*
726 11, 103-113.

- 727 29. Sandberg M., Skote M., Westerberg U., Claesson L., Johansson A.V., 2004. Urban
728 morphology and windiness. Proc. COST Action C14, ISBN 2-93089-11-7, pp B.7.1-
729 B.7.10, Von Karman Institute, Rhode-Saint-Genèse (Belgium), May 5-7.
- 730 30. Santiago J.L., Martilli A., 2010. A dynamic urban canopy parameterization for
731 mesoscale models based on Computational Fluid Dynamics Reynolds-Averaged
732 Navier–Stokes microscale simulations. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* 137, 417-439
- 733 31. Santiago J.L., Coceal O., Martilli A., 2013. How to parametrize urban-canopy drag
734 to reproduce wind-direction effects within the canopy. *Boundary-Layer*
735 *Meteorology* 149, 43-63.
- 736 32. Shetabivash H., 2015. Investigation of opening position and shape on the natural
737 cross ventilation. *Energy and Buildings* 93, 1-15.
- 738 33. Shirzadia M., Naghashzadegana M., Mirzaeib P.A., 2018. Improving the CFD
739 modelling of cross-ventilation in highly-packed urban Areas. *Sustainable Cities and*
740 *Society* 37, 451-465.
- 741 34. Tecle A., Bitsuamlak G.T., Jiru T.E., 2013. Wind-driven natural ventilation in a
742 low-rise building: a boundary layer wind tunnel study. *Building and Environment*
743 59, 275-289.
- 744 35. Tomas J.M., Eisma H.E., Pourquie M.J.B.M., Elsinga G.E., Jonker H.J.J.,
745 Westerweel J., 2017. Pollutant dispersion in boundary layers exposed to rural-to-
746 urban transitions: varying the spanwise length scale of the roughness. *Boundary-*
747 *Layer Meteorology* 163, 225-251.
- 748 36. VDI 3783 guidelines. Part 12 (2004) Environmental meteorology. Physical
749 modelling of flow and dispersion processes in the atmosphere boundary layer.
750 Application of wind tunnels. Düsseldorf (Germany).
- 751 37. VETEK. Datasheet 108AA (2014) Available at:
752 [http://www.vetek.com/Dynamics/Documents/03d70901-8980-4b82-be3c-
753 aa112de353e0/Datasheet%20108AA%20Eng.pdf](http://www.vetek.com/Dynamics/Documents/03d70901-8980-4b82-be3c-aa112de353e0/Datasheet%20108AA%20Eng.pdf)
- 754 38. Warren P.R., 1977. Ventilation through openings on one wall only. In C. J.
755 Hoogendorn & N.H. Afgan, eds. *Energy conservation in heating, cooling and*
756 *ventilating buildings*. Hemisphere, Washington DC, 189-209.

- 757 39. Zaki S.A., Hagishima A., Tanimoto J., Ikegaya N., 2011. Aerodynamic parameters
758 of urban building arrays with random geometries *Boundary-layer Meteorology* 138,
759 99-120.
- 760 40. Zu G., Lam K.M., 2018. Simultaneous measurements of wind velocity field and
761 wind forces on a square tall building. *Advances in Structural Engineering*.
762 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1369433218770822>