

*The influence of advertisement boards,
street and source layouts on CO
dispersion and building intake fraction in
three-dimensional urban-like models*

Article

Accepted Version

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

Lin, Y., Chen, G., Chen, T., Luo, Z. ORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2082-3958>, Yuan, C., Gao, P. and
Hang, J. (2019) The influence of advertisement boards, street
and source layouts on CO dispersion and building intake
fraction in three-dimensional urban-like models. Building and
Environment, 150. pp. 297-321. ISSN 0360-1323 doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.01.012> Available at
<https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/81577/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the
work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.01.012>

Publisher: Elsevier

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law,
including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other
copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in
the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

To be resubmitted to Building and Environment 2019
**The influence of advertisement boards, street and source layouts on CO
dispersion and building intake fraction in three-dimensional urban-like models**

**Yuanyuan Lin^{1,2}, Guanwen Chen^{1,2}, Taihan Chen^{1,2}, Zhiwen Luo³, Chao Yuan⁴,
Peng Gao^{1,2*}, Jian Hang^{1,2*}**

¹School of Atmospheric Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, P.R. China
²Guangdong Province Key Laboratory for Climate Change and Natural Disaster
Studies, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, P.R. China
³School of the Built Environment, University of Reading, UK
⁴School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore, Singapore

*Corresponding author: Peng Gao, Jian Hang
E-mail address: gaopeng8@mail.sysu.edu.cn; hangj3@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Abstract

Heavy traffic flows commonly result in large vehicular pollutant exposure in
near-road buildings. Street layouts and pollutant source settings are key factors.
Advertisement boards are sometimes adopted for business purpose, but their impacts
on pollutant dispersion and exposure are still unclear. Thus, this paper numerically
investigates the influence of aspect ratios (building height/street width, $H/W_s=1$ or 2 ;

$H=30\text{m}$), source locations and advertisement-board settings on the flow, carbon monoxide (CO) dispersion and exposure within three-dimensional urban-like models under the parallel approaching wind to the main streets. Personal intake fraction (P_{iF}) represents the fraction of total vehicular emissions inhaled averagely by each person of a population. Spatial mean P_{iF} is named as $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ and that for the entire building as building intake fraction ($\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$).

With span-wise CO source fixed in target secondary streets of No 2 or 13 (S2 or S13), $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ is particularly large in target streets. $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ decreases exponentially toward downstream from the target street and S13 cases attain greater $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ and larger exponential decreasing rates. Cases with $H/W_s=2$ experiences more limited upward dispersion and subsequently smaller $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ (0.155-0.339ppm) of entire target street than cases with $H/W_s=1$ (0.375-0.731ppm). For cases with stream-wise CO source along the main street (Smain), $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ first rises quickly toward downstream, then adjusts to equilibrium values (0.051-0.063ppm). Finally, with span-wise source, vertical and double-layer advertisement boards produce stronger upward CO transportation and greater $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ than lateral and single-layer types, while with Smain source, the double-layer and lateral types produce larger $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ and shorter exposure adjustment distance.

Key words: Building intake fraction ($\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$); personal intake fraction (P_{iF}); street aspect ratio (H/W); advertisement board; CO source location; computational fluid dynamic (CFD) simulation

1 Introduction

Due to the ongoing urbanization worldwide, traffic pollutant emissions have become one of the main pollutant sources in cities [1]. Urban air pollution, as one of the most significant environmental problems, is producing adverse health impacts on city dwellers [2-5]. Heavy traffic flows in the main roads, unfavorable urban layouts and atmospheric conditions commonly result in large vehicular pollutant exposure and high health risk for urban residents.

The flow and pollutant dispersion in urban area are commonly categorized into three length scales, i.e. street-scale (~100m), neighborhood-scale (~1km) and city-scale (~10km), and regional-scale (~100-1000km) [11-13]. Besides reducing regional-scale air pollution [14-15] and lowering vehicular pollutant emissions in local streets, neighborhoods or cities, sustainable urban layout designs are helpful for improving urban ventilation capacity and urban air quality [6-13, 16-20]. As reviewed by the literature [11-13, 16-20], the flow and pollutant dispersion in two-dimensional (2D) street canyon or three-dimensional (3D) urban models have been widely studied by conducting computational fluid dynamic (CFD) simulations, controlled laboratory experiments and full-scale outdoor field measurements. Atmospheric conditions and urban layouts are key parameters to influence the flow, ventilation performance and pollutant dispersion capacity [6-13, 16-20, 22-54]. The important parameters have been investigated such as overall urban form and ambient wind directions [21-25], street aspect ratios [8-10, 26-27] and building packing densities [28-32], building height variations [32-34], lift-up building design [35-37], viaduct settings [9-10, 38],

urban tree planting [39-41] and vehicle-motion-induced turbulence [42] etc. In addition, atmospheric stabilities and buoyancy force induced by wall heating and solar shading also play a significant role on the flow and urban ventilation if wind speed is relatively small and Richardson number is relatively large [43-54]. Most studies so far mainly investigated turbulent flow characteristics, urban ventilation capacity and spatial distribution of pollutant concentration in various sites of street canyons and at the pedestrian level [16-54].

In addition, advertisement-board settings are usually fixed near building wall surfaces in many Asian cities for business purpose. However, the advertisement boards possibly reduce urban wind speed and weaken pollutant dilution capacity. But their impacts on the flow and pollutant exposure in urban districts are still not clear and have been rarely investigated so far. In particular, on average, people spend about 90% of their time indoor. Outdoor vehicular air pollutants may penetrate into indoor via doors/windows/leakages/ventilation systems and produce indoor exposure originated from outdoor pollutants [2-5]. Such pollutant exposure to urban residents in near-road buildings commonly experience higher health risks than other kinds of urban micro-environments, which should be paid more concern [6-10]. The impacts of advertisement-board settings integrating with typical urban layouts and pollutant source settings on vehicular pollutant exposure to urban residents in near-road buildings and its surrounding streets should be further quantified.

In recent studies, various indexes have been adopted to quantify human exposure of a population exposed to urban air pollutants, including daily pollutant exposure (E_t),

intake fraction (iF) and health risk (HR). Ng and Chau [6] analyzed daily carbon monoxide (CO) E_t concerning the impacts of street setbacks and building permeability on in idealized street canyons by CFD simulations. Kalaiarasan et al. [55] employed HR to evaluate the potential health hazard level of traffic-generated PM_{2.5} at housing buildings located near a major expressway in Singapore. Vehicular iF represents the ratio of pollutants inhaled by an exposed population to the total pollutant emissions induced by vehicles. An intake fraction of 1ppm (part per million or 10^{-6}) means inhalation of 1mg of air pollutants with 1kg pollutants being released. For example, street-scale iFs were evaluated as 3000ppm in a typical street canyon in midtown Manhattan [7] and 371ppm in a street of central Athens Greece [8]. All these three indexes take age distributions of population, breathing rate, activity patterns in different micro-environments and pollutant concentration into account. However, differing from the other two indexes, the intake fraction iF is normalized by the total pollutant mass emission and subsequently independent of different pollutant source release rate, which makes it possible to quantify the impacts of urban layouts and atmospheric conditions etc on pollutant dilution capacity and the related exposure [7-10, 37-38]. For instance, by performing CFD simulations validated and estimated by wind tunnel data, Hang et al. [9] reported street-scale iFs of 230-913ppm in 2D shallow street canyons ($H/W=0.5-1$) with only one main vortex, then He et al. [10] further verified street-scale iFs in order of 10^5 ppm in 2D high-rise deep street canyons ($H/W=5-6$) with two main vortexes.

Because street-scale iFs increase linearly if the population size and density in

local streets rise, personal intake fraction (P_{iF}) was introduced to emphasize the impacts of urban layouts and atmospheric conditions on pollutant exposure for each person on average which is independent of population density and size [9-10]. In particular, Hang et al. [9] estimated spatial mean values of P_{iF} in entire streets (i.e. $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$) in shallow 2D street canyon ($\sim 1-5\text{ppm}$, $H/W=0.5-1$), later $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ in 2D deep street canyons ($H/W=5-6$) was evaluated ($\sim 100-1000\text{ppm}$) [10]. Then $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ in 3D urban district models were verified one order smaller ($\sim 0.1\text{ppm}$) than 2D street canyon models with similar aspect ratios ($H/W=0.5-1$) [37-38]. In addition, the literature on 2D street canyon models reported that [51], pollutant concentration decreases exponentially toward downstream street canyons of the target street with traffic carbon monoxide (CO) or particle sources, but such decay processes in 3D urban districts still require further investigations.

Therefore, the main purpose of this paper is to quantify the integrating impacts of advertisement boards, span-wise and stream-wise CO source settings and street aspect ratios on pollutant exposure in the target street of typical 3D urban districts and the CO exposure decay processes toward downstream streets. Ambient wind directions also significantly influence pollutant dispersion processes [21-25, 31, 37]. Since the parallel approaching wind direction was reported to attain better urban ventilation capacity than oblique wind directions [21, 23, 31, 37], as a start, this paper first considers the approaching wind parallel to the main streets and perpendicular to the secondary streets. In particular, the overall spatial mean P_{iF} at all floors in each building (i.e. building intake fraction $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$) will be quantified as a key index of

pollutant exposure analysis.


2 Pollutant exposure indexes

To quantify vehicular pollutant exposure, intake fraction (iF) is defined in Eq. (1):


$$iF = \sum_i^N \sum_j^M P_i \times Br_{i,j} \times \Delta t_{i,j} \times Ce_j / \dot{m} \quad (1)$$

where P_i denotes the number of population in the i^{th} of total age group ($N=3$), $Br_{i,j}$ is the average breathing rate (m^3/s) for one person of the i^{th} age group in the j^{th} micro-environment ($M=4$), similarly $\Delta t_{i,j}$ is the duration of stay in the j^{th} micro-environment (s) for i^{th} age group, Ce_j means the time-averaged pollutant concentration (kg/m^3) in the j^{th} micro-environment originated from the total vehicular emission (kg). The definition formula (Eq. (1)) also indicates that iF is independent on the pollutant source strength, but dependent on the population size and density.

In this study, according to the literature [56], the whole population is divided into three age groups ($M=3$, Fig.1a): Elders (15.5%), Children (21.2%), and Adults (63.3%). Besides, four micro-environments ($N=4$) are defined as indoors at home ($j=1$), other indoor locations ($j=2$), near vehicles ($j=3$) and other outdoor locations ($j=4$) (Fig.1b) [57], among which only indoors at home ($j=1$) is considered here assuming that present building models are residential type. Activity time pattern and breathing rate in every micro-environment vary for different age groups. Breathing rate for each age group only for indoor at home ($j=1$) is adopted [58] (Table 1).



(a)



(b)

Fig.1 (a) Age distributions according to the population census in Hong Kong [56]. (b)

Time activity patterns for each age group in various micro-environments [57].

Table 1 Breathing rate and time patterns for indoor at home for each age group [58]

Age groups	Population ratio	Breathing rate Br (m^3/day)	Time patterns
Children	21.2%	12.5	61.7%
Adults	63.3%	13.8	59.5%
Elderly	15.5%	13.1	71.6%

To obtain an exposure index independent of population density and size, personal intake fraction (P_{iF}) is defined as below [9-10]:

$$P_{iF} = iF / \sum_j^M P_i \quad (2)$$

P_{iF} represents the averaged pollutant exposure for a population (i.e. intake fraction for each person on average), and does not rise if the population density and size increases. Such index is mainly influenced by multiple factors including urban-built layouts, pollutant source settings, meteorological conditions, time activity patterns for local population etc. [9-10].

According to the literature [2-5, 59], if the building is naturally-ventilated, indoor pollutant concentration originated from outdoor pollutants is nearly equal to the outdoor concentration near building surfaces. Therefore, this paper supposes present building models are naturally-ventilated residential type and calculates P_{iFs} at building wall surfaces for each floor as P_{iFs} of rooms inside buildings originated from outdoor traffic emissions. Thus indoor space of buildings is not simulated to reduce the grid number and computational time. The overall spatial mean P_{iF} of all floors of each building is defined as building intake fraction, $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$.

3 CFD setups and case descriptions

3.1 Numerical models

Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) approaches (e.g. $k-\varepsilon$ models and Reynolds stress models (RSM)) are most commonly adopted to predict the flow and turbulence as pollutant dispersion in urban models, although large eddy simulations

(LES) have been confirmed to have higher accuracy while they need much more computing resources and it is a challenge to set appropriate time-dependent inlet boundary conditions. Among the RANS models, it was reported that [16, 60], the standard k - ε model performs worse in predicting turbulence in the strong-wind region of building clusters (e.g. flow separation region near building corners) than the modified k - ε models (e.g. RNG k - ε model), but its prediction accuracy is better in simulating weak-wind regions of urban districts (e.g. the sheltered region behind the buildings). In addition, many previous studies confirmed that the standard k - ε model can make satisfactory performance in predicting the flow/pollutant dispersion in urban models and has been validated well by experimental data [9-10, 22-24, 29-33, 42-45].

Therefore, in spite of its limitation in over-predicting the turbulence in urban flow-separation regions, this paper adopted Ansys FLUENT with the standard k - ε model and standard wall function [61] to simulate steady-state flows in full-scale urban models under neutral atmospheric conditions. The governing equations for the flow and turbulent quantities are as below:

The mass conservation equation

$$\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_i} = 0 \quad (3)$$

The momentum equation

$$\bar{u}_j \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \bar{p}}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(\nu \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j} - \overline{u_i' u_j'} \right) \quad (4)$$

The transport equations of turbulent kinetic energy (TKE, k) and its dissipation rate (ε):

$$\overline{u_i} \frac{\partial k}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\left(\nu + \frac{\nu_t}{\sigma_k} \right) \frac{\partial k}{\partial x_i} \right] + \frac{1}{\rho} P_k - \varepsilon \quad (5)$$

$$\overline{u_i} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\left(\nu + \frac{\nu_t}{\sigma_\varepsilon} \right) \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial x_i} \right] + \frac{1}{\rho} C_{\varepsilon 1} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} P_k - C_{\varepsilon 2} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{k} \quad (6)$$

where $\overline{u_j}$ is time-averaged velocity components ($\overline{u_j} = \overline{u}, \overline{v}, \overline{w}$ $j=1, 2, 3$), ν and

$\nu_t = C_\mu k^2 / \varepsilon$ ($C_\mu = 0.09$) denote the kinematic viscosity and the kinematic eddy

viscosity, $-\overline{u_i' u_j'}$ is the Reynolds stress tensor defined as:

$$-\overline{u_i' u_j'} = \nu_t \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_i}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_j}}{\partial x_i} \right) - \frac{2}{3} k \delta_{ij} \quad (7)$$

P_k is the turbulence production term defined as:

$$P_k = \nu_t \times \frac{\partial \overline{u_i}}{\partial x_j} \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_i}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_j}}{\partial x_i} \right) \quad (8)$$

and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta whose value is 1 when $i=j$ and 0 otherwise.

All the governing equations (Eqs.(3-6)) were discretized by a finite volume

method (FVM) with the second order upwind scheme. The SIMPLE scheme was used

for the coupling of pressure and velocity. The under-relaxation factors for pressure

term, momentum term, k and ε terms were set as 0.3, 0.7, 0.8 and 0.8 respectively. The

simulation stopped until all residuals approximately became constants, and the

residuals for typical variables for all cases were under 10^{-6} .

Species transport model was enabled to calculate the dispersion of carbon

monoxide (CO) which was used to represent the vehicular emission in this paper. The

governing equation of CO concentration is:

$$\overline{u_j} \frac{\partial C}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} ((D_m + D_t) \frac{\partial C}{\partial x_j}) = S \quad (9)$$

where C is the time-averaged CO concentration (kg/m^3), D_m and D_t are the molecular and turbulent diffusivity respectively, \bar{u}_j is the time-average velocity components in the stream-wise, span-wise and vertical directions ($\bar{u}_j = \bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{w}$ when $j=1,2,3$) and S is the volumetric pollutant emission rate. Here $D_t = \nu_t / Sc_t$ (ν_t is the kinematic eddy viscosity for momentum transport) and Sc_t is the turbulent Schmidt number set as 0.7 according to the literature [21-23, 29-33, 35-38].

The solution of concentration field (Eq.(9)) was discretized by the second-order upwind scheme. Zero normal flux condition was set at all wall surfaces, and zero normal gradient condition was defined at the domain outlet and domain top. The concentration at the domain inlet was set as zero so that there was no additional species injected into the calculation domain except the volumetric CO source defined in the target street. Numerical simulations of Eq.(9) did not stop until its absolute residual became constant and fell below 1×10^{-8} .

3.2 Model descriptions for case studies

Building geometrical setups and CFD settings in flow simulation

As shown in Fig.2a, case studies were based on the idealized 3D urban area with regularly-aligned cubic building models ($H=B=30\text{m}$), with the scale ratio of 200:1 to those in wind tunnel experiments ($H=B=15\text{cm}$) [62]. The approaching wind was parallel to the main streets and perpendicular to the secondary streets. To better illustrate CFD models, it is necessary to mention that, x , y and z represents the stream-wise, span-wise and vertical directions respectively. $x/H=0$ denotes the

location of windward street opening and $y/H=0$ represents the vertical symmetric plane of the middle main street. The width of the main street (along x direction, parallel to the approaching wind) is constant as $W_m=30\text{m}$, while the width of secondary streets (along y direction, perpendicular to the approaching wind) changes for different cases ($W_s=30\text{m}$ or 15m as $H/W_s=1$ or 2 , Fig.2b-2c).

In order to control the grid number and reduce computing resources, only half of one building column and the main street beside are considered in CFD simulations, and symmetry condition is used for two lateral boundaries of the computational domain (Fig.2b-2d). CFD methodologies with this “half column method” have been confirmed effective by experimental data when the lateral width of urban models is sufficiently large and the airflow is hardly influenced by lateral urban boundaries [32-33, 37, 53, 62-65]. Moreover, under the high-quality CFD validation study, our recent published paper (Hang et al. [38]) also investigated similar urban models by this “half column method”.

In addition, distances between urban boundaries and the domain top, domain inlet, domain outlet are not less than $9H$, $6.7H$ and $30H$ respectively (Fig.2b-2c). At the domain outlet, zero normal gradient boundary condition (i.e. outflow) was set. At the domain top, the symmetry boundary condition was set.

The power-law time-averaged velocity profile $U_0(z)$ measured in the upstream free flow of wind tunnel tests [62] is adopted (Eq.(10)) at the domain inlet. Vertical profiles of $k(z)$ and $\epsilon(z)$ are calculated by Eq. (11-12) [33, 37, 62-65].


$$U_0(z) = U_{ref} \times (z / H)^{0.16} \quad (10)$$

$$k(z) = u_*^2 / \sqrt{C_\mu} \quad (11)$$


$$\varepsilon(z) = C_\mu^{3/4} k^{3/2} / (\kappa_v z) \quad (12)$$

Here, U_{ref} is the reference velocity magnitude of the approaching free flow at building height ($z=H$) of wind tunnel models [62] ($U_{ref}=3\text{m/s}$) and u_* is the friction velocity ($u_*=0.24\text{m/s}$) which is the same with that in wind tunnel experiments. C_μ is constant as 0.09 and κ_v is von Karman's constant ($\kappa_v=0.41$). Velocity profiles of Eq. (10) at the domain inlet has been adopted in previous CFD studies [23, 33, 37-38, 62-65] which represents a neutral atmospheric boundary layer with a full-scale surface roughness $z_0=0.1\text{m}$ and flowing above open rural area with a regular cover of low crop [66]. Vertical profiles of turbulent quantities in Eq.(11-12) were adopted following the CFD guideline [67-68].


Fig.2d illustrates the grid arrangement of base case (Case [None, 30m]). The minimum grid size of 0.2m next to the wall surfaces and a grid expansion ratio of 1.15 were adopted. As verified in Section 4, such grid setup is sufficient to satisfy grid independence requirement (three kinds of grids tested). For all cases studied, the total number of hexahedral cells ranges from 2.8 million to 6.5 million.




(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)

Fig.2 (a) Idealized urban model; (b-c) Computational domain for cases with $H/W_s=1$ and $H/W_s=2$; (d) Grid arrangement for cases with aspect ratio $H/W_s=2$.

Overall, all CFD setups in case studies, including computational domain size, boundary conditions, grid arrangements etc, satisfy the requirements of CFD guideline for urban wind simulation [67-68]. In particular, numerical accuracy of

present CFD setups has been evaluated well by the CFD validation study in Section 4.

CFD setups in pollutant dispersion simulation

Differing from those of gaseous pollutants, the particle dispersion dynamics also depends on the gravity force and deposition effects associated with particle diameters, dynamic wind, thermal buoyancy forces etc [38, 51]. To simplify the exposure analysis, as a start, this paper mainly emphasizes the dynamic dispersion of passive and gaseous pollutants with inert chemical nature. Similar with the literature [6-10, 37-40, 51], carbon monoxide (CO) was selected as the passive and inert vehicle-emitted pollutants. Two kinds of CO source settings were considered (Fig.3), i.e. a span-wise CO source in the 2nd or 13th secondary streets (S2 in Fig. 3a-3b or S13 in Fig.3c-3d), and the stream-wise CO source along the main street (Smain in Fig.3e-3f). All volume CO sources were set with 0.4m high near street ground (i.e. $z_s=0-0.4m$). Moreover, span-wise CO sources of S2 and S13 (Fig.3a-3d) had constant span-wise length of $S_y=30m$ in y direction, and the varying stream-wise length in x direction ($S_x=W_s=15m$ or $30m$ for cases with 30m-wide or 15m-wide secondary streets). In addition, stream-wise CO source (Fig.3e-3f, Smain) was defined as $S_y=15m$ wide in y direction, and in x direction as long as the total stream-wise length of entire urban models (i.e. $S_x=L_{x1}=1230m$ long for 30m-wide cases and $S_x=L_{x2}=930m$ for 15m-wide cases). All pollutant sources were set with a constant CO emission rate of 36.1g/h/m for unit length according to Ng and Chau [6], which was calculated by counting the passing vehicles of a real street per hour in Mongkok, Hong Kong. Thus the total mass emission rate can be defined as $L_{source} \times 1.0 \times 10^{-5} kg/s$, in which L_{source}

differs for different cases: for cases with span-wise CO source (S2 and S13)
 $L_{source}=L_y=30\text{m}$, for cases with stream-wise CO source (Smain) $L_{source}=L_{xl}=1230\text{m}$ or
 930m (i.e. equal to total stream-wise length of entire urban model).





Fig.3 Descriptions of CO source settings: (a-b) S2, (c-d) S13 and (e-f) Smain in cases with $H/W_s=1$ and $H/W_s=2$.

327

328 *CFD setups for advertisement boards and case descriptions*

329 As depicted in Fig.4, nine kinds of advertisement boards arrangements were
330 considered. Test cases are named as Case [*advertisement board type, street width of*
331 *secondary streets (i.e. $W_s=15\text{m}$ or 30m), source location (i.e. S2, S13 or Smain)].
332 Overall, total 39 test cases were investigated as summarized in Table 2. The type of
333 “None” denotes the base case without any advertisement boards. As displayed in
334 Fig.4a-4b, two kinds of basic arrangements of advertising boards were first
335 investigated. “Lateral1 type” (Fig.4a, Case [Lateral1, $W_s=30\text{m}/15\text{m}$, S2 or S13])
336 represents “long” advertising boards (board length $l_b=5\text{m}$; board height $h_b=2\text{m}$)
337 perpendicular to the building surface with 5m above the ground and uniformly 5m
338 spaced. Meanwhile “Vertical1 type” (Fig.4b, Case [Vertical1, $W_s=30\text{m}/15\text{m}$, S2 or
339 S13]) describes “tall” advertising board (board length $l_b=2\text{m}$; board height $h_b=5\text{m}$)
340 attached to the buildings with 3m above the ground and 5m spaced. To avoid the
341 difficulty in generating grid, all of the advertisement boards are ideally simplified as
342 rectangles without thickness. Then as depicted in Fig.4c-4i, seven more complicated
343 types of advertising board were introduced. In more detail, four kinds of lateral types
344 (Fig. 4c-4f) are considered, including Lateral2_align type (Fig.4c) with the
345 upper-layer advertising boards aligned to the original layer below, Lateral2_stagger
346 type (Fig.4d) with upper-layer boards staggered to the original layer below,
347 Lateral1_dense type (Fig.4e) with single-layer but denser advertisement boards
348 (interval of 2.5m) than Lateral1 type (interval of 5m), Lateral1_lower type (Fig.4f)*

349 with single-layer boards but only 3m high above the ground (2 m lower than Lateral1).
 350 Meanwhile, three kinds of vertical types were investigated (Fig.4g-4i), including
 351 Vertical2_align, Vertical2_stagger and Vertical1_dense, with similar settings as those
 352 for the corresponding Lateral types.



353 Fig.4 Detailed descriptions of advertisement boards' settings

354

355 **Table 2** Summary of test cases and advertising board models investigated

Case Name	Descriptions of advertising boards' arrangements
[None, W_s^* , Source**]	Without advertising boards
[Lateral1, W_s , Source]	Long advertising boards (length $l_b=5m$; height $h_b=2m$), 5m above ground, intervals of 5m (Fig.4a)
[Vertical1, W_s , Source]	Tall advertising boards (length $l_b=2m$; height $h_b=5m$), 3m above ground, intervals of 5m (Fig.4b)
[Lateral2_align, W_s , Source]	An additional upper-layer of advertising board with same size and interval above, is align to the original layer. (Fig.4c)
[Lateral2_stagger, W_s , Source]	An additional upper-layer is staggered and locates above to the original layer below (Fig.4d)
[Lateral1_dense, W_s , Source]	Double advertising boards with half of the interval (5m to 2.5m) (Fig.4e)
[Lateral1_lower, W_s , Source]	Single-layer boards with only 3m high above ground (2 m lower than Lateral1) (Fig.4f)
[Vertical2_align, W_s , Source]	Same size as <i>Vertical1</i> and similar arrangement as Lateral2_align (Fig.4g)
[Vertical2_stagger, W_s , Source]	Same size as <i>Vertical1</i> and similar arrangement as Lateral2_stagger (Fig.4h)
[Vertical1_dense, W_s , Source]	Same size as <i>Vertical1</i> and same arrangement as . (Fig.4i)

356 * W_s stands for the width of secondary streets ($W_s=15m$ or $30m$). As $W_s=15m$, only
357 *None*, *Lateral1* and *Vertical1* types are studied.

358 ****Source type** includes **S2** (Fig.3a-3b), **S13**(Fig.3c-3d) and **Smain** (Fig.3e-f).

359

360 **4 CFD validation and grid independence study**

361 **4.1 CFD validation of flow modelling**



362 The reliability of CFD approaches using various $k-\epsilon$ models and standard wall


function was evaluated by wind tunnel data from Brown et al. [62]. In that wind tunnel experiments (Fig.5a), an idealized urban model was built with 7 rows and 11 columns of cubic buildings with a parallel approaching wind to the main streets. Each cubical building is 0.15m tall with the same space between buildings (i.e. $B=H=W=0.15\text{m}$, $H/W=1$). The urban model was 1:200 scaled compared with the full-scale models in case studies (as depicted in Section 3). As displayed in Fig.5a, x , y and z are defined as the stream-wise, span-wise and vertical direction respectively. $x/H=0$ denotes windward street entry and $y/H=0$ refers to the vertical center plane of the middle building column. Vertical profiles of velocity components and turbulent kinetic energy were measured at points of V_i ($i=1-6$) locating at $y/H=0$ and $x=1.5H-11.5H$ respectively (Fig.5a).

In the CFD validation case, a full-scale 7-row urban models (i.e. $B=H=W=30\text{m}$, $H/W=1$) were considered with a scale ratio of 200:1 to wind-tunnel-scale models. Fig. 5b displays CFD domain and boundary conditions. As confirmed by experiments or numerical simulations in the literature [32-33, 37, 53, 62-65], if the urban model is sufficiently long in the span-wise direction, airflow in the middle column is hardly influenced by the lateral urban boundaries. Thus, to reduce the computational time and total grid number, the CFD validation case only considered half of the middle column (Fig.5b), i.e. span-wise domain size $L_y=30\text{m}$.


Moreover, present urban model is $13H$ long. Urban boundaries are $9H$, $6.7H$ and $40.3H$ from the domain roof, domain inlet and domain outlet. Zero normal gradient boundary condition (i.e. outflow) was set for the domain outlet, and symmetry

385 boundary condition at the domain top and domain lateral boundaries. According to the
 386 literature [23, 33, 37-38, 62-65], vertical profiles of velocity $U_0(z)$, TKE $k(z)$ and its
 387 dissipation rate $\varepsilon(z)$ in Eq.(10-12) were defined at the domain inlet which are the same
 388 as those in cases studies described in Section 3.





(a)



(b)

Fig.5 (a) Descriptions of wind tunnel experiment (Lien et al. [63]); (b) Computational domain in CFD validation case.

It is worth mentioning that, according to Snyder (1972) [69], if the reference Reynolds number $Re \gg 11000$, the turbulent flow pattern is Reynolds number independent, i.e. does not change with the increasing Reynolds number. The Reynolds number can be calculated as below:

$$Re = (U_{ref} \cdot H) / \nu \quad (13)$$

Here, U_{ref} is the reference velocity magnitude of the approaching free flow at building height ($z=H$) of wind tunnel models [62-63] ($U_{ref}=3\text{m/s}$).


In present studies, the reference Reynolds number in wind tunnel experiments is 3×10^4 with building height of $H=15\text{cm}$ [62-63]. In full-scale simulation of the CFD

validation case, Re is 6×10^6 as $H=30\text{m}$ with a scale ratio of 1:200. No matter wind-tunnel-scale models or full-scale models, both $Re \gg 11000$ and Reynolds number independence requirement is fully satisfied, thus in both scales the turbulent flow pattern is fully-developed and is not affected by the Re values.


Three grid arrangements were tested for grid independence study: fine grid (the minimum grid size next to wall surfaces was 0.1m, about 2.7 million hexahedral cells in total), medium grid (minimum grid size of 0.2m, about 1.5 million cells) and coarse grid (minimum grid size of 0.5m, about 0.6 million cells). All grid generation had the same grid expansion ratio of 1.15. Thus, there were at least four grids adopted in the pedestrian level ($z=0\text{-}2\text{m}$), which satisfy the grid requirement of the CFD guidelines [67-68]. As the normalized distance from wall surfaces y^+ ($y^+ = yu_\tau / \nu$) ranged from 30 to 500 at most regions of wall surfaces, standard wall function was set on all wall surfaces with no slip boundary condition [61].

Fig. 6 displays the vertical profiles of time-averaged stream-wise velocity $\bar{u}(z)$, vertical velocity $\bar{w}(z)$ and turbulence kinetic energy $k(z)$ in the CFD validation case with all three grid arrangements, comparing CFD results with wind tunnel data at some example points [62]. These figures infer that, as applying the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model, CFD results with medium grids have little difference in contrast to that of the fine-grid case. In addition, with the medium grid arrangements, the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model performs better than the RNG $k-\varepsilon$ model, and the latter over-predicts both \bar{u} and \bar{w} as $z < H$ but slightly underestimates the k profile. Therefore, by considering both numerical accuracy and reducing the computational time, the medium grid (i.e.


429 the minimum grid size of 0.2m next to wall surfaces) and the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model are
 430 adopted for further case studies.




(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)

Fig.6 Vertical profiles in CFD validation case compared with wind tunnel data: (a)

$k(z)$ and (b) $\bar{w}(z)$ at Point V1, (c) $\bar{u}(z)$ at Point V3, (d) $\bar{u}(z)$ at Point V5.

To further quantify the numerical accuracy of the CFD method applied, several statistical performance metrics are calculated (Table 3), including mean value, the standard deviation (St dev.), the fraction of predictions (i.e. CFD results here) within a factor of two of observation (i.e. wind tunnel data here) (FAC2), the normalized mean error (NMSE), the fraction bias (FB) and the correlation coefficient (R). Here the NMSE refers to the normalized discrepancies between wind tunnel data and CFD results, and FB indicates overestimation or underestimation of predictions (i.e. negative value shows overestimation, and the positive value implies underestimation). According to the literature [70-71], a credible CFD simulation model should meet the following statistical metrics standards: $FAC2 \geq 0.5$, $NMSE \leq 1.5$ and $-0.3 \leq FB \leq 0.3$. As shown in Table 3, $\bar{u}(z)$ at Points V3 and V5 as well as $k(z)$ at Point V1 fit the standards well. While $\bar{w}(z)$ at Point V1 performs a little poorly in the FAC2, but its correlation coefficient (R) is still acceptable as 0.9. In conclusion, present CFD methodologies using the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model and the medium grid arrangement possess credible numerical accuracy in predicting urban airflow.

Table 3 Statistical performance metrics for CFD validation cases

Variable (position)		$k(z)$ (V1)	$\bar{w}(z)$ (V1)	$\bar{u}(z)$ (V3)	$\bar{u}(z)$ (V5)
Average	Wind tunnel	0.42	-0.21	1.47	1.58
	CFD	0.35	-0.12	1.54	1.69
Standard deviation	Wind tunnel	0.23	0.20	1.79	1.70
	CFD	0.15	0.27	1.87	1.85
FAC2		1.00	0.44	1.00	0.93
NMSE		0.15	0.65	0.01	0.02

FB	0.20	0.52	-0.05	-0.07
R	0.79	0.90	0.94	0.93

Finally, as [Brown et al. \[62\]](#) did not present the measurement result at the street side (i.e. along the main street), as shown in Appendix (Fig. A1), the data of another wind tunnel experiment was adopted to verify the effectiveness of the “half column method” in the street side.

4.2 CFD Validation of dispersion modelling

The effectiveness of the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model in predicting pollutant dispersion in the idealized urban model is evaluated by wind tunnel experiment data by Chang and Meroney [29]. [Fig. 7a](#) depicts the configuration of the wind-tunnel-scale urban model adopted. Nine rectangular-prism building models ($W=18.4\text{cm}$, $L=27.6\text{cm}$, $H=8\text{cm}$) were placed in a symmetric 3×3 arrangement with same separation distance ($B=2H=16\text{cm}$). A point C_2H_6 (ethane) source located at the center point of the cross street in front of the center building model. The concentration was measured at points along the centerline of the windward wall of the center building model and the leeward wall of the model ahead.


The same wind-tunnel-scale urban model was established in the CFD validation case. Refer to Chang and Meroney [29], the evenly releasing C_2H_6 point source was modeled as a $1.3\times 1.3\text{cm}$ velocity inlet with a constant vertically upward velocity as 0.05m/s and no turbulence. The mass fraction of C_2H_6 from that inlet was set to be 1. Approaching flow velocity, turbulent kinetic energy (TKE) and its dissipation rate

(TED) profiles measured in that wind tunnel experiment were adopted at the simulation domain inlet [72]. No slip wall boundary condition was applied at both floor and all building facades. The total grid number was 816,102.

All the concentration results are presented in a dimensionless form K , which is defined as [29]:

$$K = CU_{ref}H^2 / Q \quad (14)$$

where C is the volume fraction of C_2H_6 , U_{ref} denotes the free flow velocity at model height H , and Q is the flow rate of the steady source. Fig.7b shows that the prediction result of the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model agrees well with the measured data, which captures both the scalar magnitude and the trend of K profiles. The result confirms that the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model has a satisfactory prediction performance of pollutant dispersion.







Fig.7 (a) Model configurations of wind tunnel experiment conducted by Chang and Meroney [29]. (b) Comparison of K between wind tunnel experiment result from Chang and Meroney [29] and CFD simulation applying standard $k-\varepsilon$ model.

5 Results and discussion


5.1 Impacts of advertisement boards on flow and pollutant dispersion

Fig.8 displays velocity magnitude, 3D streamlines and CO concentration in the vertical plane of $y=30\text{m}$ (the center plane of buildings, i.e. the domain symmetry boundary as shown in Fig.2d) in the target street (Street S2) for cases with 30m-wide secondary streets ($H/W_s=1$). 3D helical flow exits and the flow fields for cases with and without advertisement boards are similar in most regions (Fig.8a-8d). In addition, in contrast to case without advertisement boards, a little difference can be found that


507 the flow near building wall surfaces tends to go vertically along the vertical
 508 advertisement boards (Fig.8c-8d). Furthermore, advertisement boards slightly weaken
 509 the velocity near building surfaces (Fig.8a-8b), thus they slightly increase CO
 510 concentration near building walls (Fig.8e-8f). When CO source is fixed in Street 13
 511 (Fig.3c, results not shown here), the overall velocity and concentration in Street 13 are
 512 slightly smaller and higher than those of Street S2. Similarly, advertisement boards in
 513 Street 13 also produce a decrease of velocity and an increase of CO concentration
 514 near building walls.




(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)





Fig.8 (a-b) Velocity magnitude, (c-d) 3D streamlines and (e-f) CO concentration at $y=30\text{m}$ in Street S2 in example cases with $W_s=30\text{m}$.

The concentration at building wall surfaces can be used to represent indoor concentration originated from outdoor pollutants when the buildings are naturally ventilated. Such concentration is more important to pollutant exposure analysis than that far from building walls. Thus Fig.9 further shows the concentration at building wall surfaces of Street 2 and Street 13 in example cases with $H/W_s=1$ ($W_s=30\text{m}$). For cases without advertisement boards, Fig.9a-9b confirm that leeward-wall concentration is always much higher than windward wall and both decrease toward the upper-level walls.

In contrast to Fig.9a-9b, the advertisement boards in Fig.9c-9f are found to significantly or slightly raise the leeward-side concentration, and more pollutants are dispersed upwardly. Moreover, Fig. 9c-9d verifies that double-layer advertisement boards (e.g. Lateral2_align) produce higher concentration and induce more upward

CO dispersion than single-layer type (e.g. Lateral1). Fig. 9e shows CO concentration distribution with dense advertisement boards (e.g. Vertical1_dense) is similar with that of type Vertical1. Finally, Fig.9f confirms that the two-layer type with staggered arrangements (e.g. Vertical2_stagger) even slightly decrease CO concentration than the aligned type (e.g. Vertical2_align).








Fig.9 CO concentration on building walls next to target street ($W_s=30m$) in (a) Case[None,30m,S2] and (b) Case[None,30m,S13]; CO concentration on leeward wall of target street in example cases with (c-d) lateral-type and (e-f) vertical-type advertisement boards. (Black lines in (c-f) stands for the location of advertisement boards on the building walls.)

Fig. 10 compares the flow and concentration filed in Street 2 ($W_s=30m$ or $15m$) with local CO source. Different 3D downward helical flows are produced (Fig.10a-10b). Velocity in narrower street (Fig.10d) is slightly smaller than that in wider street (Fig. 10c), especially near the ground. As a result, dispersion characteristics are different. Wider Street 2 experiences higher leeward-side concentration than the windward-side (Fig.10e), however it is opposite in narrower Street 2 (Fig.10f). This difference can be explained by the CO concentration at $z=1m$ (Fig.10g), the downward helical flows attack the ground and subsequently induce the lateral flows from the secondary streets to the main streets, however the direction of such ground-level lateral flows are different, i.e. toward leeward wall in case with


551 wider secondary street but flowing to windward wall in the narrower one.




(a)




(b)




(c)



(d)



(e)



(f)

CO concentration (mg/m³) and Streamlines ($z=1\text{m}$)






Fig.10 (a-b) 3D streamlines , (c-d) Velocity magnitude, (e-f) CO concentration filed at $y=30\text{m}$ in Street 2 in example cases with $W_s=15\text{m}$; (g) CO concentration and streamlines in plane of $z=1\text{m}$ in Case[None,15m,S2] and Case[None,30m,S2].

Then Fig.11a-11d further display the flow and concentration at windward and leeward building walls in cases with narrower Street 2 and 13 ($W_s=15\text{m}$) without advertisement boards. Results show that, the concentration on windward building walls is much higher than leeward walls and less pollutant is dispersed upwardly in 15m-wide cases (Fig.11a-11b) than 30m-wide cases (Fig. 9a-9b). Furthermore, it is surprise to find cases with narrower Street 2 (Fig.11a) experience much higher windward-wall concentrations than Street 13 cases (Fig.11b), which is opposite to cases with wider secondary streets ($W_s=30\text{m}$, Fig.9). Such dispersion characteristics can be explained by Fig.11c-11d that the downward helical flow in Street 13 has a

larger downward velocity near the windward wall than Street 2, which produces more ground-level lateral pollutant transportation to the main street (Fig.11g) and less upward pollutant dispersion (Fig.11a-11b). Then Fig.11e-11f emphasize the windward-wall concentration (i.e. highly polluted region) in Street 2 and Street 13 with advertisement boards. In contrast to Fig.11a-11b, the advertisement boards slightly enhance the upward pollutant dispersion and raise windward-wall concentration more or less. Besides, vertical-type advertisement boards produce more upward pollutant transport than lateral-type (Fig.11e-11f).





CO concentration (mg/m^3) and Streamlines ($z=1\text{m}$)




Fig.11 CO concentration on building walls next to 15m-wide target street (a) S2 and (b) S13; (c-d) velocity magnitude at $y=30\text{m}$ and (e-f) windward-wall CO concentration in example cases as $W_s=15\text{m}$; (g) CO concentration and streamlines in $z=1\text{m}$ in Case[None,15m,S2] and Case[None,15m,S13]. (Black lines in (e-f) stands for the location of advertisement boards on the building walls.)

5.2 Impacts of advertisement boards on building intake fraction with S2 and S13

5.2.1 P_{iF} on leeward and windward walls of target streets


This subsection mainly analyzes the impacts of advertisement board settings on personal intake fraction (P_{iF}) at various heights on building walls of Street 2 and 13.

[Fig.12a-12b](#) shows vertical profiles of P_{iF} along windward and leeward walls in some example cases with wider Street 2 ($W_s=30\text{m}$) and lateral-type or vertical-type advertisement boards. First, no matter with or without advertisement boards, leeward-side P_{iF} is always much larger than windward-side and P_{iF} decreases quickly from pedestrian levels towards upper levels ([Fig.12a-12b](#)). Moreover, [Fig.12a](#) shows that, in contrast to cases without advertisement board, the single-layer lateral type (i.e. Lateral1) slightly raise P_{iF} , and the double-layer Lateral2 type can increase P_{iF} more considerably, especially at upper levels. In addition, the impacts of vertical-type advertisement boards ([Fig.12b](#)) on P_{iF} profiles are similar with lateral-type cases. In particular, vertical-type cases experience greater overall P_{iF} than lateral-type cases, especially for Vertical2_align type with double-layer aligned boards. These findings are consistent with the concentration distribution in [Fig. 9](#).


[Fig. 12c](#) compares vertical profiles of P_{iF} in 15m-wide or 30m-wide cases with source S2. As discussed in subsection 5.1, for all 15m-wide cases, the particular downward helical flows significantly weaken the upward pollutant dispersion and tend to transport more CO toward low levels of windward wall. As a result, 15m-wide cases experience greater windward-side P_{iF} than leeward-side, opposite to 30m-wide cases. In particular, the ground-level maximum P_{iF} are 5.89 and 7.15 ppm for Case [None, 15m, S2] and Case [Lateral1, 15m, S2] respectively (not shown

in Fig. 12c) at windward walls, nearly 3 times as the maximum P_{iF} in Case [None, 30m, S2] (2.62 ppm at leeward wall). Moreover, narrower secondary streets (15m-wide) experience much less P_{iF} in its upper level ($z/H > 0.5$) than 30m-wide cases, especially for their windward walls. For example, P_{iF} in the upper-level windward and leeward walls of Case [None, 30m, S2] are 0.084-0.054ppm and 0.411-0.223ppm respectively (from $z/H=0.62-1$), while those for Case [None, 15m, S2] are 0.025-0.004ppm and 0.041-0.014 ppm from $z/H=0.62-1$.


Then Fig. 12d-12f emphasizes vertical profiles of P_{iF} as CO source moves to the downstream Street 13 (i.e. S13). First, Fig. 12d displays P_{iF} profiles in 30m-wide S13 cases with vertical-type advertisement boards. Similarly, all kinds of vertical types produce larger leeward-side P_{iF} than that without advertisement boards ("none" type), and leeward-side P_{iF} with S13 (Fig. 12d) significantly exceed those with S2 (Fig. 12b). Furthermore, Fig. 12e compares P_{iF} in S13 cases with 15m-wide and 30m-wide secondary streets. Likewise, 15m-wide cases experience larger windward-side P_{iF} than the leeward-side, opposite to that of 30m-wide cases. Besides, compared with the 15m-wide case without advertisement boards, Vertical1 type significantly raises windward-side P_{iF} than Lateral1 type. Finally Fig. 12f makes a comprehensive comparison (15m-wide to 30m-wide, S13 to S2) between all cases without advertisement boards. It is clear that, for 30m-wide cases, the downstream street (S13) experiences weaker airflow and subsequently attains slightly greater P_{iF} than S2. However, as confirmed by Fig. 11a-11b in Subsection 5.1, those for 15m-wide cases are opposite, i.e. S13 cases attain smaller P_{iF} than S2 cases.




(a)




(b)




(c)



(d)



(e)



(f)

Fig.12 Vertical profiles of P_{iF} along building walls in example cases next to (a-c)

target street 2, (d-e) next to target street 13, and (f) comparisons between cases with

CO source S2 and S13 without advertisement boards.

Finally, [Fig. 13a](#) displays the overall surface-averaged P_{iF} ($\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$) for both leeward and windward wall of the target street for all cases. Obviously, 15m-wide cases with $H/W_s=2$ attain smaller $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$ (0.155-0.339ppm) than 30m-wide cases ($H/W_s=1$, 0.375-0.731ppm). Such finding is opposite to that of 2D street canyons in [He et al. \[10\]](#), in which $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$ in 2D deeper streets (5.64ppm as $H/W_s=2$) is larger than that in 2D shallower streets (4.42ppm as $H/W_s=1$). Furthermore, $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$ in present 3D cases (0.155-0.731ppm) are one-order smaller than those of 2D cases (4.42-5.64ppm). Such phenomena can be explained as below: 3D urban models are ventilated by both the flow flushing 3D urban space and turbulent diffusion/air exchange across street roofs, thus experience much stronger pollutant dispersion capacity than 2D street canyons in which wind is relatively weak and pollutants can only be removed across street roof. All advertisement boards basically raise $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$ more or less ([Fig. 13a](#)), and cases with double-layer advertisement boards experience larger $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$ than single-layer types, especially Case [Vertical2_align, 30m] experience the greatest $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$ among all the cases (i.e. $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$ for S2 and S13 are 47.5%-36.9% greater than Case [none, 30m]). In more detail, [Fig. 13b](#) shows $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ at leeward wall and windward wall respectively. [Table 4](#) displays the ratios of leeward-side $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ to windward-side $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ ($\langle P_{iF} \rangle_{lee/wind}$). For 30m-wide cases, leeward-side $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ are 3.71-4.70 times of windward-side $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ with S2 source and 3.73-4.53 times with S13 source, while for 15m-wide cases $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_{lee/wind}$ are all

below 1 (i.e. 0.339- 0.931) verifying leeward-side $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ are smaller than
windward-side.





Fig.13 (a) Overall surface-averaged $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ value of entire target street ($\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$)
and (b) surface-averaged P_{iF} ($\langle P_{iF} \rangle$) of leeward and windward walls respectively.

Table 4 $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_{lee/wind}$ for all cases studied

Case name	Source S2	Source S13
-----------	-----------	------------

Case[None, 30m]	3.710	3.923
Case[Vertical1, 30m]	3.821	4.037
Case[Vertical1_dense, 30m]	4.261	4.293
Case[Vertical2_align, 30m]	4.701	4.524
Case[Vertical2_stagger, 30m]	4.132	4.072
Case[Lateral1, 30m,]	3.794	3.892
Case[Lateral1_dense, 30m]	3.765	4.059
Case[Lateral1_lower, 30m]	3.765	4.101
Case[Lateral2_align, 30m]	3.974	3.739
Case[Lateral2_stagger, 30m]	3.759	3.726
Case[None, 15m]	0.339	0.931
Case[Vertical1, 15m]	0.448	0.681
Case[Lateral1, 15m]	0.395	0.749

* $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_{\text{lee/wind}}$: ratios of leeward $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ to windward $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$.


5.2.2 $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ profiles toward downstream streets

Building intake fraction $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ represents the spatially-averaged P_{iF} at all wall surfaces of each building model. This subsection emphasizes the influence of advertisement boards and CO source locations on the decreasing processes of $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ from the target street to downstream urban regions (Fig. 14). Only cases with 30m-wide secondary streets are discussed here.


Fig. 14a depicts $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ for three example cases (None, Lateral1 and Vertical1) with CO source S2 or S13. Obviously, $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ decreases exponentially from the building adjoining the target street toward downstream regions. With CO source S13, since wind in Street 13 is relatively weaker than Street 2, thus more CO accumulates in Street 13 and $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ are much greater nearby S13 than Street 2. Moreover, $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ in S13 cases decrease more quickly toward downstream streets. Then Fig. 14b-14c display $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ profiles in more 30m-wide test cases. All types of advertisement boards raise $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ more or less than cases without advertisement

boards. In addition, no matter for lateral-type (Fig. 14b) or vertical-type (Fig. 14c) advertisement boards, double-layer types (Vertical2 or Lateral2, aligned or staggered) attain much greater $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ near the target street with CO source. However, for buildings in far downstream regions, those double-layer-type cases experience a little smaller $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ as more CO is accumulated in the target street.

To quantify the influence of advertisement boards on $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ decreasing rates towards downstream, the decay function as $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B = a \times \langle P_{iF} \rangle_{n_0} \times e^{(n_0 - n)/b}$ (n =building number; for S2 or S13 cases, $n_0=3$ or 14) is defined. Table 5 summarizes the exponentially decay factor b for all 30m-wide case. Larger decay factor b indicates relatively mild decreasing of $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ profile. The decay factors b are 5.512-8.649 and 3.115-4.003 for S2 and S13 cases respectively, verifying the quicker decrease of $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ in S13 cases. Moreover, double-layer lateral type (Case [Lateral2_align or stagger, 30m, S2 or S13]) have the smallest decay factor b and the quickest decrease processes of $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ toward downstream regions.




(a)




700

701

702



(b)






Fig. 14 $\langle P_i F \rangle_B$ profiles in example cases with 30m-wide secondary streets with CO source S2 or S13.

Table 5 Exponential decay factor b in $\langle P_i F \rangle_B$ decay profiles in cases with $W_s=30m$

Source	S2	S13
Case[None, 30m]	8.649	3.801
Case[Vertical1, 30m]	8.150	3.801
Case[Vertical1_dense, 30m]	8.487	3.510
Case[Vertical2_align, 30m]	6.970	3.887
Case[Vertical2_stagger, 30m]	7.439	3.367
Case[Lateral1, 30m,]	7.245	3.751
Case[Lateral1_dense, 30m]	7.443	4.003
Case[Lateral1_lower, 30m]	8.164	4.031
Case[Lateral2_align, 30m]	5.541	3.136
Case[Lateral2_stagger, 30m]	5.512	3.115


*Decay factor b calculated by fitting $\langle P_i F \rangle_B = a \times \langle P_i F \rangle_{n_0} \times e^{(n_0 - n)/b}$, denotes $\langle P_i F \rangle_B$ decay rate from target street (n_0) toward downstream regions (For S2 and S13 cases $n_0=3$ and 14).

5.3 Impacts of advertisement boards on $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ in cases with Smain source


Fig. 15a-15b displays CO mass fraction (ppm) in the plane of $z=1.5\text{m}$ (pedestrian level) with CO source along the main street (i.e. Smain) in cases with 30m-wide or 15m-wide secondary streets. Compared with cases without advertisement boards, all types of advertisement boards considerably raise CO concentration along the main street, and the lateral type seems to attain more CO exposure than vertical type. Fig. 15c-15e further shows $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ profiles toward downstream regions in Smain cases. For most 30m-wide cases (Fig. 15c-15d), $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ reaches an approximate equilibrium state at the 10th building for cases with single-layer types (Vertical1 and Lateral1) and at the 7th for double-layer types (i.e. shorter exposure adjustment distance). The equilibrium values of $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ with 30m-wide secondary streets are about 0.049-0.054ppm, much smaller than peak $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ in S2 or S13 cases with span-wise CO source (i.e. 0.12-0.26ppm in Fig. 14). Moreover, the double-layer types experience a little greater $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ than the single-layer types. These phenomena result from smaller in-canopy velocity induced by double-layer boards than the single-layer types. Finally, cases with 15m-wide secondary streets (Fig. 15e) attain longer adjustment distance for $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$, and come to slightly greater equilibrium values of $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ (i.e. average 0.063ppm) than 30m-wide cases (0.049-0.054ppm). It can be explained that the 15m-wide secondary streets induce weaker drag force of buildings and smaller in-canopy velocity than 30m-wide secondary streets [32].

CO mass fraction (ppm) in plane of $z=1.5\text{m}$ (pedestrian level)


Case[None, 30m, Smain]




Case[Lateral1, 30m, Smain]




Case[Lateral2_align, 30m, Smain]



Case[Vertical1, 30m, Smain]




Case[Vertical2_align, 30m, Smain]




(a)

CO mass fraction (ppm) in plane of $z=1.5\text{m}$ (pedestrian level)


Case[None, 15m, Smain]





Case[Lateral1, 15m, Smain]





Case[Vertical1, 15m, Smain]



(b)





(e)

Fig.15 CO concentration in $z=1.5\text{m}$ (pedestrian level) with CO source Smain in cases with (a) 30m-wide and (b) 15m-wide secondary streets. (c-e) $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ profiles in cases with CO source Smain.

752

753 **5.4 Limitations and future study**

754 Finally, it is worth mentioning that, as the urban models and advertisement board
755 models adopted here are fairly simplified and only residential buildings are
756 considered, the current exposure results possibly change if more realistic factors are
757 taken into account, such as more realistic urban morphologies, more complicated
758 advertisement boards and pollutant source settings, realistic atmospheric conditions
759 and various ambient wind directions, building air tightness and functions (residential,
760 commercial, industrial etc), pollutant properties (e.g. particle diameter) etc.
761 Furthermore, realistic meteorological conditions usually include the unsteady
762 temporal variations of wind speed and direction as well as various atmospheric
763 stabilities and relative importance of buoyancy force. Particularly, as confirmed by
764 outdoor field measurement (Mavroidis [et al. \[73\]](#)) and numerical simulation ([Zhang et](#)
765 [al. \[74\]](#)), urban airflow and pollutant dispersion under steady and unsteady boundary
766 conditions are different. For instance, [Zhang et al. \[74\]](#) reported that, unsteady wind
767 conditions experience lower pollutant concentration than that with unsteady
768 background wind and the same average wind speed.

769 Therefore, it still requires further investigations to perform unsteady CFD
770 simulations evaluated by the high-quality scale-model outdoor field measurement. For
771 this purpose, we developed a 3D building cluster ([Fig. A2](#)) consisting of more than
772 3000 concrete building models (building height $H=1.2\text{m}$, building width $B=0.5\text{m}$,
773 street width $W=0.5\text{m}$, $H/W=2.4$) in the suburb of Guangzhou for scale-model outdoor

measurement of urban micro-climate and health (SOMUCH). The unsteady velocity and turbulence profiles, radiation characteristics, air and wall temperature within and above the urban model were measured by using twenty ultrasonic anemometers, three CRN4 radiometers, forty temperature and humidity sensors, two infrared cameras etc. In recent future, the concentration distribution of tracer gas at 24 sites will be measured with line source of tracer gas fixed near street ground. Further transient numerical simulations will be conducted under the validation of scale-model outdoor experimental data to investigate unsteady urban turbulence, pollutant dispersion and personal exposure analysis in urban-like models.

6 Conclusions

Heavy traffic flows in street networks commonly result in serious urban air pollution. Urban pollutant dispersion and their exposure assessment have become an important issue. In particular, urban residents in near-road buildings commonly experience high exposure risks to vehicular pollutants induced by street traffic flows. Personal intake fraction (P_{iF}) represents the fraction of total CO emissions inhaled by each person on average of a population. Particularly, building intake fraction ($\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$) denotes spatial mean P_{iF} for all floors of each building. Street layouts and pollutant source settings are key influencing factors. Advertisement boards may weaken urban windiness and raise pollutant exposure. Therefore, this paper numerically quantify the integrated impacts of street aspect ratios ($H/W_s=1$ or 2), CO source locations and advertisement boards on the flow, pollutant dispersion, $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$

in 3D urban-like models, which are still unclear so far. Neutral atmospheric condition is first considered with the approaching wind parallel to the main street and perpendicular to the secondary streets.

The aspect ratio of the secondary streets ($H/W_s=1, 2$; $H=30\text{m}$) and CO source locations (span-wise and stream-wise type) are confirmed key factors. If the target secondary street of No 2 or No 13 is fixed with CO source (i.e. span-wise CO source S2 or S13), 3D downward helical flows transport more pollutants to the leeward side in wider secondary streets (i.e. $W_s=30\text{m}$, $H/W_s=1$), inducing much greater leeward-side $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ than the windward-side. But it is opposite for cases with narrower secondary streets (i.e. $W_s=15\text{m}$, $H/W_s=2$) in which windward-side $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ is larger. It can be confirmed by the ratio of windward-side $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$ to leeward-side $\langle P_{iF} \rangle$, i.e. $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_{\text{lee/wind}}$ is 3.710-4.701 as $H/W_s=1$ and 0.339-0.931 as $H/W_s=2$. Moreover, $H/W_s=2$ experiences more limited upward CO dispersion, much greater P_{iF} at low levels and smaller P_{iF} at high levels than $H/W_s=1$, thus the overall average P_{iF} of both windward and leeward wall of the target street ($\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$) as $H/W_s=2$ (0.155-0.339ppm) is nearly half of that as $H/W_s=1$ (0.375-0.731ppm). There are different findings for 2D street canyon model that $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_T$ (4.42ppm) as $H/W_s=1$ is smaller than that as $H/W_s=2$ (5.64ppm) which are one order greater than present 3D urban models. Building intake fraction $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ decreases exponentially from the target street toward downstream. As span-wise CO source is fixed in the secondary street, S13 attains greater $\langle P_{iF} \rangle_B$ and much larger decreasing rate toward downstream than S2. Such exponential decay function is defined as

818 $\langle P_iF \rangle_B = a \times \langle P_iF \rangle_{n_0} \times e^{(n_0-n)/b}$ (n =building number; $n_0=3$ and 14 for S2 and
819 S13 cases), and the decay factor b is 5.51-8.65 for S2 cases, and 3.12-4.00 for S13
820 cases, for which smaller b indicates $\langle P_iF \rangle_B$ decreases more quickly toward the
821 downstream. For cases with CO source in the main street parallel to the approaching
822 wind (i.e. stream-wise source, S_{main}), $\langle P_iF \rangle_B$ first rises quickly as deeper into
823 urban models, then increases slowly to the equilibrium values, which are 0.051ppm
824 and 0.063ppm as $H/W_s=1$ and 2 respectively, being only 20%-50% of the maximum
825 $\langle P_iF \rangle_B$ in cases with span-wise source S2 or S13 (i.e. 0.12-0.26ppm).

826 Advertisement boards are verified to slightly slow down 3D helical flow and
827 pollutant dispersion in the secondary streets, and such impact is more considerable
828 near building wall surfaces. All types of advertisement boards reduce urban wind
829 speed, enhance upward pollutant transportation and subsequently raise $\langle P_iF \rangle$ more
830 or less. With span-wise S2 or S13 source, advertisement boards produce greater
831 decreasing rates of $\langle P_iF \rangle_B$ towards downstream due to more pollutant stagnated in
832 the target secondary street. For a single building, vertical type and double-layer type
833 of advertisement boards produce stronger upward pollutant transportation and greater
834 $\langle P_iF \rangle_B$ than lateral type and single-layer ones. With stream-wise S_{main} source,
835 advertisement boards produce more surface roughness on the building walls, which
836 weaken the pollutant dilution and bring higher CO concentration near the building
837 row. In such cases, the double-layer and lateral types of advertisement boards produce
838 greater equilibrium values of $\langle P_iF \rangle_B$ and shorter exposure adjustment distance
839 toward the constant $\langle P_iF \rangle_B$ region. In conclusion, the influence of advertisement

boards on the pollutant dispersion and exposure mostly depends on two factors—the vertical dimension and span-wise stretch. The vertical dimension decides how far the pollutant can be transport upward on the building facades, while the span-wise stretch serves as roughness that deteriorates the pollutant purging efficiency.

Although further investigations are still required to provide practical guidelines, this paper is one of the first attempts to quantify how advertisement board types, street aspect ratios, span-wise or stream-wise CO source setting influence flow and pollutant exposure in 3D urban models, which can provide effective methodologies and meaningful references to urban planning.

Acknowledgements

This study was financially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No 51478486) and National Natural Science Foundation--Outstanding Youth Foundation (grant No. 41622502), by STINT (dnr CH2017-7271) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (51811530017), as well as Science and Technology Program of Guangzhou, China (grant No. 201607010066 and 2014B020216003).

Reference list

- [1] J. Fenger, Urban air quality. Atmos. Environ. 33 (1999), 4877-4900.
- [2] B. Zhou, B. Zhao, X.F. Guo, R.J. Chen, H.D. Kan, Investigating the geographical heterogeneity in PM10-mortality associations in the China Air

Pollution and Health Effects Study (CAPES): A potential role of indoor

exposure to PM₁₀ of outdoor origin, *Atmos. Environ.* 75 (2013) 217-223.

- [3] R.J. Chen, B. Zhou, H.D. Kan, B. Zhao, Associations of particulate air pollution and daily mortality in 16 Chinese cities: An improved effect estimate after accounting for the indoor exposure to particles of outdoor origin. *Environ. Pollut.* 182 (2013), 278-282.

- [4] W.J. Ji, B. Zhao, Estimating mortality derived from indoor exposure to particles of outdoor origin. *PLOS ONE*. 10 (2015) e0124238.

- [5] C. Chen, B. Zhao, W.T. Zhou, X.Y. Jiang, Z.C. Tan, A methodology for predicting particle penetration factor through cracks of windows and doors for actual engineering application, *Build. Environ.* 47 (2012) 339-348.

- [6] W. Ng, C. Chau, A modelling investigation of the impact of street and building configurations on personal air pollutant exposure in isolated deep urban canyons, *Sci. Total. Environ.* 468-469 (2014) 429-448.

- [7] Y. Zhou, J.I. Levy, The impact of urban street canyons on population exposure to traffic-related primary pollutants, *Atmos. Environ.* 42 (2008) 3087-3098.

- [8] G. Hambilomatis, A. Chaloulakou, A CFD modelling study in an urban street canyon for ultrafine particles and population exposure: The intake fraction approach, *Sci. Total. Environ.* 530-531 (2015) 227-232.

- [9] J. Hang, Z.W. Luo, X.M. Wang, L.J. He, B.M. Wang, W. Zhu, The influence of street layouts and viaduct settings on daily CO exposure and intake fraction in idealized urban canyons, *Environ. Pollut.* 220 (2017) 72-86.

- 884 [10] L.J. He, J. Hang, X.M. Wang, B.R. Lin, X.H. Li, G.D. Lan, Numerical
885 investigations of flow and passive pollutant exposure in high-rise deep street
886 canyons with various street aspect ratios and viaduct settings, *Sci. Total*
887 *Environ.* 584-585 (2017) 189-206.
- 888 [11] R.E. Britter, S.R. Hanna, Flow and dispersion in urban areas, *Annu. Rev. Fluid.*
889 *Mech.* 35 (2003) 469-496.
- 890 [12] H.J.S. Fernando, D. Zajic, S. Di Sabatino, R. Dimitrova, B. Hedquist, Flow,
891 turbulence, and pollutant dispersion in urban atmospheres, *Phys. Fluids.* 22
892 (2010) 1-20.
- 893 [13] B. Blocken, CFD simulation of micro-scale pollutant dispersion in the built
894 environment, *Build. Environ.* 64 (2013) 225 – 230.
- 895 [14] K.G. Zhu, M. Xie, T.J. Wang, X.J. Cai, S.B. Li, W. Feng, A modeling study on
896 the effect of urban land surface forcing to regional meteorology and air quality
897 over South China, *Atmos. Environ.* 152(2017) 389-404.
- 898 [15] L. Shu, M. Xie, D. Gao, T. Wang, D. Fang, Q. Liu, A. Huang, L. Peng, Regional
899 severe particle pollution and its association with synoptic weather patterns in
900 the Yangtze River Delta region, China, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 17(2017)
901 12871-12891.
- 902 [16] Y. Tominaga, T. Stathopoulos, CFD simulation of near-field pollutant dispersion
903 in the urban environment: A review of current modeling techniques. *Atmos.*
904 *Environ.* 79 (2013) 716-730.
- 905 [17] B. Blocken, Computational fluid dynamics for urban physics: importance,

906 scales, possibilities, limitations and ten tips and tricks towards accurate and
 907 reliable simulations, *Build. Environ.* 91 (2015) 219-245.

908 [18] R.N. Meroney, Ten questions concerning hybrid computational/physical model
 909 simulation of wind flow in the built environment, *Build. Environ.* 96 (2016)
 910 12-21.

911 [19] X.X. Li, C.H. Liu, D.Y.C. Leung, K.M. Lam, Recent progress in CFD
 912 modelling of wind field and pollutant transport in street canyons, *Atmos.*
 913 *Environ.* 40 (2006) 5640-5658.

914 [20] Y.W. Zhang, Z. Gu, W. Y. Chuck, Review on numerical simulation of airflow
 915 and pollutant dispersion in urban street canyons under natural background wind
 916 conditions. *Aerosol. Air. Qual. Res.* 18 (2018), 780-789.

917 [21] J. Hang, M. Sandberg, Y.G. Li. Age of air and air exchange efficiency in
 918 idealized city models. *Build. Environ.* 44(8) (2009)1714-1723.

919 [22] T. van Hooff, B. Blocken, CFD evaluation of natural ventilation of indoor
 920 environments by the concentration decay method: CO₂ gas dispersion from a
 921 semi-enclosed stadium, *Build. Environ.* 61 (2013) 1-17.

922 [23] J. Hang, Q. Wang, X.Y. Chen, M. Sandberg, W. Zhu, R. Buccolieri, S. Di
 923 Sabatino, City breathability in medium density urban-like geometries evaluated
 924 through the pollutant transport rate and the net escape velocity, *Build. Environ.*
 925 94 (2015) 166-182.

926 [24] B. Blocken, R. Vervoort, T.A.J. van Hooff, Reduction of outdoor particulate
 927 matter concentrations by local removal in semi-enclosed parking garages: a

928 preliminary case study for Eindhoven city center, *J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.*
 929 159 (2016) 80-98.

930 [25] H.L Gough, Z. Luo, C.H. Halios, M.F. King, C.J. Noakes, C.S.B. Grimmond,
 931 J.F. Barlow, R. Hoxey, A.D. Quinn, Field measurement of natural ventilation
 932 rate in an idealised full-scale building located in a staggered urban array:
 933 Comparison between tracer gas and pressure-based methods. *Build. Environ.*
 934 137 (2018) 246-256.

935 [26] R.N Meroney, M. Pavageau, S. Rafailidis, M. Schatzmann, Study of line source
 936 characteristics for 2-D physical modelling of pollutant dispersion in street
 937 canyons, *J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 62 (1996) 37-56.

938 [27] X.X. Li, C.H. Liu, D.Y.C. Leung, Large-eddy simulation of flow and pollutant
 939 dispersion in high-aspect-ratio urban street canyons with wall model,
 940 *Bound-Lay. Meteorol.* 129 (2008) 249-268.

941 [28] S.R. Hanna, S. Tehranian, B. Carissimo, R.W. Macdonald, R. Lohner.
 942 Comparisons of model simulations with observations of mean flow and
 943 turbulence within simple obstacle arrays. *Atmos. Environ.* 36 (2002)
 944 5067-5079.

945 [29] C.H. Chang, R.N. Meroney, Concentration and flow distributions in urban street
 946 canyons: wind tunnel and computational data, *J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 91
 947 (2003) 1141-1154.

948 [30] R. Ramponi, B. Blocken, L.B. de Coo, W.D. Janssen, CFD simulation of
 949 outdoor ventilation of generic urban configurations with different urban

950 densities and equal and unequal street widths, *Build. Environ.* 92 (2015)
951 152-166.

952 [31] R. Buccolieri, M. Sandberg, S. Di Sabatino, City breathability and its link to
953 pollutant concentration distribution within urban-like geometries, *Atmos.*
954 *Environ.* 44 (2010) 1894-1903.

955 [32] J. Hang, Y.G. Li, Age of air and air exchange efficiency in high-rise urban areas
956 and its link to pollutant dilution, *Atmos. Environ.* 45 (2011) 5572-5585.

957 [33] M. Lin, J. Hang, Y.G. Li, Z.W. Luo, M. Sandberg, Quantitative ventilation
958 assessments of idealized urban canopy layers with various urban layouts and the
959 same building packing density, *Build. Environ.* 79 (2014) 152-167.

960 [34] Z.L. Gu, Y.W. Zhang, Y. Cheng, S.C. Lee, Effect of uneven building layout on
961 airflow and pollutant dispersion in non-uniform street canyons, *Build. Environ.*
962 46 (2011) 2657-2665.

963 [35] Y.X. Du, C.M. Mak, J.L. Liu, Q. Xia, J.L. Niu, K.C.S. Kwok, Effects of lift-up
964 design on pedestrian level wind comfort in different building configurations
965 under three wind directions, *Build. Environ.* 117 (2017) 84-99.

966 [36] J.L. Liu, J.L. Niu, C.M. Mak, Q. Xia, Detached eddy simulation of
967 pedestrian-level wind and gust around an elevated building, *Build. Environ.* 125
968 (2017) 168-179.

969 [37] C.Y. Sha, X.M. Wang, Y.Y. Lin, Y.F. Fan, X. Chen, J. Hang, The impact of
970 urban open space and 'lift-up' building design on building intake fraction and

971 daily pollutant exposure in idealized urban models. *Sci. Total. Environ.* 633
972 (2018) 1314-1328.

973 [38] J. Hang, Z.N. Xian, D.Y. Wang, C.M. Mak, B.M. Wang, Y.F. Fan, The impacts
974 of viaduct settings and street aspect ratios on personal intake fraction in
975 three-dimensional urban-like geometries, *Build. Environ.* 143(2018) 138-162.

976 [39] C. Gromke, B. Blocken, Influence of avenue-trees on air quality at the urban
977 neighborhood scale. Part I: Quality assurance studies and turbulent Schmidt
978 number analysis for RANS CFD simulations, *Environ. Pollut.* 196 (2015)
979 214-223.

980 [40] C. Gromke, B. Blocken, Influence of avenue-trees on air quality at the urban
981 neighborhood scale. Part II: Traffic pollutant concentrations at pedestrian level,
982 *Environ. Pollut.* 196 (2015) 176-184.

983 [41] C.H. Wang, Q. Li, Z.H. Wang. Quantifying the impact of urban trees on passive
984 pollutant dispersion using a coupled large-eddy simulation–Lagrangian
985 stochastic model. *Build. Environ* 145 (2018) 33-49.

986 [42] Y.W. Zhang, Z.L. Gu, C.W. Yu, Large eddy simulation of vehicle induced
987 turbulence in an urban street canyon with a new dynamically vehicle-tracking
988 scheme. *Aerosol. Air. Qual. Res.* 17(3) (2017) 865-874.

989 [43] N. Nazarian, J. Kleissl, Realistic solar heating in urban areas: Air exchange and
990 street-canyon ventilation, *Build. Environ.* 95 (2016) 75-93.

991 [44] Y. Toparlar, B. Blocken, P. Vos, G.J.F. van Heijst, W.D. Janssen, H. Montazeri,
992 H.J.P. Timmermans, CFD simulation and validation of urban microclimate: A
993 case study for Bergpolder Zuid, Rotterdam. *Build. Environ.* 83 (2015) 79-90.

994 [45] X.Y. Yang, Y.G. Li, The impact of building density and building height
995 heterogeneity on average urban albedo and street surface temperature, *Build.*
996 *Environ.* 90 (2015) 146-156.

997 [46] P.Y. Cui, Z. Li, W.Q. Tao, Buoyancy flows and pollutant dispersion through
998 different scale urban areas: CFD simulations and wind-tunnel measurements,
999 *Build. Environ.* 104 (2016) 76-91.

1000 [47] X.X. Wang, Y.G. Li, Predicting urban heat island circulation using CFD, *Build.*
1001 *Environ.* 99 (2016) 82-97.

1002 [48] Y.F. Fan, J.C.R. Hunt, Y.G. Li, Buoyancy and turbulence-driven atmospheric
1003 circulation over urban areas, *J. Environ. Sci.* 59 (2017) 63-71.

1004 [49] X.X. Li, R.E. Britter, L.K. Norford, Effect of stable stratification on dispersion
1005 within urban street canyons: A large-eddy simulation, *Atmos. Environ.* 144
1006 (2016) 47-59.

1007 [50] X. M. Cai, Effects of differential wall heating in street canyons on dispersion
1008 and ventilation characteristics of a passive scalar, *Atmos. Environ.* 51 (2012)
1009 268-277.

1010 [51] L. Lin, J. Hang, X.X. Wang, X.M. Wang, S.J. Fan, Q. Fan, Y.H. Liu, Integrated
1011 effects of street layouts and wall heating on vehicular pollutant dispersion and

1012 their reentry into downstream canyons, *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.* 16 (2016) 3142-
1013 3163.

1014 [52] J. Liu, Z.W. Luo, J.N. Zhao, T.Y. Shui. Ventilation in a street canyon under
1015 diurnal heating conditions. *Int. J. Vent.*,11(2) (2012). 141-154.

1016 [53] J.Y. Liu, J. Srebric, N.Y. Yu, Numerical simulation of convective heat transfer
1017 coefficient at the external surfaces of building arrays immersed in a turbulent
1018 boundary layer, *Inter. J. Heat. Mass. Trans.* 61 (2013) 209-225.

1019 [54] W.W. Wang, E. Ng, Air ventilation assessment under unstable atmospheric
1020 stratification - A comparative study for Hong Kong, *Build. Environ.* 130(2018)
1021 1-13.

1022 [55] M. Kalaiarasan, R. Balasubramanian, K.W.D. Cheong, K.W. Tham,
1023 Traffic-generated airborne particles in naturally ventilated multi-storey
1024 residential buildings of Singapore: Vertical distribution and potential health risks,
1025 *Build. Environ.* 44.7 (2009) 1493-1500.

1026 [56] Z.W. Luo, Y.G. Li, W.W. Nazaroff, Intake fraction of nonreactive motor
1027 vehicle exhaust in Hong Kong, *Atmos. Environ.* 44 (2010) 1913-1918.

1028 [57] C.K. Chau, E.Y. Tu, D.W.T. Chan, C.J. Burnett, Estimating the total exposure
1029 to air pollutants for different population age groups in Hong Kong, *Environ.*
1030 *Inter.* 27 (2002) 617-630.

1031 [58] M. Allan, G.M. Richardson, H. Jones-Otazo, Probability density functions
1032 describing 24-hour inhalation rates for use in human health risk assessments: an
1033 update and comparison, *Hum. Ecol. Risk. Assess.* 14 (2008) 372-391.

1034 [59] T.N. Quang, C. He, L. Morawska, L.D. Knibbs, M. Falk, Vertical particle
1035 concentration profiles around urban office buildings, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 12
1036 (2012) 5017-5030.

1037 [60] R. Yoshie, A. Mochida, Y. Tominaga, T. Shirasawa. Cooperative project for
1038 CFD prediction of pedestrian wind environment in the Architectural Institute of
1039 Japan, *J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 95(2007) 1551-1578.

1040 [61] FLUENT V6.3, <http://fluent.com>. Accessed in 2006.

1041 [62] M.J. Brown, R.E. Lawson, D.S. DeCroix, R. L. Lee, Comparison of centerline
1042 velocity measurements obtained around 2D and 3D building arrays in a wind
1043 tunnel. Report LA-UR-01-4138, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos,
1044 (2001) pp.7.

1045 [63] F.S. Lien, E. Yee, Numerical modeling of the turbulent flow developing within
1046 and over a 3-D building array, part I: A high-resolution Reynolds-averaged
1047 Navier-Stokers approach, *Bound-lay. Meteorol.* 112 (2004) 427-466.

1048 [64] J. Hang, Y.G. Li, Wind conditions in idealized building clusters – macroscopic
1049 simulations using a porous turbulence model. *Boundary-Lay. Meteorol.* 136(1)
1050 (2010) 129-159.

1051 [65] J.L. Santiago, A. Martilli, F. Martin, CFD simulation of airflow over a regular
1052 array of cubes. Part I: three dimensional simulation of the flow and validation
1053 with wind-tunnel measurements, *Bound-lay. Meteorol.* 122 (2007) 609-634.

1054 [66] J.S. Irwin, A theoretical variation of the wind profile power-law exponent as a
1055 function of surface roughness and stability, *Atmos. Environ.* 13(1) (1979) 191-
1056 194.

1057 [67] Y. Tominaga, A. Mochida, R. Yoshie, H. Kataoka, T. Nozu, M. Yoshikawa, T.
1058 Shirasawa, AIJ guidelines for practical applications of CFD to pedestrian wind
1059 environment around buildings, *J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerod.* 96 (2008) 1749-1761.

1060 [68] J. Franke, A. Hellsten, H. Schlunzen, B. Carissimo, The COST732 Best Practice
1061 Guideline for CFD simulation of flows in the urban environment a summary, *Int.*
1062 *J. Environ. Pollut.* 44 (2011) 419-427.

1063 [69] W.H. Snyder, Similarity criteria for the application of fluid models to the study
1064 of air pollution meteorology. *Bound-Lay. Meteorol.* 3(1972) 113-134.

1065 [70] S. Di Sabatino, R. Buccolieri, H.R. Olesen, M. Ketznel, R. Berkowicz, J. Franke,
1066 M. Schatzmann, K.H. Schlunzen, B. Leidl, R. Britter, C. Borrego, A.M. Costa, A.
1067 Trini Castelli, T.G. Reisin, A. Hellsten, J. Saloranta, N. Moussiopoulos, F.
1068 Barmpas, K. Brzozowski, I. Goricsan, M. Balczó, J.G. Bartzis, G. Efthimiou, J.L.
1069 Santiago, A. Martilli, M. Piringer, K. Baumann-Stanzer, M. Hirtl, A.A. Baklanov,
1070 R.B. Nuterman, A.V. Starchenko, COST 732 in practice: the MUST model
1071 evaluation exercise, *Int. J. Env. Poll.* 44(2011) 1-4.

1072 [71] K. Schlunzen, W. Bächlin, H. Brünger, J. Eichhorn, D. Grawe, R. Schenk, C.
1073 Winkler, 9th international conference on harmonisation within atmospheric
1074 dispersion modelling for regulatory purposes, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, June
1075 2004: 1-4.


- [72] C.H. Chang, R.N. Meroney, Numerical and physical modeling of bluff body flow and dispersion in urban street canyons, *Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 89.14-15 (2001) 1325-1334.
- [73] I. Mavroidis, R.F. Griffiths, Local characteristics of atmospheric dispersion within building arrays. *Atmos. Environ.* 35 (2001) 2941-2954.
- [74] Y.W. Zhang, Z. Gu, Y. Cheng, S.C. Lee, Effect of real-time boundary wind conditions on the air flow and pollutant dispersion in an urban street canyon Large eddy simulations. *Atmos. Environ.* 45(2011) 3352-3359.

Appendix


As Brown et al. [62] did not present the measurement result at the street side (i.e. along the main street parallel to the approaching wind), as depicted in Fig. A1, the data of another wind tunnel experiment was adopted to verify the effectiveness of the “half column method” in the street side.

The experiment was carried out in the wind tunnel laboratory at the University of Gavle, Sweden (Fig. A1a). An idealized 1:200 scaled urban model containing 27 rows and 15 columns of evenly separated cuboids ($B=W=5\text{cm}$, $H=12\text{cm}$) was built (Fig. A1b). Velocities were measured using Laser Doppler Anemometer system. The reference velocity of parallel coming wind (i.e. U_{ref} , Stream-wise velocity u at $z=H$) was 1.67m/s, with a large enough reference Re value as 1.39×10^4 at building height ($z=H=12\text{cm}$), which met the Re independence criterion [69]. The x , y and z direction were defined as the stream-wise, span-wise and vertical direction separately.


A full-scale CFD model with half of the middle column and street was established for validation study (Fig. A1c). The velocity and TKE profiles measured in that experiment were applied for the inlet condition (Fig. A1d). And the vertical profile of inlet TED ($\epsilon(z)$) was calculated by Eq. (12). Same boundary conditions as the validation cases described in subsections 4.1 were adopted at domain outlet, domain top and lateral boundaries (Fig. A1c). Moreover, the urban model is $53H$ long, while the urban boundaries are $9H$ from the domain roof, $6.3H$ from the inlet, and $41.7H$ from the domain outlet. Grid independence was also studied. Three different grid arrangements were tested: fine grid arrangement (the minimum grid size next to the wall surface was 0.1m, about 4.4 million hexahedral cells in total), medium grid arrangement (minimum grid size of 0.2m, about 2.2 million cells), and coarse grid arrangement (minimum grid size of 0.4m, about 0.9 million cells). Fig. A1e displays the CFD results of normalized stream-wise velocity profile (i.e. $\bar{u}(z)/U_{ref}$, $U_{ref}=U_{z=H}$ of wind tunnel experiment) at the center of cross street at $x/H=25.5$ (point S1). It shows that standard $k-\epsilon$ model performed well and there was little difference between the prediction results using fine or medium grid arrangement. The result also convinced that the “half column method” with present CFD methodologies applied is reliable for such urban flow simulation studied in this paper.




(a)




Scale ratio to full-scale models is 1:200




(b)




(c)







(d)



(e)

Fig. A1 (a) Overview of urban model studied in the wind tunnel laboratory at the University of Gavle; (b) Model configurations; (c) CFD computational domain; (d) $\bar{u}(z)$ and $k(z)$ profiles used for computational domain inlet; (e) Vertical profiles of normalized stream-wise velocity in CFD validation cases compared with wind tunnel measurement.





1137

1138 Fig.A2 Photos and model descriptions of 3D urban models in the scale-model outdoor
 1139 field measurement of urban climate and health (SOMUCH) in suburb of Guangzhou,
 1140 P.R. China.

1141