

# GRADIENTWIND

ENGINEERS & SCIENTISTS

## PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND STUDY

45 Grenoble Drive  
Toronto, Ontario

REPORT: GW24-091-WTPLW



August 26, 2024

PREPARED FOR

**Davad Investments Inc.**

113A Leslie Street, Suite 500  
Toronto, ON M3C 3L8

PREPARED BY

Sam Woolsey, M.E.Sc., Junior Wind Scientist  
Nick Petersen, P.Eng., Wind Engineer

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes a wind tunnel pedestrian level wind study undertaken to assess wind conditions for the proposed residential development located at 45 Grenoble Drive in Toronto, Ontario. Two configurations were studied: (i) *existing scenario*, including all approved, surrounding developments and without the proposed development, and (ii) *proposed scenario* with the proposed development in place. The study involves wind tunnel measurements of pedestrian wind speeds using a physical scale model, combined with meteorological data integration, to assess pedestrian comfort at key areas within and surrounding the study site. Grade-level areas investigated include sidewalks, laneways, surface parking, landscaped spaces, parks, transit stops, playgrounds, and building access points. Wind comfort is also evaluated over the Level 5 elevated amenity terrace. The results and recommendations derived from these considerations are summarized in the following paragraphs and detailed in the subsequent report.

Our work is based on industry standard wind tunnel testing and data analysis procedures, architectural drawings provided by BDP Quadrangle in August 2024, surrounding street layouts, as well as existing and approved future building massing information, and recent site imagery.

A complete summary of the predicted wind conditions is provided in Section 5 of this report and is also illustrated in Figures 2A through 4D, as well as Tables A1-A2 and B1-B3 in the appendices. Based on wind tunnel test results, meteorological data analysis, and experience with similar developments in Toronto, we conclude that the future wind conditions over all grade-level pedestrian wind-sensitive areas within and surrounding the study site will be acceptable for the intended uses on a seasonal basis. Additionally, mitigation is recommended for the Level 5 amenity terrace where the summer sitting criterion will be exceeded, as detailed in Section 5.2.

Within the context of typical weather patterns, which exclude anomalous localized storm events such as tornadoes and downbursts, no areas over the study site will experience wind conditions that are considered unsafe



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE .....	1
3. OBJECTIVES .....	2
4. METHODOLOGY.....	2
4.1 Wind Tunnel Context Modelling .....	2
4.2 Wind Speed Measurements.....	3
4.3 Meteorological Data Analysis - Pearson International Airport.....	4
4.4 Pedestrian Comfort and Safety Guidelines .....	6
5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	7
5.1 Pedestrian Comfort Suitability – <i>Existing Scenario</i> .....	8
5.2 Pedestrian Comfort Suitability – <i>Proposed Scenario</i> .....	9
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	10

### MODEL PHOTOGRAPHS

### FIGURES

### APPENDICES

Appendix A – Pedestrian Comfort Suitability (Existing Scenario)

Appendix B – Pedestrian Comfort Suitability (Proposed Scenario)

Appendix C – Wind Tunnel Simulation of the Natural Wind

Appendix D – Pedestrian Level Wind Measurement Methodology



## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report describes a wind tunnel pedestrian level wind (PLW) study undertaken to assess wind conditions the proposed residential development located at 45 Grenoble Drive in Toronto, Ontario. Two configurations were studied: (i) *existing scenario*, including all approved, surrounding developments and without the proposed development, and (ii) *proposed scenario* with the proposed development in place. The study was performed in accordance with industry standard wind tunnel testing techniques, architectural drawings provided by BDP Quadrangle in August 2024, surrounding street layouts and existing and approved future building massing information, as well as recent site imagery.

## 2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The focus of this wind tunnel pedestrian wind study is the proposed residential development located at 45 Grenoble Drive in Toronto, Ontario. The study site is bounded by Grenoble Drive to the north and east, Dufresne Court to the south, and Flemingdon Park to the west.

The study site comprises a nominally triangular-shaped 39-storey tower atop a five-storey podium, including mezzanine. At grade, 3 levels of below-grade parking are accessed from an existing laneway off Grenoble Drive, west of the study site. Residential entrances front Grenoble Drive to the east, and the walkway towards the existing apartment to the northwest. Residential units are found along the south and east elevations, with indoor amenity spaces and building support spaces within. Levels 2 through 4 rise uniformly, comprising residential units throughout. At Level 5, the podium sets back from all elevations to accommodate indoor and outdoor amenity spaces. The typical tower floorplate rises uniformly from Level 6 through 39, upon which a mechanical penthouse completes the development.

Regarding wind exposures, the near-field surroundings of the development (defined as an area within a 200-metre (m) radius of the subject site) are characterized by the existing high-rise apartment buildings (28 storeys & 28 storeys) directly northwest and southwest of the study site, and the approved future high-rise (43-storey & 45-storey) two-tower development at 48 Grenoble Drive to the north. Low-rise buildings are found in all other directions. The far-field surroundings (defined as the area beyond the near-field and within a 2-kilometre (km) radius) are characterized by primarily low-rise exposures with pockets



of open spaces in all directions, notably along the east and west branches of the Don River flanking the study site, with isolated high-rise buildings throughout.

Grade-level areas investigated include sidewalks, laneways, surface parking, landscaped spaces, transit stops, playgrounds, parks, and building access points. Wind comfort is also evaluated over the Level 5 outdoor amenity terrace. Figures 1A and 1B illustrates the *existing* and *proposed* study sites and surrounding context, respectively, and Photographs 1 through 6 depict the wind tunnel model used to conduct the study.

### 3. OBJECTIVES

The principal objectives of this study are to (i) determine pedestrian level wind comfort and safety conditions at key areas within and surrounding the development site; (ii) identify areas where wind conditions may interfere with the intended uses of outdoor spaces; (iii) recommend suitable mitigation measures, where required; and (iv) evaluate the influence of the proposed development on the existing wind conditions.

### 4. METHODOLOGY

The approach followed to quantify pedestrian wind conditions over the site is based on wind tunnel measurements of wind speeds at selected locations on a reduced-scale physical model, meteorological analysis of the Toronto wind climate and synthesis of wind tunnel data with industry-accepted guidelines<sup>1</sup>. The following sections describe the analysis procedures, including a discussion of the pedestrian comfort and safety guidelines.

#### 4.1 Wind Tunnel Context Modelling

A detailed PLW study is performed to determine the influence of local winds at the pedestrian level for a proposed development. The physical model of the proposed development and relevant surroundings, illustrated in Photographs 1 through 6 following the main text, was constructed at a scale of 1:400. The wind tunnel model includes all existing buildings and approved future developments within a full-scale diameter of approximately 840 metres. The general concept and approach to wind tunnel modelling is to

---

<sup>1</sup> Pedestrian Level Wind Study Terms of Reference Guide, 2022




provide building and topographic detail in the immediate vicinity of the study site on the surrounding model, and to rely on a length of wind tunnel upwind of the model to develop wind properties consistent with known turbulent intensity profiles that represent the surrounding terrain.

An industry standard practice is to omit trees, vegetation, and other existing and planned landscape elements from the wind tunnel model due to the difficulty of providing accurate seasonal representation of vegetation. The omission of trees and other landscaping elements produces slightly more conservative wind speed values.

## 4.2 Wind Speed Measurements

The PLW study was performed by testing a total of 73 sensor locations on the scale model in Gradient Wind's wind tunnel. Of these 73 sensors, 68 were located at grade and the remaining five sensors were located over the Level 5 outdoor amenity. Wind speed measurements were performed for each of the 73 sensors for 36 wind directions at 10° intervals. Figures 1A and 1B illustrates the *existing* and *proposed* study sites and surrounding context, respectively, while sensor locations used to investigate wind conditions are illustrated in Figures 2A through 4D.

Mean and peak wind speed values for each location and wind direction were calculated from real-time pressure measurements, recorded at a sample rate of 500 samples per second, and taken over a 60-second time period. This period at model-scale corresponds approximately to one hour in full-scale, which matches the time frame of full-scale meteorological observations. Measured mean and gust wind speeds at grade were referenced to the wind speed measured near the ceiling of the wind tunnel to generate mean and peak wind speed ratios. Ceiling height in the wind tunnel represents the depth of the boundary layer of wind flowing over the earth's surface, referred to as the gradient height. Within this boundary layer, mean wind speed increases up to the gradient height and remains constant thereafter. Appendices C and D provide greater detail of the theory behind wind speed measurements. Wind tunnel measurements for this project, conducted in Gradient Wind's wind tunnel facility, meet or exceed guidelines found in the National Building Code of Canada 2015 and of 'Wind Tunnel Studies of Buildings and Structures', ASCE Manual 7 Reports on Engineering Practice No 67.




### 4.3 Meteorological Data Analysis - Pearson International Airport

A statistical model for winds in Toronto was developed from over 50 years of hourly meteorological wind data recorded at Pearson International Airport. Wind speed and direction data were analyzed for each month of the year in order to determine the statistically prominent wind directions and corresponding speeds, and to characterize similarities between monthly weather patterns. Based on this portion of the analysis, the four seasons are represented by grouping data from consecutive months based on similarity of weather patterns, and not according to the traditional calendar method.

The statistical model of the Toronto area wind climate, which indicates the directional character of local winds on a seasonal basis, is illustrated on the following page. The plots illustrate seasonal distribution of measured wind speeds and directions in km/h. Probabilities of occurrence of different wind speeds are represented as stacked polar bars in sixteen azimuth divisions. The radial direction represents the percentage of time for various wind speed ranges per wind direction during the measurement period. The preferred wind speeds and directions can be identified by the longer length of the bars. For Pearson International Airport, the most common winds concerning pedestrian comfort occur from the southwest clockwise to the north, as well as those from the east. The directional preference and relative magnitude of the wind speed varies somewhat from season to season, with the summer months displaying the calmest winds relative to the remaining seasonal periods.

## SEASONAL DISTRIBUTION OF WINDS FOR VARIOUS PROBABILITIES PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, TORONTO, ONTARIO



### Notes:

1. Radial distances indicate percentage of time of wind events.
2. Wind speeds are mean hourly in km/h, measured at 10 m above the ground.





#### 4.4 Pedestrian Comfort and Safety Guidelines

Pedestrian comfort and safety guidelines are based on the mechanical effects of wind without consideration of other meteorological conditions (i.e. temperature, relative humidity). The comfort guidelines assume that pedestrians are appropriately dressed for a specified outdoor activity during any given season. Four pedestrian comfort classes are based on 80% non-exceedance Guest Equivalent Mean (GEM) wind speed ranges, which include (i) Sitting; (ii) Standing; (iii) Walking; and (iv) Uncomfortable. More specifically, the comfort classes and associated GEM wind speed ranges are summarized as follows:

- (i) **Sitting** – A wind speed below 10 km/h (i.e. 0 – 10 km/h) would be considered acceptable for sedentary activities, including sitting.
- (ii) **Standing** – A wind speed below 15 km/h (i.e. 10 km/h – 15 km/h) is acceptable for activities such as standing or leisurely strolling.
- (iii) **Walking** – A wind speed below 20 km/h (i.e. 15 km/h – 20 km/h) is acceptable for walking or more vigorous activities.
- (iv) **Uncomfortable** – A wind speed over 20 km/h is classified as uncomfortable from a pedestrian comfort standpoint. Brisk walking and exercise, such as jogging, would be acceptable for moderate excesses of this criterion.

The pedestrian safety wind speed guideline is based on the approximate threshold that would cause a vulnerable member of the population to fall. A 0.1% exceedance gust wind speed of greater than 90 km/h is classified as dangerous.

Experience and research on people's perception of mechanical wind effects has shown that if the wind speed levels are exceeded for more than 20% of the time, the activity level would be judged to be uncomfortable by most people. For instance, if wind speeds of 10 km/h were exceeded for more than 20% of the time most pedestrians would judge that location to be too windy for sitting or more sedentary activities. Similarly, if 20 km/h at a location were exceeded for more than 20% of the time, walking or less vigorous activities would be considered uncomfortable. As most of these criteria are based on subjective reactions of a population to wind forces, their application is partly based on experience and judgment.

Once the pedestrian wind speed predictions have been established at tested locations, the assessment of pedestrian comfort involves determining the suitability of the predicted wind conditions for their



associated spaces. This step involves comparing the predicted comfort class to the desired comfort class, which is dictated by the location type represented by the sensor (i.e. a sidewalk, building entrance, amenity space, or other). An overview of common pedestrian location types and their desired comfort classes are summarized below.

### DESIRED PEDESTRIAN COMFORT CLASSES FOR VARIOUS LOCATION TYPES

Location Types	Desired Comfort Classes
Primary Building Entrance	Standing
Secondary Building Access Point	Walking
Public Sidewalks / Pedestrian Walkways	Walking
Outdoor Amenity Spaces	Sitting / Standing
Cafés / Patios / Benches / Gardens	Sitting / Standing
Plazas	Standing / Walking
Transit Stops	Standing
Public Parks	Sitting / Walking
Garage / Service Entrances	Walking
Vehicular Drop-Off Zones	Walking
Laneways / Loading Zones	Walking

## 5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Tables A1 through A2 in Appendix A provide a summary of seasonal comfort predictions for each sensor location under the *existing* massing scenario. Similarly, Tables B1 through B3 in Appendix B provide the seasonal comfort predictions for under the *proposed* massing scenario. The tables indicate the 80% non-exceedance GEM wind speeds and corresponding comfort classifications as defined in Section 4.4. In other words, a wind speed threshold of 19.1 for the summer season indicates that 80% of the measured data falls at or below 19.1 km/h during the summer months and conditions are therefore suitable for walking, as the 80% threshold value falls within the exceedance range of 15-20 km/h for walking. The tables include the predicted threshold values for each sensor location during each season, accompanied by the corresponding predicted comfort class (i.e. sitting, standing, walking, etc.).



The most significant findings of the PLW study are summarized in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. To assist with understanding and interpretation, predicted conditions for the proposed development are also illustrated in colour-coded format in Figures 2A through 4D. Conditions suitable for sitting are represented by the colour blue, while standing is represented by green, and walking by yellow. Conditions considered uncomfortable for walking are represented by the colour orange. For locations where the wind safety criterion is exceeded, the sensor is highlighted in red.

### 5.1 Pedestrian Comfort Suitability – *Existing Scenario*

Based on the analysis of the measured data, consideration of local climate data, and the suitability descriptors provided in Tables A1-A2 in Appendix A and illustrated in Figures 2A through 2D, this section summarizes the significant findings of the PLW study with respect to the *existing scenario*, as follows:

1. Most sidewalks, laneways, surface parking, and landscaped spaces within and surrounding the proposed development, currently experience wind conditions suitable for walking or better during each seasonal period. Exceptions include portions of sidewalk along Grenoble Drive to the north (Sensors 14 & 16), and greenspace southwest of the study site (Sensor 45), which experience uncomfortable wind conditions during the colder months.
2. Flemingdon Park (Sensors 1-7 & 9-12), to the west of the study site, currently experiences wind conditions largely suitable for standing or better throughout the year.
3. The children's playground to the north of the study site (Sensors 27 & 28), currently experiences wind conditions largely suitable for standing throughout the year.
4. Existing transit stops along Grenoble drive (Sensors 33 & 59) are currently suitable for standing or better throughout the year.
5. Within the context of typical weather patterns, which exclude anomalous localized storm events such as tornadoes and downbursts, no areas over the study site were found to experience conditions too windy for walking, or that are considered unsafe.



## 5.2 Pedestrian Comfort Suitability – *Proposed Scenario*

Based on the analysis of the measured data, consideration of local climate data, and the suitability descriptors provided in Tables B1-B3 in Appendix B and illustrated in Figures 3A through 4D, this section summarizes the significant findings of the PLW study with respect to the *proposed scenario*, as follows:

1. Most sidewalks, laneways, surface parking, and landscaped spaces within and surrounding the proposed development will experience wind conditions suitable for walking or better throughout each seasonal period, which is acceptable for the intended uses of the spaces. Exceptions include portions of sidewalk fronting Grenoble Drive to the north (Sensors 14 & 16), and greenspace southwest of the study site (Sensors 44 & 45) which will experience uncomfortable wind conditions during the winter and spring. As these exceedances are all pre-existing from the *Existing scenario*, are largely marginal (< 1 km/h, see Appendix B), and all remain safe annually, these exceedances are acceptable without the need for mitigation.
2. Flemington Park (Sensors 1-7 & 9-12), to the west of the study site, will continue to experience wind conditions largely suitable for standing or better throughout the year, which is acceptable.
3. The children's playground to the north of the study site (Sensors 27 & 28), will continue to experience wind conditions suitable for standing or better on a seasonal basis, which is acceptable.
4. Existing transit stops along Grenoble drive (Sensors 33 & 59) will be suitable for standing or better throughout the year, with the stop on the east side of Grenoble Drive (Sensor 33) becoming comfortable for walking during the winter and spring. It is notable that both stops are equipped with pedestrian transit shelters, therefore no additional mitigation is required.
5. Most primary entrances throughout the site will experience wind conditions suitable for standing or better throughout the year, which is appropriate. Limited exceptions include the northwest residential lobby entrance (Sensor 66), which will experience walking wind conditions during the winter. As this exceedance is marginal (0.1 km/h, see Appendix B), this is acceptable without the need for mitigation.




All secondary building access points (including stairwell exits and vehicle access points) will experience wind conditions suitable for walking or better throughout the year, which is appropriate.

6. The Level 5 outdoor amenity terrace (Sensors 69-73) will be comfortable for a mix of sitting, standing, and walking throughout the warmer seasons. It is recommended that the terrace perimeter guards at the southwest corner of the terrace (Sensors 69-70) be raised to at least 1.8-metres above the walking surface, or targeted barriers upwind of seating with overhead pergola structures be provided, to ensure conditions comfortable for sitting throughout the summer months. Additionally, as the exceedance of the sitting criterion during the summer at the southeast corner of the space (Sensor 72) is marginal ( $<1.5$  km/h, see Appendix B), this is acceptable without the need for mitigation, however, designated seating areas at this location should be avoided.
7. Within the context of typical weather patterns, which exclude anomalous localized storm events such as tornadoes and downbursts, no areas over the study site will experience wind conditions that are considered unsafe.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This report summarizes the methodology, results, and recommendations related to a pedestrian level wind study for the proposed mixed-use development located at 45 Grenoble Drive in Toronto, Ontario. The study was performed in accordance with industry standard wind tunnel testing and data analysis procedures.

A complete summary of the predicted wind conditions is provided in Section 5 of this report and is also illustrated in Figures 2A through 4D, as well as Tables A1-A2 and B1-B3 in the appendices. Based on wind tunnel test results, meteorological data analysis, and experience with similar developments in Toronto, we conclude that the future wind conditions over all grade-level pedestrian wind-sensitive areas within and surrounding the study site will be acceptable for the intended uses on a seasonal basis. Additionally, mitigation is recommended for a portion of the Level 5 amenity terrace where the summer sitting criterion will be exceeded, as detailed in Section 5.2.



Within the context of typical weather patterns, which exclude anomalous localized storm events such as tornadoes and downbursts, no areas over the study site will experience wind conditions that are considered unsafe.

This concludes our pedestrian level wind study and report. Please advise the undersigned of any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

***Gradient Wind Engineering Inc.***



Sam Woolsey, M.E.Sc.,  
Junior Wind Scientist

GW24-091-WTPLW



Nick Petersen, P.Eng.,  
Wind Engineer








**PHOTOGRAPH 1: CLOSE-UP VIEW OF EXISTING CONTEXT MODEL LOOKING NORTHWEST**



**PHOTOGRAPH 2: CLOSE-UP VIEW OF EXISTING CONTEXT MODEL LOOKING NORTHEAST**





**PHOTOGRAPH 3: STUDY MODEL INSIDE THE GWE WIND TUNNEL LOOKING DOWNWIND**



**PHOTOGRAPH 4: STUDY MODEL INSIDE THE GWE WIND TUNNEL LOOKING UPWIND**








**PHOTOGRAPH 5: CLOSE-UP VIEW OF PROPOSED STUDY MODEL LOOKING SOUTHWEST**




**PHOTOGRAPH 6: CLOSE-UP VIEW OF PROPOSED STUDY MODEL LOOKING NORTHEAST**





<div>GRADIENTWIND</div> <div>ENGINEERS &amp; SCIENTISTS</div> <div>127 WALGREEN ROAD, OTTAWA, ON 613 836 0934 • GRADIENTWIND.COM</div>	PROJECT45 GRENABLE DRIVE, NORTH YORK PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND STUDY		DESCRIPTION  FIGURE 1A: EXISTING SCENARIO AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT
	SCALE1:2500 (APPROX.)	DRAWING NO.GW24-091-PLW-1A	
	DATEAUGUST 26, 2024	DRAWN BYK.A.	



<b>GRADIENTWIND</b> ENGINEERS & SCIENTISTS 127 WALGREEN ROAD, OTTAWA, ON 613 836 0934 • GRADIENTWIND.COM	PROJECT45 GRENABLE DRIVE, NORTH YORK PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND STUDY		DESCRIPTION  FIGURE 18: FUTURE SCENARIO AND SURROUNDING CONTEXT
	SCALE1:2500 (APPROX.)	DRAWING NO.GW24-091-PLW-1B	
	DATEAUGUST 26, 2024	DRAWN BYK.A.	





















PREDICTED COMFORT CLASSES

- # SITTING
- # STANDING
- # WALKING
- # UNCOMFORTABLE

WIND SAFETY CRITERION

- # ACCEPTABLE
- # EXCEEDED

#### NOTES:

1. SCALE IS APPROXIMATE.
2. # PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND SENSOR LOCATION.

**GRADIENTWIND**  
ENGINEERS & SCIENTISTS

127 WALGREEN ROAD, OTTAWA, ON  
613 836 0934 • GRADIENTWIND.COM

PROJECT 45 GRENABLE DRIVE, NORTH YORK  
PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND STUDY

SCALE 1:1100 (APPROX.)

DATE AUGUST 26, 2024


DRAWING NO. GW24-091-PLW-3C

DRAWN BY K.A.

DESCRIPTION

FIGURE 3C: AUTUMN  
FUTURE GRADE LEVEL PLW SENSOR LAYOUT  
PEDESTRIAN COMFORT PREDICTIONS






LEVEL 5

PREDICTED COMFORT CLASSES	#	SITTING
	#	STANDING
	#	WALKING
	#	UNCOMFORTABLE

WIND SAFETY CRITERION	#	ACCEPTABLE
	#	EXCEEDED

NOTES:

1. SCALE IS APPROXIMATE.
2. # PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND SENSOR LOCATION.




LEVEL 5

PREDICTED COMFORT CLASSES	#	SITTING
	#	STANDING
	#	WALKING
	#	UNCOMFORTABLE
WIND SAFETY CRITERION	#	ACCEPTABLE
	#	EXCEEDED

NOTES:	
1. SCALE IS APPROXIMATE.	
2. # PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND SENSOR LOCATION.	

PROJECT	45 GRENoble DRIVE, NORTH YORK PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND STUDY	
SCALE	1:400 (APPROX.)	DRAWING NO. GW24-091-PLW-4B
DATE	AUGUST 26, 2024	DRAWN BY K.A.

DESCRIPTION	FIGURE 4B: SUMMER FUTURE TERRACE PLW SENSOR LAYOUT PEDESTRIAN COMFORT PREDICTIONS
-------------	---




LEVEL 5

PREDICTED COMFORT CLASSES	#	SITTING
	#	STANDING
	#	WALKING
	#	UNCOMFORTABLE
WIND SAFETY CRITERION	#	ACCEPTABLE
	#	EXCEEDED

NOTES:	
1. SCALE IS APPROXIMATE.	
2. # PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND SENSOR LOCATION.	

PROJECT	45 GRENoble DRIVE, NORTH YORK PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND STUDY	
SCALE	1:400 (APPROX.)	DRAWING NO. GW24-091-PLW-4C
DATE	AUGUST 26, 2024	DRAWN BY K.A.

DESCRIPTION	FIGURE 4C: AUTUMN FUTURE TERRACE PLW SENSOR LAYOUT PEDESTRIAN COMFORT PREDICTIONS
-------------	---



LEVEL 5

- PREDICTED COMFORT CLASSES
- # SITTING
  - # STANDING
  - # WALKING
  - # UNCOMFORTABLE


- WIND SAFETY CRITERION
- # ACCEPTABLE
  - # EXCEEDED

NOTES:

1. SCALE IS APPROXIMATE.
2. # PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND SENSOR LOCATION.

# GRADIENTWIND

ENGINEERS & SCIENTISTS



## APPENDIX A


### PEDESTRIAN COMFORT SUITABILITY, TABLES A1-A2 (EXISTING SCENARIO)



Guidelines	
Pedestrian Comfort	<b>20% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-10 km/h = Sitting, 10-15 km/h = Standing, 15-20 km/h = Walking, >20 km/h = Uncomfortable
Pedestrian Safety	<b>0.1% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-90 km/h = Safe

**TABLE A1: SUMMARY OF PEDESTRIAN COMFORT (EXISTING SCENARIO)**


Sensor	Pedestrian Comfort								Pedestrian Safety	
	Spring		Summer		Autumn		Winter		Annual	
	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Safety Class
1	14.0	Standing	11.6	Standing	11.9	Standing	13.4	Standing	49.1	Safe
2	12.7	Standing	10.2	Standing	10.9	Standing	12.4	Standing	46.6	Safe
3	13.6	Standing	10.7	Standing	11.9	Standing	13.8	Standing	50.4	Safe
4	12.2	Standing	9.6	Sitting	10.3	Standing	11.8	Standing	46.5	Safe
5	13.0	Standing	9.6	Sitting	10.8	Standing	12.6	Standing	51.4	Safe
6	13.0	Standing	9.8	Sitting	10.6	Standing	12.3	Standing	51.3	Safe
7	14.0	Standing	10.3	Standing	11.2	Standing	12.8	Standing	56.5	Safe
8	11.1	Standing	8.5	Sitting	9.3	Sitting	11.0	Standing	54.5	Safe
9	14.3	Standing	10.8	Standing	11.3	Standing	13.3	Standing	60.3	Safe
10	14.6	Standing	10.9	Standing	11.7	Standing	13.5	Standing	55.2	Safe
11	14.4	Standing	10.7	Standing	11.4	Standing	13.3	Standing	62.5	Safe
12	15.1	Walking	10.9	Standing	12.2	Standing	14.1	Standing	58.0	Safe
13	16.1	Walking	12.7	Standing	14.3	Standing	17.0	Walking	60.7	Safe
14	20.2	Uncomfortable	15.3	Walking	17.1	Walking	20.1	Uncomfortable	65.1	Safe
15	17.7	Walking	13.5	Standing	16.1	Walking	19.5	Walking	74.8	Safe
16	19.8	Walking	15.6	Walking	17.5	Walking	21.2	Uncomfortable	79.4	Safe
17	18.4	Walking	14.6	Standing	16.5	Walking	19.2	Walking	66.6	Safe
18	14.8	Standing	11.7	Standing	13.2	Standing	15.8	Walking	59.9	Safe
19	17.1	Walking	14.3	Standing	14.4	Standing	16.1	Walking	64.7	Safe
20	18.2	Walking	13.5	Standing	14.3	Standing	16.8	Walking	72.5	Safe
21	15.6	Walking	12.2	Standing	13.2	Standing	15.6	Walking	59.2	Safe
22	16.5	Walking	12.3	Standing	13.3	Standing	15.5	Walking	65.0	Safe
23	13.9	Standing	11.2	Standing	12.2	Standing	14.5	Standing	56.5	Safe
24	14.5	Standing	11.8	Standing	13.4	Standing	16.5	Walking	70.6	Safe
25	12.5	Standing	10.0	Sitting	10.9	Standing	13.0	Standing	55.0	Safe
26	14.4	Standing	10.9	Standing	12.3	Standing	14.6	Standing	70.7	Safe
27	15.1	Walking	11.8	Standing	12.5	Standing	14.3	Standing	68.0	Safe
28	13.0	Standing	10.4	Standing	11.1	Standing	13.0	Standing	57.3	Safe
29	11.7	Standing	9.6	Sitting	10.1	Standing	11.7	Standing	46.1	Safe
30	12.7	Standing	10.1	Standing	10.8	Standing	12.4	Standing	52.5	Safe
31	11.4	Standing	9.3	Sitting	10.4	Standing	11.9	Standing	49.3	Safe
32	9.1	Sitting	7.5	Sitting	8.2	Sitting	9.5	Sitting	40.7	Safe
33	11.3	Standing	9.5	Sitting	10.0	Sitting	11.3	Standing	46.2	Safe
34	11.5	Standing	9.2	Sitting	10.3	Standing	12.3	Standing	46.6	Safe
35	10.6	Standing	8.5	Sitting	9.8	Sitting	11.7	Standing	47.3	Safe



Guidelines	
Pedestrian Comfort	<b>20% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-10 km/h = Sitting, 10-15 km/h = Standing, 15-20 km/h = Walking, >20 km/h = Uncomfortable
Pedestrian Safety	<b>0.1% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-90 km/h = Safe

**TABLE A2: SUMMARY OF PEDESTRIAN COMFORT (EXISTING SCENARIO)**

Sensor	Pedestrian Comfort								Pedestrian Safety	
	Spring		Summer		Autumn		Winter		Annual	
	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Safety Class
36	10.3	Standing	8.7	Sitting	9.3	Sitting	10.7	Standing	39.0	Safe
37	8.8	Sitting	7.5	Sitting	8.1	Sitting	9.4	Sitting	38.1	Safe
38	11.7	Standing	10.0	Sitting	10.8	Standing	13.2	Standing	52.9	Safe
39	11.4	Standing	9.6	Sitting	10.6	Standing	12.7	Standing	51.5	Safe
40	12.9	Standing	10.7	Standing	11.6	Standing	13.8	Standing	54.2	Safe
41	12.0	Standing	10.2	Standing	10.9	Standing	13.6	Standing	55.5	Safe
42	15.1	Walking	12.8	Standing	14.4	Standing	17.9	Walking	68.0	Safe
43	15.7	Walking	13.0	Standing	14.4	Standing	17.3	Walking	69.8	Safe
44	16.2	Walking	13.0	Standing	15.4	Walking	19.5	Walking	69.8	Safe
45	18.7	Walking	14.6	Standing	18.2	Walking	23.3	Uncomfortable	83.3	Safe
46	14.5	Standing	11.0	Standing	13.2	Standing	15.9	Walking	56.6	Safe
47	15.8	Walking	12.0	Standing	14.3	Standing	17.1	Walking	58.6	Safe
48	14.0	Standing	9.9	Sitting	11.5	Standing	13.7	Standing	57.0	Safe
49	12.9	Standing	9.9	Sitting	10.7	Standing	12.3	Standing	60.1	Safe
50	17.4	Walking	12.9	Standing	15.7	Walking	18.8	Walking	68.2	Safe
51	15.0	Standing	11.8	Standing	14.6	Standing	18.5	Walking	69.9	Safe
52	15.4	Walking	12.3	Standing	14.4	Standing	17.7	Walking	62.3	Safe
53	15.0	Standing	12.1	Standing	14.1	Standing	17.7	Walking	62.7	Safe
54	14.0	Standing	11.5	Standing	13.3	Standing	16.8	Walking	62.5	Safe
55	12.5	Standing	10.5	Standing	11.8	Standing	14.7	Standing	58.5	Safe
56	12.6	Standing	10.6	Standing	11.7	Standing	14.5	Standing	57.9	Safe
57	12.5	Standing	10.3	Standing	11.2	Standing	13.7	Standing	54.8	Safe
58	12.9	Standing	10.5	Standing	11.5	Standing	13.9	Standing	55.7	Safe
59	12.7	Standing	10.6	Standing	11.4	Standing	13.5	Standing	53.1	Safe
60	14.0	Standing	11.5	Standing	12.5	Standing	14.7	Standing	57.5	Safe
61	13.4	Standing	10.8	Standing	11.8	Standing	13.6	Standing	55.2	Safe
62	12.9	Standing	10.1	Standing	10.9	Standing	12.7	Standing	51.8	Safe
63	14.4	Standing	11.7	Standing	12.5	Standing	14.4	Standing	62.0	Safe
64	13.7	Standing	11.3	Standing	12.0	Standing	13.9	Standing	61.5	Safe
65	14.0	Standing	11.5	Standing	12.3	Standing	14.4	Standing	60.9	Safe
66	15.1	Walking	12.0	Standing	13.2	Standing	15.5	Walking	58.5	Safe
67	15.8	Walking	12.6	Standing	14.3	Standing	17.1	Walking	65.3	Safe
68	14.8	Standing	11.8	Standing	14.1	Standing	17.7	Walking	70.8	Safe



# GRADIENTWIND

ENGINEERS & SCIENTISTS




## APPENDIX B

### PEDESTRIAN COMFORT SUITABILITY, TABLES B1-B3 (PROPOSED SCENARIO)

Guidelines	
Pedestrian Comfort	<b>20% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-10 km/h = Sitting, 10-15 km/h = Standing, 15-20 km/h = Walking, >20 km/h = Uncomfortable
Pedestrian Safety	<b>0.1% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-90 km/h = Safe

**TABLE B1: SUMMARY OF PEDESTRIAN COMFORT (PROPOSED SCENARIO)**


Sensor	Pedestrian Comfort								Pedestrian Safety	
	Spring		Summer		Autumn		Winter		Annual	
	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Safety Class
1	13.4	Standing	10.9	Standing	11.2	Standing	12.5	Standing	48.0	Safe
2	12.1	Standing	9.7	Sitting	10.4	Standing	11.8	Standing	46.7	Safe
3	13.3	Standing	10.0	Sitting	11.4	Standing	13.3	Standing	52.1	Safe
4	12.8	Standing	10.0	Sitting	10.6	Standing	12.1	Standing	48.6	Safe
5	13.2	Standing	9.8	Sitting	10.9	Standing	12.3	Standing	55.9	Safe
6	13.9	Standing	10.5	Standing	11.0	Standing	12.6	Standing	52.5	Safe
7	14.1	Standing	10.7	Standing	11.3	Standing	12.8	Standing	56.1	Safe
8	11.5	Standing	9.2	Sitting	9.6	Sitting	11.2	Standing	52.6	Safe
9	15.0	Standing	11.4	Standing	11.7	Standing	13.7	Standing	59.9	Safe
10	14.4	Standing	11.3	Standing	11.9	Standing	13.5	Standing	54.9	Safe
11	15.2	Walking	11.6	Standing	12.1	Standing	13.8	Standing	62.0	Safe
12	15.3	Walking	11.7	Standing	12.5	Standing	14.3	Standing	57.9	Safe
13	16.7	Walking	13.6	Standing	14.9	Standing	17.6	Walking	63.0	Safe
14	20.7	Uncomfortable	15.4	Walking	17.2	Walking	20.2	Uncomfortable	64.9	Safe
15	18.0	Walking	13.7	Standing	15.9	Walking	19.5	Walking	72.3	Safe
16	20.4	Uncomfortable	15.9	Walking	17.9	Walking	21.1	Uncomfortable	78.0	Safe
17	19.1	Walking	15.4	Walking	17.0	Walking	19.4	Walking	65.7	Safe
18	15.6	Walking	12.3	Standing	13.7	Standing	16.3	Walking	59.3	Safe
19	16.2	Walking	13.3	Standing	13.9	Standing	15.6	Walking	66.0	Safe
20	16.7	Walking	12.4	Standing	13.1	Standing	15.6	Walking	77.1	Safe
21	14.6	Standing	11.7	Standing	12.7	Standing	14.9	Standing	59.9	Safe
22	15.3	Walking	11.6	Standing	12.2	Standing	13.9	Standing	66.8	Safe
23	13.6	Standing	10.8	Standing	11.7	Standing	13.6	Standing	54.7	Safe
24	14.4	Standing	11.3	Standing	13.1	Standing	15.9	Walking	66.4	Safe
25	12.2	Standing	9.4	Sitting	10.4	Standing	12.0	Standing	48.6	Safe
26	14.3	Standing	10.1	Standing	11.5	Standing	13.4	Standing	68.9	Safe
27	12.4	Standing	9.3	Sitting	10.5	Standing	12.1	Standing	62.4	Safe
28	14.2	Standing	10.1	Standing	12.1	Standing	13.7	Standing	61.9	Safe
29	13.9	Standing	10.9	Standing	12.2	Standing	14.1	Standing	55.4	Safe
30	13.8	Standing	11.3	Standing	12.2	Standing	14.3	Standing	53.3	Safe
31	12.5	Standing	10.5	Standing	11.4	Standing	13.0	Standing	51.5	Safe
32	8.8	Sitting	7.2	Sitting	7.9	Sitting	9.6	Sitting	43.2	Safe
33	15.1	Walking	12.7	Standing	13.5	Standing	15.6	Walking	56.1	Safe
34	13.8	Standing	11.6	Standing	12.5	Standing	14.4	Standing	55.0	Safe
35	10.1	Standing	8.5	Sitting	9.4	Sitting	11.4	Standing	48.8	Safe



Guidelines	
Pedestrian Comfort	<b>20% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-10 km/h = Sitting, 10-15 km/h = Standing, 15-20 km/h = Walking, >20 km/h = Uncomfortable
Pedestrian Safety	<b>0.1% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-90 km/h = Safe

**TABLE B2: SUMMARY OF PEDESTRIAN COMFORT (PROPOSED SCENARIO)**

Sensor	Pedestrian Comfort								Pedestrian Safety	
	Spring		Summer		Autumn		Winter		Annual	
	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Safety Class
36	11.6	Standing	9.9	Sitting	10.5	Standing	12.4	Standing	44.0	Safe
37	8.0	Sitting	6.8	Sitting	7.7	Sitting	9.0	Sitting	38.1	Safe
38	15.5	Walking	13.1	Standing	14.2	Standing	16.9	Walking	61.3	Safe
39	13.7	Standing	11.3	Standing	12.6	Standing	15.7	Walking	58.5	Safe
40	13.5	Standing	10.8	Standing	12.2	Standing	14.9	Standing	58.2	Safe
41	13.5	Standing	10.9	Standing	12.7	Standing	16.3	Walking	62.0	Safe
42	16.4	Walking	13.0	Standing	15.2	Walking	19.6	Walking	71.0	Safe
43	17.1	Walking	13.8	Standing	15.4	Walking	19.3	Walking	74.2	Safe
44	18.8	Walking	14.7	Standing	17.1	Walking	20.9	Uncomfortable	68.3	Safe
45	16.8	Walking	13.1	Standing	16.6	Walking	22.6	Uncomfortable	83.2	Safe
46	14.3	Standing	10.6	Standing	12.8	Standing	15.3	Walking	57.2	Safe
47	16.5	Walking	12.4	Standing	13.9	Standing	16.1	Walking	60.4	Safe
48	13.4	Standing	10.1	Standing	11.0	Standing	12.5	Standing	55.4	Safe
49	10.3	Standing	8.2	Sitting	9.0	Sitting	10.4	Standing	52.5	Safe
50	15.0	Standing	12.0	Standing	12.9	Standing	15.4	Walking	60.7	Safe
51	8.9	Sitting	7.6	Sitting	8.4	Sitting	9.9	Sitting	41.6	Safe
52	9.4	Sitting	7.9	Sitting	8.9	Sitting	11.2	Standing	51.0	Safe
53	11.8	Standing	9.5	Sitting	11.0	Standing	12.9	Standing	57.6	Safe
54	10.6	Standing	8.2	Sitting	9.5	Sitting	11.1	Standing	44.8	Safe
55	9.4	Sitting	7.3	Sitting	8.5	Sitting	10.1	Standing	40.5	Safe
56	9.7	Sitting	8.2	Sitting	9.4	Sitting	11.3	Standing	51.4	Safe
57	12.4	Standing	9.6	Sitting	10.1	Standing	12.1	Standing	49.3	Safe
58	10.7	Standing	8.9	Sitting	9.2	Sitting	10.9	Standing	45.4	Safe
59	13.9	Standing	11.7	Standing	11.9	Standing	13.4	Standing	51.4	Safe
60	11.0	Standing	9.1	Sitting	9.7	Sitting	11.4	Standing	46.3	Safe
61	13.5	Standing	10.1	Standing	10.8	Standing	12.1	Standing	52.5	Safe
62	15.7	Walking	12.2	Standing	13.5	Standing	15.4	Walking	58.3	Safe
63	13.9	Standing	9.9	Sitting	11.1	Standing	13.4	Standing	64.8	Safe
64	12.6	Standing	9.9	Sitting	11.7	Standing	15.0	Standing	62.0	Safe
65	12.5	Standing	10.1	Standing	11.8	Standing	14.6	Standing	57.0	Safe
66	14.0	Standing	11.3	Standing	12.6	Standing	15.1	Walking	58.1	Safe
67	13.2	Standing	10.6	Standing	11.7	Standing	13.8	Standing	50.7	Safe
68	16.9	Walking	14.0	Standing	15.7	Walking	19.3	Walking	68.6	Safe
69	16.9	Walking	13.2	Standing	14.6	Standing	17.3	Walking	62.0	Safe
70	19.0	Walking	16.4	Walking	17.4	Walking	20.5	Uncomfortable	74.6	Safe



Guidelines	
Pedestrian Comfort	<b>20% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-10 km/h = Sitting, 10-15 km/h = Standing, 15-20 km/h = Walking, >20 km/h = Uncomfortable
Pedestrian Safety	<b>0.1% exceedance wind speed</b> 0-90 km/h = Safe

**TABLE B3: SUMMARY OF PEDESTRIAN COMFORT (PROPOSED SCENARIO)**

Sensor	Pedestrian Comfort								Pedestrian Safety	
	Spring		Summer		Autumn		Winter		Annual	
	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Comfort Class	Wind Speed	Safety Class
<b>71</b>	7.0	Sitting	5.6	Sitting	6.2	Sitting	7.3	Sitting	26.7	Safe
<b>72</b>	14.2	Standing	11.2	Standing	12.3	Standing	13.7	Standing	67.7	Safe
<b>73</b>	10.1	Standing	8.0	Sitting	9.0	Sitting	10.7	Standing	39.9	Safe



# GRADIENTWIND

ENGINEERS & SCIENTISTS



## APPENDIX C

### WIND TUNNEL SIMULATION OF THE NATURAL WIND



## **WIND TUNNEL SIMULATION OF THE NATURAL WIND**

Wind flowing over the surface of the earth develops a boundary layer due to the drag produced by surface features such as vegetation and man-made structures. Within this boundary layer, the mean wind speed varies from zero at the surface to the gradient wind speed at the top of the layer. The height of the top of the boundary layer is referred to as the gradient height, above which the velocity remains more-or-less constant for a given synoptic weather system. The mean wind speed is taken to be the average value over one hour. Superimposed on the mean wind speed are fluctuating (or turbulent) components in the longitudinal (i.e. along wind), vertical and lateral directions. Although turbulence varies according to the roughness of the surface, the turbulence level generally increases from nearly zero (smooth flow) at gradient height to maximum values near the ground. While for a calm ocean the maximum could be 20%, the maximum for a very rough surface such as the center of a city could be 100%, or equal to the local mean wind speed. The height of the boundary layer varies in time and over different terrain roughness within the range of 400 metres (m) to 600 m.

Simulating real wind behaviour in a wind tunnel requires simulating the variation of mean wind speed with height, simulating the turbulence intensity, and matching the typical length scales of turbulence. It is the ratio between wind tunnel turbulence length scales and turbulence scales in the atmosphere that determines the geometric scales that models can assume in a wind tunnel. Hence, when a 1:200 scale model is quoted, this implies that the turbulence scales in the wind tunnel and the atmosphere have the same ratios. Some flexibility in this requirement has been shown to produce reasonable wind tunnel predictions compared to full scale. In model scale the mean and turbulence characteristics of the wind are obtained with the use of spires at one end of the tunnel and roughness elements along the floor of the tunnel. The fan is located at the model end and wind is pulled over the spires, roughness elements and model. It has been found that, to a good approximation, the mean wind profile can be represented by a power law relation, shown below, giving height above ground versus wind speed.

$$U = U_g \left( \frac{Z}{Z_g} \right)^\alpha$$

Where;  $U$  = mean wind speed,  $U_g$  = gradient wind speed,  $Z$  = height above ground,  $Z_g$  = depth of the boundary layer (gradient height) and  $\alpha$  is the power law exponent.

Figure B1 on the following page plots three velocity profiles for open country, and suburban and urban exposures.


The exponent  $\alpha$  varies according to the type of upwind terrain;  $\alpha$  ranges from 0.14 for open country to 0.33 for an urban exposure. Figure C2 illustrates the theoretical variation of turbulence for open country, suburban and urban exposures.

The integral length scale of turbulence can be thought of as an average size of gust in the atmosphere. Although it varies with height and ground roughness, it has been found to generally be in the range of 100 m to 200 m in the upper half of the boundary layer. Thus, for a 1:300 scale, the model value should be between 1/3 and 2/3 of a metre. Integral length scales are derived from power spectra, which describe the energy content of wind as a function of frequency. There are several ways of determining integral length scales of turbulence. One way is by comparison of a measured power spectrum in model scale to a non-dimensional theoretical spectrum such as the Davenport spectrum of longitudinal turbulence. Using the Davenport spectrum, which agrees well with full-scale spectra, one can estimate the integral scale by plotting the theoretical spectrum with varying  $L$  until it matches as closely as possible the measured spectrum:

$$f \times S(f) = \frac{\frac{4(Lf)^2}{U_{10}^2}}{\left[1 + \frac{4(Lf)^2}{U_{10}^2}\right]^{\frac{4}{3}}}$$

Where,  $f$  is frequency,  $S(f)$  is the spectrum value at frequency  $f$ ,  $U_{10}$  is the wind speed 10 m above ground level, and  $L$  is the characteristic length of turbulence.

Once the wind simulation is correct, the model, constructed to a suitable scale, is installed at the center of the working section of the wind tunnel. Different wind directions are represented by rotating the model to align with the wind tunnel center-line axis.




**FIGURE C1 (LEFT): MEAN WIND SPEED PROFILES;  
 FIGURE C2 (RIGHT): TURBULENCE INTENSITY PROFILES**

## REFERENCES

1. Teunissen, H.W., 'Characteristics of The Mean Wind And Turbulence In The Planetary Boundary Layer', Institute For Aerospace Studies, University Of Toronto, UTIAS # 32, Oct. 1970
2. Flay, R.G., Stevenson, D.C., 'Integral Length Scales in an Atmospheric Boundary Layer Near The Ground', 9th Australian Fluid Mechanics Conference, Auckland, Dec. 1966
3. ESDU, 'Characteristics of Atmospheric Turbulence Near the Ground', 74030
4. Bradley, E.F., Coppin, P.A., Katen, P.C., '*Turbulent Wind Structure Above Very Rugged Terrain*', 9<sup>th</sup> Australian Fluid Mechanics Conference, Auckland, Dec. 1966

# GRADIENTWIND

ENGINEERS & SCIENTISTS



## APPENDIX D

### PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND MEASUREMENT METHODOLOGY

## **PEDESTRIAN LEVEL WIND MEASUREMENT METHODOLOGY**

Pedestrian level wind studies are performed in a wind tunnel on a physical model of the study buildings at a suitable scale. Instantaneous wind speed measurements are recorded at a model height corresponding to 1.5 m full scale using either a hot wire anemometer or a pressure-based transducer. Measurements are performed at any number of locations on the model and usually for 36 wind directions. For each wind direction, the roughness of the upwind terrain is matched in the wind tunnel to generate the correct mean and turbulent wind profiles approaching the model.

The hot wire anemometer is an instrument consisting of a thin metallic wire conducting an electric current. It is an omni-directional device equally sensitive to wind approaching from any direction in the horizontal plane. By compensating for the cooling effect of wind flowing over the wire, the associated electronics produce an analog voltage signal that can be calibrated against velocity of the air stream. For all measurements, the wire is oriented vertically so as to be sensitive to wind approaching from all directions in a horizontal plane.

The pressure sensor is a small cylindrical device that measures instantaneous pressure differences over a small area. The sensor is connected via tubing to a transducer that translates the pressure to a voltage signal that is recorded by computer. With appropriately designed tubing, the sensor is sensitive to a suitable range of fluctuating velocities.

For a given wind direction and location on the model, a time history of the wind speed is recorded for a period of time equal to one hour in full-scale. The analog signal produced by the hot wire or pressure sensor is digitized at a rate of 400 samples per second. A sample recording for several seconds is illustrated in Figure D1. This data is analyzed to extract the mean, root-mean-square (rms) and the peak of the signal. The peak value, or gust wind speed, is formed by averaging a number of peaks obtained from sub-intervals of the sampling period. The mean and gust speeds are then normalized by the wind tunnel gradient wind speed, which is the speed at the top of the model boundary layer, to obtain mean and gust ratios. At each location, the measurements are repeated for 36 wind directions to produce normalized polar plots, which will be provided upon request.

In order to determine the duration of various wind speeds at full scale for a given measurement location the gust ratios are combined with a statistical (mathematical) model of the wind climate for the project site. This mathematical model is based on hourly wind data obtained from one or more meteorological stations (usually airports) close to the project location. The probability model used to represent the data is the Weibull distribution expressed as:

$$P(> U_g) = A_{\theta} \cdot \exp \left[ \left( - \frac{U_g}{C_{\theta}} \right)^{K_{\theta}} \right]$$

Where,

$P(> U_g)$  is the probability, fraction of time, that the gradient wind speed  $U_g$  is exceeded;  $\theta$  is the wind direction measured clockwise from true north,  $A$ ,  $C$ ,  $K$  are the Weibull coefficients, (Units:  $A$  - dimensionless,  $C$  - wind speed units [km/h] for instance,  $K$  - dimensionless).  $A_{\theta}$  is the fraction of time wind blows from a  $10^{\circ}$  sector centered on  $\theta$ .

Analysis of the hourly wind data recorded for a length of time, on the order of 10 to 30 years, yields the  $A_{\theta}$ ,  $C_{\theta}$  and  $K_{\theta}$  values. The probability of exceeding a chosen wind speed level, say 20 km/h, at sensor  $N$  is given by the following expression:


$$P_N(> 20) = \sum_{\theta} P \left[ \frac{(> 20)}{\left( \frac{U_N}{U_g} \right)} \right]$$

$$P_N(> 20) = \sum_{\theta} P \{ > 20 / (U_N / U_g) \}$$

Where,  $U_N / U_g$  is the gust velocity ratios, where the summation is taken over all 36 wind directions at  $10^{\circ}$  intervals.



If there are significant seasonal variations in the weather data, as determined by inspection of the  $C_\theta$  and  $K_\theta$  values, then the analysis is performed separately for two or more times corresponding to the groupings of seasonal wind data. Wind speed levels of interest for predicting pedestrian comfort are based on the comfort guidelines chosen to represent various pedestrian activity levels as discussed in the main text.



**FIGURE D1: TIME VERSUS VELOCITY TRACE FOR A TYPICAL WIND SENSOR**

## REFERENCES

1. Davenport, A.G., '*The Dependence of Wind Loading on Meteorological Parameters*', Proc. of Int. Res. Seminar, Wind Effects on Buildings & Structures, NRC, Ottawa, 1967, University of Toronto Press.
2. Wu, S., Bose, N., '*An Extended Power Law Model for the Calibration of Hot-wire/Hot-film Constant Temperature Probes*', Int. J. of Heat Mass Transfer, Vol.17, No.3, pp.437-442, Pergamon Press.