

**INFLUENCE OF ROOF SHAPE ON THE NATURAL VENTILATION
POTENTIAL OF A BUILDING**

GOH-ZHONGYU

**A report submitted
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering with Honours**

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering

UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA

2018

DECLARATION

I declare that this report entitled “Influence of Roof Shape on the Natural Ventilation Potential of a Building” is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

Signature : _____

Name : GOH-ZHONGYU

Date : _____

SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I have read this project report and in my opinion this report is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of the degree of Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering with Honours.

Signature : _____
Supervisor : DR. CHENG SEE YUAN
Date : _____

DEDICATION

To my beloved mother and father

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The success and final outcome of this thesis was the result from a lot of guidance and assistance from many individuals and parties. I am extremely fortunate to have them all along the execution of the project work.

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere acknowledgement to my supervisor, Dr. Cheng See Yuan from the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka (UTeM) for his unparalleled teachings and support towards the completion of this thesis.

Besides, I would like to thank Dr. Fudhail Bin Abdul Munir, Computational Fluid Dynamics lecturer from the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering for his assistance in the CFD simulation works. Furthermore, I owe my profound gratitude to my peers who took interest on my project work and helped me in solving some critical CFD simulation problems.

Special thanks to my parents and sibling for their undivided moral support. Without them, this thesis would not have been possible to occur. Finally, I am thankful to all the people involved in this thesis and I am fortunate enough to get constant encouragement, support and guidance from them which helped me in successfully completing my thesis. Also, I would like to extend my sincere regards to all of them for their timely support.

ABSTRACT

The present study investigated the influence of different roof shapes on the natural ventilation potential of an isolated low-rise building by using Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD). The Barrel Vault, Gable, Pyramid and Shed roof were chosen for the study. The Realizable k- ϵ turbulent model was adopted in the CFD simulations. The wind which obeyed power law equation was set to approach the building model at eight different angles. The natural ventilation potential of the ground and the upper floors of the building model were studied separately with the assumption of no cross ventilation between both floors. The Shed roof shape was found out to be the highest performer in inducing natural ventilation, the Barrel Vault roof came in second, followed by the Gable roof and lastly, the Pyramid roof. It was proven that different roof shapes will have significant influence on the natural ventilation potential of a building.

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini mengkaji pengaruh bentuk bumbung yang berbeza kepada potensi pengudaraan semula jadi sesebuah bangunan dengan menggunakan Dinamik Bendalir Berkomputer. Bumbung “Barrel Vault”, “Gable”, “Pyramid” dan “Shed” telah dipilih sebagai bentuk kajian. Model bergelora “Realizable k- ϵ ” telah digunakan dalam simulasi Dinamik Bendalir Berkomputer. Angin yang berdasarkan formula “power law” telah ditetapkan untuk menuju ke bangunan modal dari lapan arah yang berbeza. Potensi pengudaraan semula jadi bagi aras bawah dan aras atas telah dikaji secara berasingan dengan andaian tiada pengudaraan salib antara kedua-dua aras. Bentuk bumbung “Shed” didapati mencapai potensi pengudaraan semula jadi yang tertinggi, bentuk bumbung “Barrel Vault” mencapai tempat kedua, diikuti bentuk bumbung “Gable” dan akhir sekali, bentuk bumbung “Pyramid”. Kajian ini telah membuktikan bahawa bentuk bumbung yang berbeza akan mempengaruhi potensi pengudaraan semula jadi sesebuah bangunan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
SUPERVISOR’S DECLARATION	
TITLE	
DECLARATION	
DEDICATION	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xvi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	4
1.3 Objectives	4
1.4 Scope of Project	4

2.	LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1	Natural Ventilation	5
2.2	Airflow	8
2.3	Airflow Pressure Distribution	9
2.4	Boundary Layer	10
2.5	Computational Fluid Dynamics	11
	2.5.1 Geometry of the Building Models	11
	2.5.2 Computational Domain	12
	2.5.3 Meshing	12
	2.5.4 Turbulent Models	13
	2.5.5 Boundary Conditions	14
3.	METHODOLOGY	15
3.1	Introduction	15
3.2	Geometry of the Building Models	15
3.3	Computational Domain	18
3.4	Meshing	19
3.5	Turbulent Models	22
3.6	Boundary Conditions	22
3.7	Solution Methods and Monitors	24
3.8	Validation	25
	3.8.1 Approaching Flow Vertical Wind Velocity Profile	25
	Comparison between CFD with Power Law	
	Implementation versus SFP Wind Tunnel Test	

3.8.2	Vertical Wind Velocity Profile Comparison between CFD Power Law and Non-Power Law Implementation in Different Turbulent Models versus SFP Wind Tunnel Test	27
3.9	Verification	29
3.9.1	Gird Independent Test	29
3.9.2	Turbulent Model Comparison	31
4.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	23
4.1	Wind Velocity Profile	33
4.2	Coefficient of Win Pressure Distribution around the Building Model	37
4.3	Difference in the Wind Pressure Coefficients between Opposing Facades	49
4.3.1	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficient Data for All Roof Shapes in the Average Wind Approach Angle	51
4.3.2	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficient Data for Barrel Vault Roof Shapes in the All Wind Approach Angles	54
4.3.3	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficient Data for Gable Roof Shapes in the All Wind Approach Angles	56
4.3.4	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficient Data for Pyramid Roof Shapes in the All Wind Approach Angles	58
4.3.5	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficient Data for Shed Roof Shapes in the All Wind Approach Angles	60

5.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	63
5.1	Conclusion	63
5.2	Recommendations	63
	REFERENCES	64
	APPENDICES	70

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	TITLE	PAGE
3.1	Face Sizing and Inflation Method Comparison	19
3.2	Grid Independent Test	29
3.2	Turbulent Model Comparison	32

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Temperature Driven Natural Ventilation (Source: Da Graca and Linden, 2016)	5
2.2	Streamlines Influenced by Roof Shape (Source: Tominaga et al, 2014)	8
2.3	Pressure Coefficient Distribution around Building Model (Source: Tominaga et al, 2014)	9
2.4	Laminar Flow (Left) and Turbulent Flow (Right) in an Enclosed Region. (Source: Ahepp, 2017)	11
2.5	Meshing for Building Model. (source: Cheng (2007))	13
2.6	Comparison of Streamwise Velocity, U_1 and Turbulent Kinetic Energy, k from Different Turbulent Model. (Source: Tominaga et al, 2014)	14
3.1	The Default 0° Wind Approach Angle Relative to the Building Model	16
3.2	The Building Model Dimensions of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right), Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right)	17
3.3	The Top View of the Building Model Facades Relative to the Wind Approach Angles	17

3.4	The Dimensions of the Computational Domain	18
3.5	Wind Velocity Profile Comparison between Different Mesh Settings and SFP Wind Tunnel Test (Tominaga et al, 2014)	20
3.6	The Computational Domain	20
3.7	The Grid Topology and Prismatic Layers	21
3.8	Power-Law Equation in UDF C Programming Code	23
3.9	The Approaching Wind Velocity Profile Comparison between CFD Simulation and SFP Wind Tunnel Test (Tominaga et al, 2014)	25
3.10	Standard k- ϵ Turbulent Model with Power Law and Non-Power Law Implementation versus SFP Wind Tunnel Test Velocity Profile	27
3.11	The Realizable k- ϵ Turbulent Model with Power Law and Non-Power Law Implementation versus SFP Wind Tunnel Test Velocity Profile	28
3.12	Pressure Difference between Windward and Leeward Building Façade versus Number of Element	30
3.13	Wind Velocity Profiles Comparison of CFD with Different Turbulent Models versus Actual Wind Tunnel Test	31
4.1	The Wind Velocity Profile of Each Roof Shapes on 0° Wind Approach Angle	35
4.2	The Wind Velocity Profile of Each Roof Shapes on 45° Wind Approach Angle	36

- 4.3 The Wind Pressure Distribution Contour around the Building 38
Model of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
0° Wind Approach Angle
- 4.4 The Wind Pressure Coefficient Distribution Contour on the North 39
Facade of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
0° Wind Approach Angle.
- 4.5 The Wind Pressure Coefficient Distribution Contour on the East 40
Facade of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
0° Wind Approach Angle.
- 4.6 The Wind Pressure Coefficient Distribution Contour on the South 41
Facade of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
0° Wind Approach Angle.
- 4.7 The Wind Pressure Coefficient Distribution Contour on the West 42
Facade of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
0° Wind Approach Angle.
- 4.8 The Wind Pressure Distribution Contour around the Building 43
Model of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
45° Wind Approach Angle

- 4.9 The Wind Pressure Coefficient Distribution Contour on the North 45
 Facade of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
 Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
 45° Wind Approach Angle.
- 4.10 The Wind Pressure Coefficient Distribution Contour on the East 46
 Facade of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
 Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
 45° Wind Approach Angle.
- 4.11 The Wind Pressure Coefficient Distribution Contour on the South 47
 Facade of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
 Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
 45° Wind Approach Angle.
- 4.12 The Wind Pressure Coefficient Distribution Contour on the West 48
 Facade of Barrel Vault Roof (Top Left), Gable Roof (Top Right),
 Pyramid Roof (Bottom Left) and Shed Roof (Bottom Right) under
 45° Wind Approach Angle.
- 4.13 Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against the 51
 Ground Floor Building Model Façades of Each Roof Shapes at the
 Average Wind Approach Angle
- 4.14 Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against the Upper 52
 Floor Building Model Façades of Each Roof Shapes at the Average
 Wind Approach Angle.
- 4.15 Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against All Wind 54
 Approach Angles at the Ground Floor Building Model Façades of
 the Barrel Vault Roof Shape

4.16	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against All Wind Approach Angles at the Upper Floor Building Model Façades of the Barrel Vault Roof Shape	55
4.17	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against All Wind Approach Angles at the Ground Floor Building Model Façades of the Gable Roof Shape	56
4.18	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against All Wind Approach Angles at the Upper Floor Building Model Façades of the Gable Roof Shape	57
4.19	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against All Wind Approach Angles at the Ground Floor Building Model Façades of the Pyramid Roof Shape	58
4.20	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against All Wind Approach Angles at the Upper Floor Building Model Façades of the Pyramid Roof Shape	59
4.21	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against All Wind Approach Angles at the Ground Floor Building Model Façades of the Shed Roof Shape	60
4.22	Difference in Wind Pressure Coefficients, C_{diff} against All Wind Approach Angles at the Upper Floor Building Model Façades of the Shed Roof Shape	61

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	PSM Gantt Chart	58
B	Methodology Flowchart	60
C	Wind Velocity Profile	61
D	Difference in Coefficient of Wind Pressure	67

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANSI	American National Standards Institute
ASHRAE	American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers
CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics
IAQ	Indoor Air Quality
RAM	Random Access Memory
RNG	Re-Normalisation Group
SBS	Sick Building Syndrome
SFP	Split Fibre Probe
SST	Shear Stress Transport
UDF	User-Defined Function

LIST OF SYMBOLS

Q_{buoyancy}	=	Buoyancy ventilation rate
C_d	=	Discharge coefficient
A	=	Cross sectional area of the inlet that equals to the outlet
g	=	The acceleration due to gravity
h	=	Vertical distance between inlet and outlet midpoints
T_i	=	Average temperature of indoor air
T_o	=	Average temperature of outdoor air
$Q_{\text{ventilation}}$	=	wind driven ventilation rate
U_{wind}	=	wind speed at far-field
C_{p1}	=	coefficient of wind pressure drag at the upstream opening
C_{p2}	=	coefficient of wind pressure drag at the upstream opening
A_1	=	cross sectional area of the inlet
A_2	=	cross sectional area of the outlet
C_1	=	discharge coefficient at the inlet
C_2	=	discharge coefficient at the outlet
ΔP	=	Pressure drop across the openings
ρ	=	Air density
P	=	Pressure measured on the building surface
C_p	=	Pressure coefficient
U	=	Air velocity

Re	=	Reynolds number
u	=	Fluid velocity
L	=	Characteristic linear dimension
μ	=	Dynamic viscosity of the fluid
ν	=	Kinematic viscosity of the fluid
H_e	=	Building height
Hz	=	Hertz
k	=	Turbulent kinetic energy
ε	=	Epsilon
ω	=	Omega
U_1	=	Streamwise velocity
U_{H_e}	=	Air velocity at building height
W	=	Building width
k_s	=	Roughness height
C_s	=	Roughness constant
Z_0	=	Aerodynamic roughness length of the topography
$^\circ$	=	Degree
x/H_e	=	Ratio of unit length in x-axis against height of the building model
C_{diff}	=	Difference in Coefficient of Wind Pressure

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Ventilation is a process of air circulation or exchange of air into and out of a space. In a tropical country like Malaysia, ventilation plays an important role in good indoor air quality (IAQ) of a building. Adequate air ventilation provide thermal comfort in a building and at the same time reduce the possibility of Sick Building Syndrome (SBS) among the residents (Norhidayah et al, 2013). According to an estimation by Spiru and Simona (2017), people in urban areas tend to spend up to 90% of their time in indoor environments especially work place. Hence, ventilation is crucial to ensure human wellbeing in a building.

There are essentially two types of ventilation: natural ventilation and mechanical ventilation. Natural ventilation usually involves wind while mechanical ventilation involves machines like fans and air conditioners. Mechanical ventilation systems force the air moves in the designated motion to provide ventilation or manipulating the temperature of air by certain degree. On the other hand, formation of natural ventilation relies heavily on air velocity and air flow pressure difference (Burnett et al, 2005). For cases where only insignificant indoor and outdoor temperature difference occur, air flow pressure difference determines the performance of natural ventilation (Cheng, 2007). As one of the aspects of building design, roof shape can create air flow pressure difference and thus affecting natural ventilation potential.

Despite the convenience of mechanical ventilation system functions, it occupies more than half of the annual energy consumption in a building at a rate of 100kWh per square meter of floor space (Bastide, 2006). Over reliance on mechanical ventilation on a global scale will cause enormous amount of burden towards the environment and energy suppliers (Omrani et al, 2017). According to Schulze and Eicker (2013), several studies showed natural ventilation was able to save 17% of energy consumption by mechanical ventilation in a targeted building at Meiji University, Tokyo.

Studies done by Kubota and Ahmad (2006) shows that application of natural ventilation could build up thermal comfort in tropical climate conditions while improving indoor air quality as it removes hot polluted air in a building. Natural ventilation approach on a building design proved to be a cost and operation effective solution for higher indoor environment comfort (Lei et al, 2017). The advantages of natural ventilation has grabbed attention of architects as the future of building design is more aggressive on environmental friendly and energy saving approach.

Estate developers tend to focus more on aesthetic rather than functionality in their housing design to attract buyers. Usually, the natural ventilation potential of a building is not in the primary consideration of the buyers as they unknowingly compromise by utilizing mechanical ventilation systems that are widely available in the market. This behaviour may lead to unbalanced approach on both aesthetic and functionality aspects during building design process which directly interrupts the air flow pressure difference around the building.

One of main factors found affecting the natural ventilation performance of a building in a study did by Aynsley (2007) was the building shape. The roof design has huge influence on air flow patterns around the building (Peren et al, 2015). Therefore, the intent of the project was to study the influence of roof shape on the natural ventilation potential on a building. The validation and verification of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) application were done by referring to a closely related work of Tominaga et al (2015). A few common roof shapes on typical low rise building were chosen as the target of investigation. Several vital parameters such as distribution of air pressure difference and air velocity on different roof shape designs were examined. The simulations were done on CFD capable software and data were extracted for further analysis on natural ventilation potential.