PEDESTRIAN WIND ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

APPENDIX X

Sydney Metro City & Southwest: Waterloo Over Station Development

Pedestrian Wind Environment Impact Assessment Report

Applicable to:	Sydney Metro City & Southwest
Author:	Joseph Gallace and Joseph Whippy
Owner	Sydney Metro
Status:	Final
Version:	4
Date of issue:	9th November 2018
Review date:	9th November 2018

© Sydney Metro 2018

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a detailed investigation into the wind environment conditions for the proposed concept development of the Metro Quarter. The existing site wind conditions were identified via wind tunnel testing, allowing for opportunities and constraints to be explored through the master planning process of the Metro Quarter development, including land use and community needs to support the development. Similarly, a review of the proposed massing model was conducted to identify key wind sensitive ground locations within and around the site which were quantitatively assessed by conducting a wind tunnel test of the massing model.

The existing site conditions and proposed massing of the Metro Quarter site were tested and are detailed within this report. Testing was performed using Windtech's boundary layer wind tunnel, which has a 3.0 metre wide test section and has a fetch length of 14 metres. Measurements were made in the wind tunnel at selected critical trafficable outdoor locations within and around the development from 16 wind directions at 22.5 degree increments using a 1:400 scale detailed model of the development. The effect of nearby buildings and land topography has been accounted for through the use of a proximity model, which represents an area with a radius of 600 metres.

Wind velocity coefficients representing the local wind speeds are derived from the wind tunnel and are combined with a statistical model of the regional wind climate (which accounts for the directional strength and frequency of occurrence of the prevailing regional winds) to provide the equivalent full-scale wind speeds at the site. These wind speed measurements are compared with criteria for pedestrian comfort and safety, based on gust wind speeds and Gust-Equivalent Mean (GEM) wind speeds.

Wind tunnel testing of the existing site wind conditions allowed for a baseline case for the proposed Metro Quarter development to be established, taking into account the prevailing wind directions for the area, as well as the local topographical effects of the terrain and the surrounding buildings of the proposed site. An assessment of the wind conditions has been made to identify the wind conditions and patterns, with the information used to coordinate a massing model.

Wind tunnel testing of the proposed concept proposal for the Metro Quarter was undertaken in January 2018. The results indicate a number of localised ground level areas are subject to wind conditions that do not achieve the desired criteria for pedestrian comfort and safety. However, through the incorporation of recommended in-principle treatments these wind conditions are expected to be ameliorated. Further wind tunnel testing of the ground level and elevated areas within the proposed Metro Quarter will be investigated during the detailed design stage to verify the suitability of the areas for their intended purpose and to incorporate wind amelioration measures as appropriate into the design.

An updated drawing package (For Coordination – 11/5/2018) prepared by Turner architects and received from UrbanGrowth NSW, May 2018 has been reviewed. Review of the updated drawings indicates the recommended awnings around the development have been

incorporated. The New Street through site link is also noted to include an awning over the space. The surrounding pedestrian footpath areas and the communal community square indicate the inclusion of landscaping and tree planting located in wind sensitive areas which has the potential to further enhance the wind comfort conditions. The building form of Tower D is noted to have changed from the initial massing model, however the change in building form is not expected to cause a significant impact on the measured ground level wind conditions. Hence, with the inclusion of the abovementioned design changes to the development, it is expected that the wind conditions for all outdoor trafficable within and around the development will be acceptable for their intended uses.

A desktop assessment of the private balconies indicates that a majority are exposed to winds on a single aspect and also benefit from the setback design, hence are expected to be suitable for their intended use. Recommendations have been made to address the balconies exposed to two aspects, through the recommended incorporation of deflective wind elements such as full-height screens to be added along one of the aspects. The elevated communal open spaces are exposed to the prevailing north-easterly, southerly and westerly winds due to their locations. With the recommended incorporation of wind deflective elements and strategic landscaping within these areas the wind conditions are expected to be acceptable for their intended uses.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary **2**
1.0 Introduction **5**
1.1 Purpose of this report 5
1.2 Overview of the Sydney Metro in its context 6
1.3 Nominated State Significant Precinct - Waterloo 9
1.4 Planning relationship between Waterloo Station and the OSD 10
1.5 The site 13
1.5.1 Location 13
1.5.2 Site context 14
1.6 Overview of the proposed development 17
1.7 Staging and framework for managing environmental impacts 20
2.0 Scope of assessment **22**
2.1 Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements 22
2.2 Baseline Investigations 22
2.2.1 Wind Climate for the Sydney Region 23
2.2.2 The Wind Tunnel Model 26
2.2.3 Boundary Layer Wind Flow Model 30
2.2.4 Pedestrian Wind Comfort and Safety 33
2.2.5 Layout of Study Points, and Relevant Wind Speed Criteria 35
2.2.6 Results 37
2.2.7 Discussion of Results 39
2.3 Implementation Plan & Strategy 40
2.3.1 The Wind Tunnel Model 41
2.3.2 Pedestrian Wind Comfort and Safety 46
2.3.3 Layout of Study Points, and Relevant Wind Speed Criteria 46
2.3.4 Discussion 49
2.4 Assessment 50
2.4.1 Ground Level Results 50
2.4.2 Discussion of Updated Drawing Package and Treatments 58
2.4.3 Public Plaza and Raglan Street Seating Criteria Comparison 59
2.4.4 Various Private Balconies and Podia and Communal Spaces 60
3.0 Conclusion **62**
References **64**
Appendix A – Directional Plots of the Wind Tunnel Results **66**
Appendix B – Velocity and Turbulence Intensity Profiles **67**
Appendix C – Published Environmental Criteria **68**
Appendix D – Data Acquisition **74**

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this report

This report accompanies a concept State Significant Development Application (concept SSD Application) submitted to the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) pursuant to Part 4 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act). The concept SSD Application is made under Section 4.22 of the EP&A Act.

This report should be read in conjunction with the Nominated State Significant Precinct (SSP) Study – Waterloo, submitted to the Minister for Planning (The Minister) in July 2018. That study proposes new planning controls to facilitate the development proposed.

Sydney Metro is seeking to secure concept approval for over station development (OSD) above and adjacent to Waterloo Station comprising a podium and three taller buildings which include commercial, residential, and community land uses. The concept SSD Application seeks consent for a building envelope and use for residential, retail, commercial, entertainment, community and recreational purposes, maximum building height, maximum gross floor area (GFA), pedestrian and vehicular access, circulation arrangements and associated car parking and the strategies and design parameters for the future detailed design of development.

Sydney Metro proposes to procure the construction of the OSD as part of an integrated station development package, which would result in the combined delivery of the station, OSD and public domain improvements. The station and its public domain elements form part of a separate planning approval for Critical State Significant Infrastructure (CSSI) approved by DPE on 9 January 2017.

As the development is within a rail corridor, is associated with railway infrastructure and is for "commercial premises or residential accommodation" with a Capital Investment Value of more than $30 million, the project is identified as State Significant Development (SSD) pursuant to Schedule 1, 19(2)(a) of the *State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011* (SRD SEPP).

This report has been prepared to outline the wind analysis impacts and specifically respond to the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) issued for the concept SSD Application on 29th June 2018 which states that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to address the following requirements:

Reference	SEARs Requirement	Where Addressed in Report
8	Amenity	2.1 (2.1.2, 2.1.8, 2.1.9), 2.2 (2.2.2, 2.2.7), 2.3
19	Consultation	2.1, 2.2, 2.3

1.2 Overview of the Sydney Metro in its context

Sydney Metro is Australia's biggest public transport project. A new standalone metro railway system, this 21st century network will deliver 31 metro stations and 66km of new metro rail for Australia's biggest city — revolutionising the way Sydney travels. Services start in the first half of 2019 on Australia's first fully-automated railway.

Sydney Metro was identified in *Sydney's Rail Future*, as an integral component of the *NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan*, a plan to transform and modernise Sydney's rail network so it can grow with the city's population and meet the future needs of customers. In early 2018, *the Future Transport Strategy 2056* was released as an update to *the NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan* and *Sydney's Rail Future*. Sydney Metro City & Southwest is identified as a committed initiative in the *Future Transport Strategy 2056*.

Sydney Metro is comprised of three projects:

Sydney Metro Northwest — formerly the 36km North West Rail Link. This $8.3 billion project is now under construction and will open in the first half of 2019 with a metro train every four minutes in the peak.

Sydney Metro City & Southwest — a new 30km metro line extending the new metro network from the end of Sydney Metro Northwest at Chatswood, under Sydney Harbour, through the CBD and south west to Bankstown. It is due to open in 2024 with an ultimate capacity to run a metro train every two minutes each way through the centre of Sydney.

Sydney Metro West – a new underground railway connecting the Parramatta and Sydney central business districts. This once-in-a-century infrastructure investment will double the rail capacity of the Parramatta to Sydney CBD corridor and will establish future capacity for Sydney's fast growing west. Sydney Metro West will serve five key precincts at Westmead, Parramatta, Sydney Olympic Park, The Bays and the Sydney CBD. The project will also provide an interchange with the T1 Northern Line to allow faster connections for customers from the Central Coast and Sydney's north to Parramatta and the Sydney CBD.

Sydney's new metro, together with signalling and infrastructure upgrades across the existing Sydney suburban rail network, will increase the capacity of train services entering the Sydney CBD – from about 120 an hour currently to up to 200 services beyond 2024. That's an increase of up to 60 per cent capacity across the network to meet demand.

Figure 1: Sydney Metro alignment map

Sydney Metro City & Southwest includes the construction and operation of a new metro rail line from Chatswood, under Sydney Harbour through Sydney's CBD to Sydenham and on to Bankstown through the conversion of the existing line to metro standards.

The project also involves the delivery of six (6) new metro stations, including at Waterloo, together with new underground platforms at Central. Once completed, Sydney Metro will have the ultimate capacity for a train every two minutes through the CBD in each direction - a level of service never seen before in Sydney.

On 9 January 2017, the Minister approved the Sydney Metro City & Southwest - Chatswood to Sydenham application lodged by TfNSW as a CSSI project (reference SSI 15_7400.

The CSSI Approval includes all physical work required to construct the CSSI, including the demolition of existing buildings and structures on each site. Importantly, the CSSI Approval also includes provision for the construction of below and above ground structures and other components of future OSD (including building infrastructure and space for future lift cores, plant rooms, access, parking and building services, as relevant to each site). The rationale for this delivery approach, as identified within the CSSI application is to enable the OSDs to be more efficiently built and appropriately integrated into the metro station structures.

The EIS for the Chatswood to Sydenham alignment of the City & Southwest project identified that the OSD would be subject to a separate assessment process.

Since the CSSI Approval was issued, Sydney Metro has lodged four modification applications to amend the CSSI Approval as outlined below:

- Modification 1 - Victoria Cross and Artarmon Substation which involves relocation of the Victoria Cross northern services building from 194-196A Miller Street to 50 McLaren Street together with inclusion of a new station entrance at this location referred to as Victoria Cross North. The modification also involves the relocation of the substation at Artarmon from Butchers Lane to 98 – 104 Reserve Road. This modification application was approved on 18 October 2017.
- Modification 2 - Central Walk which involves additional works at Central Railway Station including construction of a new eastern concourse, a new eastern entry, and upgrades to suburban platforms. This modification application was approved on 21 December 2017.
- Modification 3 - Martin Place Station which involves changes to the Sydney Metro Martin Place Station to align with the Unsolicited Proposal by Macquarie Group Limited (Macquarie) for the development of the station precinct. The proposed modification involves a larger reconfigured station layout, provision of a new unpaid concourse link and retention of the existing MLC pedestrian link and works to connect into the Sydney Metro Martin Place Station. It is noted that if the Macquarie proposal does not proceed, the original station design remains approved. This modification application was approved on 22 March 2018.
- Modification 4 - Sydenham Station and Sydney Metro Trains Facility South which incorporated Sydenham Station and precinct works, the Sydney Metro Trains Facility South, works to Sydney Water's Sydenham Pit and Drainage Pumping Station and ancillary infrastructure and track and signalling works into the approved project. This modification application was approved on 13 December 2017.

The CSSI Approval as modified allows for all works to deliver Sydney Metro between Chatswood and Sydenham Stations and also includes upgrade of Sydenham Station.

The remainder of the City & Southwest alignment (Sydenham to Bankstown) proposes the conversion of the existing heavy rail line from west of Sydenham Station to Bankstown to metro standards. This part of the project, referred to as the Sydenham to Bankstown upgrade, is the subject of a separate CSSI Application (Application No. SSI 17_8256) for which an EIS was exhibited between September and November 2017. A Response to Submissions and Preferred Infrastructure Report was submitted to DPE in June 2018 for further exhibition and assessment. This application is subject to assessment and determination by DPE, taking into consideration a further Response to Submissions Report which was submitted to DPE in September 2018.

1.3 Nominated State Significant Precinct - Waterloo

Following the decision to locate a metro station in Waterloo, the Minister determined that parts of Waterloo are of State planning significance which should be investigated for urban renewal through the SSP process. SSP study requirements for such investigations were issued by the Minister on 19 May 2017.

Investigation of the Precinct is being undertaken by UrbanGrowth NSW Development Corporation (UrbanGrowth NSW), in partnership with Sydney Metro and the Land and Housing Corporation (LAHC). The outcome of the SSP process will be new planning controls that will enable future development applications for renewal of the Precinct.

The Precinct includes two separate but contiguous and inter-related parts:

- The Waterloo Metro Quarter (the Metro Quarter)
- The Waterloo Estate (the Estate)

A separate SSP Study for the Metro Quarter was lodged in July 2018 in advance of the SSP Study for the Estate to provide a planning framework for the construction of OSD within the Metro Quarter. The staged submission of the Metro Quarter SSP Study also facilitates the proposed development to be delivered concurrently with the metro station, as an integrated station development.

As this concept SSD Application relies upon the planning framework proposed in the Metro Quarter SSP Study, it is anticipated that the SSP Study and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the SSD Application will be exhibited concurrently.

1.4 Planning relationship between Waterloo Station and the OSD

While Waterloo Station and the OSD will form an integrated station development, the planning pathways defined under the EP&A Act require separate approval for each component of the development. In this regard, the approved station works (CSSI Approval) are subject to the provisions of Part 5.1 of the EP&A Act (now referred to as Division 5.2) and the OSD component is subject to the provisions of Part 4 of the EP&A Act.

For clarity, the approved station works under the CSSI Approval included the construction of below and above ground structures necessary for delivering the station and also enabling construction of the integrated OSD. This includes but is not limited to:

- demolition of existing development
- excavation
- integrated station and OSD structure (including concourse and platforms)
- lobbies
- retail spaces within the station building
- public domain improvements associated with the station
- access arrangements including vertical transport such as escalators and lifts
- space provisioning and service elements necessary to enable the future development of the OSD, such as lift cores, plant rooms, access, parking, retail, utilities connections and building services.

The vertical extent of the approved station works above ground level is defined by the 'transfer level' level (which for Waterloo is defined by approximately RL 33.1 over the northern station box and RL 35.1 over the southern station box), above which would sit the OSD. An example of this delineation is illustrated in Figure 2.



Figure 2: Delineation between the Metro station and OSD

It is noted that the structural and service requirements and space provisioning to support OSD vary from station to station. For example, based on the current level of design, Waterloo Station is not expected to provide for OSD lobbies, end of trip facilities and plant rooms. However, the detailed design may be amended to incorporate these elements as part of the integrated station development.

The CSSI Approval also establishes the general concept for the ground plane of Waterloo Station including access strategies for commuters, pedestrians and workers. In this regard, the main pedestrian access to the station would be via an entry located at the corner of Raglan and Cope Streets. The station design has continued to be developed having regard to its integration with the Metro Quarter OSD, and as a result, a second entrance to the station is to be provided from a proposed public plaza adjacent to Cope Street. Retail uses (approved under the CSSI Approval) would be located on the ground floor of the station development along the Cope Street frontage of the site.

Since the issue of the CSSI Approval, Sydney Metro has undertaken design work to determine the technical requirements for the structural integration of the OSD with the station. This level of design work, together with the planning and design undertaken for the remainder of the Metro Quarter has informed the concept proposal for the OSD. It is noted that ongoing design development of the works to be delivered under the CSSI Approval would continue with a view to developing an Interchange Access Plan (IAP) and Station

Design Precinct Plan (SDPP) for Waterloo Station to satisfy Conditions E92 and E101 of the CSSI Approval. The detailed design for the Metro Quarter would continue to evolve having regard to the IAP and SDPP.

Public domain improvement works immediately adjacent to Waterloo Station would be delivered as part of the CSSI Approval to support pedestrian movements between transport modes (including to new and relocated bus stops, bike parking on Cope Street, and taxi and kiss-and-ride bays on Cope Street), while other public domain works within the Metro Quarter are proposed as part of the OSD. Final details of public domain works for the OSD will be provided with the detailed SSD Application(s) following finalisation of the SDPP and IAP for the CSSI Approval.

1.5 The site

1.5.1 Location

The site is located within the City of Sydney Local Government Area (LGA).

The Metro Quarter comprises land to the west of Cope Street, east of Botany Road, south of Raglan Street and north of Wellington Street. The heritage listed Waterloo Congregational Church located at 103–105 Botany Road is within this block but is not part of the site.

The site has an approximate area of 1.287 hectares (refer to Figure 3).



Figure 3: Waterloo Station location plan

1.5.2 Site context

The Metro Quarter is located in Redfern Street Village (see Figure 4) in the City of Sydney LGA approximately 3.3 kilometres south of Sydney CBD, 1 kilometre north of Green Square and less than 1 kilometre south of Redfern Station.

Directly east is the Waterloo Estate, which is owned by the NSW Government and is under the management of NSW LAHC. The Waterloo Estate comprises 2,012 social housing dwellings and a small number of private dwellings in medium and high density forms, ranging from single storey attached dwellings to apartment buildings of up to thirty storeys.

The Metro Quarter is less than 1 kilometre south-east of the Australian Technology Park (ATP), a technology micro-cluster that currently contains around 3,000 – 3,500 workers with a range of businesses in technology and creative industries; and a start-up/business incubator hub. It is set to grow into a business park that will soon accommodate new premises currently under construction (i.e. Commonwealth Bank Australia (CBA) has committed to two major office towers).



Figure 4: Location and site plan of the Waterloo State Significant Precinct (in red) and Redfern Street Village (in pink)



Figure 5: Nominated State Significant Precinct – Waterloo

The site comprises the following properties:

- 136B Raglan Street Lot 4 DP 215751
- 59 Botany Road Lot 5 DP 215751
- 65 Botany Road Lot 1 DP814205
- 67 Botany Road Lot 1 DP228641
- 124-128 Cope Street Lot 2 DP228641
- 69-83 Botany Road SP75492
- 130-134 Cope Street Lot 12 DP399757
- 136-144 Cope Street Lots A-E DP108312
- 85 Botany Road Lot 1 DP27454
- 87 Botany Road Lot 2 DP27454
- 89-91 Botany Road Lot 1 DP996765
- 93-101 Botany Road Lot 1 DP433969 & Lot 1 DP738891
- 156-160 Cope Street Lot 31 DP805384
- 107-117A Botany Road Lot 32 DP805384 & Lot A DP408116
- 119-121 Botany Road Lot 1 DP205942 & Lot 1 DP436831
- 170-174 Cope Street Lot 2 DP205942

The buildings and structures on the site are now demolished in accordance with the CSSI Approval with the exception of one building which is being used to support construction.

1.6 Overview of the proposed development

This concept SSD Application follows the submission of a SSP Study which supports a proposal to amend existing controls to facilitate the proposed development. The concept SSD Application will in turn comprises the first stage of seeking SSD development consent for the Waterloo OSD project. It will be followed by a future detailed SSD Application(s) for the design and construction of the OSD built form.

This concept SSD Application seeks approval for the planning and development framework and strategies to inform the future detailed design of the OSD. It specifically seeks approval for:

- maximum building envelopes, including maximum building heights, street-wall heights and ground and upper level setbacks
- a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 68,750 square metres, comprising:
  - approximately 56,200 square metres GFA of residential accommodation, providing for approximately 700 dwellings, including 5 to 10 percent affordable housing and 70 social housing dwellings
  - approximately 3,905 square metres GFA of retail premises and entertainment facilities
  - approximately 8,645 square metres GFA for business and commercial premises and community, health service and recreational facilities (indoor), including at least 2,000 square metres of floor space for community uses
- a three storey podium and a free standing building located within a public plaza, accommodating non-residential land uses
- use of OSD space provisioning within the footprint of the CSSI Approval
- residential uses above podium level in various building forms including three taller buildings of 23, 25 and 29 storeys (Reduced Level (RL) 96.9, 104.2 and 116.9 metres AHD respectively)
- public domain works, including open spaces, through-site links, footpaths, provision for cycle facilities and enhanced pedestrian crossings and roads.
- car parking for up to 427 vehicles
- cycle parking to support residential and non-residential land uses and visitors to the Metro Quarter. Approval is also being sought for space within the future basement for a bike hub which would also support future bike parking for Waterloo Station
- loading, vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements
- strategies for utilities and services provision
- strategies for managing stormwater and drainage
- a strategy for the achievement of ecologically sustainable development
- a public art strategy
- provision for future signage zones

- a design excellence framework
- the future subdivision of parts of the OSD footprint (if required).

It is noted that the Sydney Metro comprises GFA of approximately 8,415 square metres on the site, approved under CSSI Approval. The total GFA for the integrated station development, including the station GFA is approximately 77,165 square metres, which is equivalent to an FSR of approximately 6:1.

Key parameters of the concept proposal based on the current level of design development are indicated at Figure 6 and Figure 7.



Figure 6: Proposed massing, viewed from the west



Figure 7: Proposed massing, viewed from the east

The proposal is a significant opportunity to contribute to the urban renewal process for the Waterloo SSP. The objective to deliver the Metro Quarter project as soon as reasonably possible after completion of the Sydney Metro works (earmarked to open 2024) would ensure buildings within the Metro Quarter are occupied to support maximum patronage of the proposed metro station.

The Metro Quarter would contain a mix of uses including residential, commercial, retail, community facilities and services and cultural opportunities sufficient for daily life to be provided for within the wider neighbourhood and to support the activation of the precinct. This would help make Waterloo one of the most connected and attractive inner-city places to live, work and visit.

1.7 Staging and framework for managing environmental impacts

Sydney Metro proposes to procure the delivery of the Waterloo integrated station development in one single package, which would entail the following works:

- station structure fit-out, including mechanical and electrical
- OSD structure fit-out, including mechanical and electrical.

Separate delivery packages are also proposed by Sydney Metro to deliver the excavation of the station boxes/shafts ahead of the integrated station development delivery package, and linewide systems (e.g. track, power, ventilation) and operational readiness works prior to the Sydney Metro City & Southwest metro system being able to operate.

For the purposes of considering construction related impacts, three possible staging scenarios have been identified for delivery of the integrated station development:

1. Scenario 1 – the station and OSD are constructed concurrently by constructing the transfer slab first and then building in both directions. Both the station and OSD would be completed in 2024.
2. Scenario 2 – the station is constructed first and ready for operation in 2024. OSD construction may still be incomplete or soon ready to commence after station construction is completed. This means that some or all OSD construction is likely to still be underway upon opening of the station in 2024.
3. Scenario 3 – the station is constructed first and ready for operation in 2024. The OSD is built at a later stage, with timing yet to be determined. This creates two distinct construction periods for the station and OSD.

The final staging for the delivery of the OSD would be resolved as part of the detailed SSD Application(s).

For the purposes of providing a high level assessment of the potential environmental impacts associated with construction, the following have been considered:

- Impacts directly associated with the OSD, the subject of this SSD Application
- Cumulative impacts of the construction of the OSD at the same time as the station works (subject of the CSSI Approval).

Given the integration of the delivery of the Sydney Metro City & Southwest metro station with an OSD development, Sydney Metro proposes the framework detailed in Figure 8 to manage the design and environmental impacts, in relation to the wind analysis consistent with the framework adopted for the CSSI Approval.



Figure 8 Project approach to environmental mitigation and management

This approach would be implemented until such time as completion of the station works (i.e. works under the CSSI Approval) is achieved. Beyond that point, standard construction environmental management practices would be implemented by the OSD developer in accordance with relevant guidelines and any conditions of approval.

2.0 Scope of assessment

2.1 Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements

On 29 June 2017 The Minister issued the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for the Metro Quarter over station development. Of relevance to this study are the following requirements:

8. Amenity

- *provide wind analysis (including wind tunnel modelling) outlining the impacts, in particularly any impacts to existing and proposed public domain areas and open space. The wind impact assessment must identify the existing wind characteristics of the site and its locality, significant locations for wind sensitivity and mitigating measures.*

2.2 Baseline Investigations

This section addresses SEARs 8 and 19 through the analysis of the existing (pre-demolition) site wind conditions via wind tunnel testing. The existing site wind conditions testing was undertaken to identify issues, opportunities and constraints to be explored through the master planning process of the Metro Quarter development, including land use and community needs to support the development.

Wind tunnel testing was performed at Windtech's boundary layer wind tunnel facility. The wind tunnel has a 3.0 metre wide working section and a fetch length of 14 metres, and measurements were taken from 16 wind directions at 22.5 degree increments. Testing was carried out using a 1:400 detailed scale model of the development. The effects of nearby buildings and land topography have been accounted for through the use of a proximity model which represents an area with a radius of 600 metres. The testing procedures were based on the guidelines set out in the Australasian Wind Engineering Society Quality Assurance Manual (AWES-QAM-1-2017), ASCE 7-10 (Chapter C31), and CTBUH (2013).

Peak gust and mean wind speeds were measured at selected critical outdoor trafficable locations within and around the subject development. Wind velocity coefficients representing the local wind speeds are derived from the wind tunnel and are combined with a statistical model of the regional wind climate (which accounts for the directional strength and frequency of occurrence of the prevailing regional winds) to provide the equivalent full-scale wind speeds at the site. These wind speed measurements are compared with criteria for pedestrian comfort and safety, based on gust wind speeds and Gust-Equivalent Mean (GEM) wind speeds.

Testing of the Metro Quarter concept proposal was undertaken initially for the existing (pre-demolition) site conditions, based on the informational drawing packages received May 2017. The existing site development was tested in the wind tunnel without the effect of any forms of wind ameliorating devices such as screens, balustrades, etc. that are not already shown in the architectural drawings. Any proposed vegetation was also excluded from testing.

The results allowed for a baseline wind case of the existing site conditions of the proposed development site to be established, taking into account the prevailing wind directions for the region, as well as the local topographical effects of the terrain and the surrounding buildings of the proposed site.

2.2.1 Wind Climate for the Sydney Region

The regional wind model used in this study was determined from an analysis of measured directional mean wind speeds obtained at the meteorological recording station located at Kingsford Smith Airport (Sydney Airport). Data was collected from 1995 to 2016 between 6am to 10pm and corrected so that it represents wind speeds over standard open terrain at a height of 10 metres above ground for each wind direction. From this analysis, directional probabilities of exceedance and directional wind speeds for the region are determined. The directional wind speeds are summarised in Table 2.1. The directional wind speeds and corresponding directional frequencies of occurrence are presented in Figure 8.

The data indicates that the southerly winds are by far the most frequent winds for the Sydney region, and are also the strongest. The westerly winds occur most frequently during the winter season for the Sydney region, and although they are typically not as strong as the southerly winds, they are usually a cold wind and hence can be a cause for discomfort for outdoor areas. North-easterly winds occur most frequently occur during the warmer months of the year for the Sydney region, and hence are usually welcomed within outdoor areas since they are typically not as strong as the southerly or westerly winds.

The recurrence intervals examined in this study are for exceedances of 5 percent (per 90 degree sector) for the pedestrian comfort criteria using Gust-Equivalent Mean (GEM) wind speeds, and annual maximum wind speeds (per 22.5 degree sector) for the pedestrian safety criterion. Note that the 5 percent probability wind speeds presented in Table 2.1 are only used for the directional plot presented in Figure 8 and are not used for the integration of the probabilities.

Table 2.1: Directional Wind Speeds (m/s)
(hourly means, reference to 10 metres above ground in standard open terrain)

Wind Direction	5 percent Exceedance	Annual Maximum
N	5.9	9.9
NNE	9.9	12.9
NE	9.7	12.3
ENE	7.5	10.0
E	6.3	9.3
ESE	6.2	9.1
SE	7.0	10.1
SSE	8.5	12.2
S	10.3	13.9
SSW	10.0	14.1
SW	6.9	11.9
WSW	9.3	13.6
W	9.8	14.4
WNW	8.8	14.3
NW	6.7	12.6
NNW	5.5	10.7



Figure 9: Annual and 5 percent Exceedance Hourly Mean Wind Speeds, and Frequencies of Occurrence, for the Sydney Region (referenced to 10 metres above ground in standard open terrain)

2.2.2 The Wind Tunnel Model

Measurements were made in the wind tunnel at selected critical trafficable outdoor locations within and around the development from 16 wind directions at 22.5 degree increments using a 1:400 scale detailed model of the development. The existing site (pre-demolition) study model incorporates all necessary architectural features on the development to ensure an accurate wind flow is achieved. The effect of nearby buildings and land topography has been accounted for through the use of a proximity model, which represents a radius of approximately 600 metres. Photographs of the wind tunnel model are presented below for the existing site conditions in Figures 9 to 14 on the following pages. Figure 15 depicts a plan view of the proximity model.

The model of the proposed development was tested in the wind tunnel without the effect of any forms of wind ameliorating devices such as screens, balustrades, awnings, etc., which are not already shown in the architectural drawings.



Figure 10: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the North)

Figure 11: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the North-East)



Figure 12: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the East)



Figure 13: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the South



Figure 14: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the West)

Figure 15: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the South-East)



Figure 16: Map of Proximity Model

2.2.3 Boundary Layer Wind Flow Model

Testing was performed using Windtech's boundary layer wind tunnel, which has a 3.0 metre wide working section and has a fetch length of 14 metre. The model was placed in the appropriate standard boundary layer wind flow for each of the prevailing wind directions for the wind tunnel testing. The type of wind flow used in a wind tunnel study is determined by a detailed analysis of the surrounding terrain types around the subject site. Details of the analysis of the surrounding terrain for this study are provided in the following pages of this report.

The roughness of the earth's surface has the effect of slowing down the prevailing wind near the ground. This effect is observed up to what is known as the boundary layer height, which can range between 500 metres to 3 kilometres above the earth's surface depending on the roughness of the surface (i.e. oceans, open farmland, dense urban cities, etc.). Within this range, the prevailing wind forms what is known as a boundary layer wind profile.

Various wind codes and standards classify various types of boundary layer wind flows depending on the surface roughness. However, it should be noted that the wind profile does not change instantly due to changes in the terrain roughness. It can take many kilometres (at least 100 kilometres) of a constant surface roughness for the boundary layer profile to achieve a state of equilibrium. Descriptions of the standard boundary layer profiles for various terrain types are summarised as follows (in accordance with AS/NZS1170.2.2011):

- **Terrain Category 1.0:** Extremely flat terrain. Examples include enclosed water bodies such as lakes, dams, rivers, bays, etc.
- **Terrain Category 1.5:** Relatively flat terrain. Examples include the open ocean, deserts and very flat open plains.
- **Terrain Category 2.0:** Open terrain. Examples include grassy fields and plains and open farmland (without buildings or trees).
- **Terrain Category 2.5:** Relatively open terrain. Examples include farmland with scattered trees and buildings and very low-density suburban areas.
- **Terrain Category 3.0:** Suburban and forest terrain. Examples include suburban areas of towns and areas with dense vegetation such as forests, bushland, etc.
- **Terrain Category 3.5:** Relatively dense suburban terrain. Examples include centres of small cities, industrial parks, etc.
- **Terrain Category 4.0:** Dense urban terrain. Examples include CBD's of large cities with many high-rise towers, and areas with many closely-spaced mid-rise buildings.

For this study, the shape of the boundary layer wind flows over standard terrain types is defined in accordance with Deaves & Harris (1978). These are summarised in Table 2.2, referenced to the study reference height of 56 metres above ground. The Suburban Terrain Category 3.0 profile has been used in the wind tunnel testing of the subject development.

Table 2.2: Terrain and Height Multipliers, Turbulence Intensities, and Corresponding Roughness Lengths, for the Standard Boundary Layer Profiles (referenced to the study reference height)

Terrain Category	Terrain and Height Multipliers			Turbulence Intensity I_v	Terrain Roughness Length (metres) $z_{0,r}$
	$k_{tr,T=3600s}$ (hourly)	$k_{tr,T=600s}$ (10-minute)	$k_{tr,T=3s}$ (3-second)		
1.0	0.97	1.00	1.29	0.109	0.003
1.5	0.91	0.95	1.26	0.125	0.01
2.0	0.86	0.89	1.23	0.144	0.03
2.5	0.78	0.82	1.18	0.171	0.1
3.0	0.70	0.74	1.13	0.204	0.3
3.5	0.60	0.64	1.07	0.260	1
4.0	0.48	0.53	0.98	0.346	3

An analysis of the effect of changes in the upwind terrain roughness was carried out for each of the wind directions studied. This has been undertaken based on the method given in AS/NZS1170.2:2011, which uses a “fetch” length of 40 times the study reference height. However, it should be noted that this “fetch” commences beyond a “lag distance” area, which has a length of 20 times the study reference height (in accordance with AS/NZS1170.2:2011), so the actual “fetch” of terrain analysed is the area between 20 and 60 times the study reference height away from the site. An aerial image showing the surrounding terrain is presented in Figure 16 for a radius of 3.4 kilometres from the edge of the wind tunnel proximity model. The resulting mean and gust terrain and height multipliers at the site location are presented in Table 2.3, referenced to the study reference height.

For each of the 16 wind directions tested in this study, the approaching boundary layer wind profiles modelled in the wind tunnel matched the model scale and the overall surrounding terrain characteristics beyond the extent of the proximity model. Plots of the wind tunnel boundary layer wind profiles are presented in Appendix B of this report.

Table 2.3: Directional Mean and Gust Terrain and Height Multipliers at the Site
(at the study reference height)

Wind Sector (degrees)	$k_{tr,T=3600s}$ *(hourly mean)*	$k_{tr,T=600s}$ *(10-minute mean)*	$k_{tr,T=3s}$ *(3-second gust)*
0	0.60	0.65	1.07
30	0.60	0.64	1.07
60	0.74	0.78	1.16
90	0.78	0.82	1.18
120	0.74	0.78	1.16
150	0.78	0.81	1.18
180	0.70	0.74	1.13
210	0.60	0.64	1.07
240	0.70	0.74	1.13
270	0.70	0.74	1.13
300	0.68	0.72	1.12
330	0.79	0.82	1.18



Figure 17 Aerial Image of the Surrounding Terrain
(radius of 3.4 kilometres from the edge of the proximity model, which is coloured red)

2.2.4 Pedestrian Wind Comfort and Safety

The acceptability of wind conditions of an area is determined by comparing the measured wind speeds against an appropriate criteria. This section outlines how the measured wind speeds were obtained, the criteria considered for the development, as well as the critical trafficable areas that were assessed and their corresponding criteria designation.

2.2.4.1 Measured Wind Speeds

Wind speeds were measured using Dantec hot-wire probe anemometers, positioned to monitor wind conditions at critical outdoor trafficable areas of the development. The reference mean free-stream wind speed measured in the wind tunnel, which is at a full-scale height of 200 metres and measured 3 metres upstream of the study model.

Measurements were acquired for 16 wind directions at 22.5 degree increments using a sample rate of 1,024Hz. The full methodology of determining the wind speed measurements at the site from the Dantec Hot-wire probe anemometers is provided in Appendix D. Based on the results of the analysis of the boundary layer wind profiles at the site (see Section 2.2.3), and incorporating the regional wind model (see Section 2.2.1), the data sampling length of the wind tunnel test for each wind direction corresponds to a full-scale sample length ranging between 30 minutes and 1 hour. Research by A.W. Rofail and K.C.S. Kwok (1991) has shown that, in addition to the mean and standard deviation of the wind being stable for sample lengths of 15 minutes or more (full-scale), the peak value determined using the upcrossing method is stable for sample lengths of 30 minutes or more.

2.2.4.2 Wind Speed Criteria Used for this Study

For this study, the measured wind conditions for the various critical outdoor trafficable areas around the subject development are compared against the criteria presented in the Draft Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 - Central Sydney Planning Review Amendment (Draft Sydney DCP 2012), which supersedes the criteria detailed in the City of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (SDCP2012).

For pedestrian comfort, the Draft Sydney DCP 2012 requires that the hourly mean wind speed, or Gust-Equivalent Mean (GEM) wind speed (whichever is greater for each wind direction), must not exceed 8m/s for walking, 6m/s for standing, and 4m/s for sitting. These are based on a 5 percent probability of exceedance.

For pedestrian safety, the Draft Sydney DCP 2012 defines a safety limit criterion of 24m/s, based on an annual maximum 0.5 second gust wind speed, which applies to all areas.

Furthermore, in accordance with the provisions of the Draft Sydney DCP 2012, the existing conditions for the pedestrian footpaths around the site are also analysed as part of this study to determine the impact of the subject development. If it is found that the existing conditions exceed the relevant criteria, then the target wind speed for that area with the inclusion of the proposed development is to at least match the existing site conditions.

In accordance with the provisions of the Draft Sydney DCP 2012, the wind speed assessment is undertaken for winds occurring between 6am and 10pm (AEST).

A more detailed comparison of published criteria for pedestrian wind comfort and safety is provided in Appendix C.

For this study the measured wind conditions of the selected critical outdoor trafficable areas are compared against two sets of criteria; one for pedestrian safety, and one for pedestrian comfort. The safety criterion is applied to the annual maximum gust winds, and the comfort criteria is applied to Gust Equivalent Mean (GEM) winds. In accordance with ASCE (2003), the GEM wind speed is defined as follows:

$$GEM = max\left(\bar{V}, \frac{\hat{V}}{1.85}\right) \tag{2.1}$$

Where:

$\bar{V}$ is the mean wind speed.

$\hat{V}$ is the gust wind speed.

The criteria considered in this study are summarised in Tables 2.4 and 2.5 for pedestrian comfort and safety, respectively. The results of the wind tunnel study are presented in the form of directional plots attached in Appendix A of this report. For each study point there is a plot of the GEM wind speeds using the comfort criteria, and a plot for the annual maximum gust wind speeds using the safety criterion.

Table 2.4: Pedestrian Comfort Criteria (Draft Sydney DCP 2012)

Classification	Description	Maximum 5 percent Exceedance GEM Wind Speed (m/s)
Sitting	Outdoor areas that involve seating such as parks, dining areas in restaurants, amphitheatres, etc.	4
Standing	Short duration stationary activities (generally less than 1 hour), including window shopping, waiting areas, etc.	6
Walking	For pedestrian thoroughfares, private swimming pools, most communal areas, private balconies and terraces, etc.	8

Table 2.5: Pedestrian Safety Criterion (Draft Sydney DCP 2012)

Classification	Description	Maximum 5 percent Exceedance GEM Wind Speed (m/s)
Safety	Safety criterion applies to all trafficable areas	24

2.2.5 Layout of Study Points, and Relevant Wind Speed Criteria

For this study a total of 10 ground level study points have been selected for analysis in the wind tunnel located within and around various locations of the proposed development site.

The locations of the various study points tested are presented in Figure 17 in the form of a marked-up plan drawing. The target wind speed criteria for the outdoor trafficable areas within and around the development is also indicated in these figure which are based on the intended use (length of stay).

The most critical outdoor locations of the development have been selected for analysis to assist with the masterplan design input. The significant areas of concern are the corner areas of the proposed development site due to the alignment of the city street grid coinciding with two of the prevailing winds for the Sydney region, which are the southerly and westerly winds. These areas may be subject to adverse wind effects due to a combination of direct winds and corner accelerations. The wind tunnel results are explained in Section 2.2.6.



Figure 18 Study Point Locations and Target Criteria – Ground Level
Existing Site (Pre-demolition) of Proposed Waterloo Metro Block

2.2.6 Results

The results for the existing site (pre-demolition) point locations are presented in the form of directional plots in Appendix A, summarised in Table 2.6, and shown in marked-up plans in Figure 18.The wind speed criteria that the wind conditions should achieve are also listed in Table 2.6 for each study point location, as well as shown in Figure 17.

The baseline conditions established from the pedestrian wind environment testing have subsequently been used as the basis for comparison against the results of further wind tunnel testing of the concept proposal.

Table 2.6: Wind Tunnel Results Summary – Existing Site Conditions (Draft Sydney DCP 2012)

Study Point	Wind Speed Criteria and Overall Rating			
	GEM 5% exceedance (m/s)	Rating	Safety Limit (m/s)	Rating
Point 71	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS
Point 72	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS
Point 73	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS
Point 74	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS
Point 75	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS
Point 76	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS
Point 102	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS
Point 105	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS
Point 903	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS
Point 905	8.0	PASS	24.0	PASS

Note that when classifying a “Pass” or “Fail” for the weekly GEM wind speeds, the desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedance is greater than 5 percent and hence awarded a “Fail”.



Figure 19: Wind Directionality Plots – Ground Level - Existing Site of Proposed Waterloo Metro Block

2.2.7 Discussion of Results

Wind tunnel testing was performed to determine the baseline wind case of the existing (pre-demolition) site wind conditions at the Metro Quarter. The prevailing wind directions for the region, as well as the local topographical effects of the terrain and the surrounding buildings of the proposed site were considered. The results have allowed for design guidance and subsequent comparison with further wind tunnel testing for the concept and detailed design stages of the development.

Due to the relatively low-rise and scattered nature of the existing buildings within and around the study site, the wind conditions from the wind tunnel test generally indicate the exposed nature of the site to the predominant north-easterly, westerly and southerly winds for the region, with only a small amount of localised wind effects detected. More specifically, the majority of wind effects detected from the wind tunnel testing were observed to be direct wind effects due to limited shielding.

The predominant north-easterly, westerly and southerly winds are seen to impact the various study point locations located around the Metro Quarter site. The noted wind effects have been important for the consideration of the layout of outdoor areas, including proposed outdoor areas/laneways through the site. The westerly winds also predominantly occur during the winter months and will therefore have an adverse impact on thermal comfort due to “wind chill” effects.

The orientation and location of the various streetscapes around the site were observed to play a role in the amount of exposure the regions experienced to the predominant wind directions. For example, the streets orientated east/west were heavily impacted by the westerly winds, namely Henderson Road, Raglan Street and Wellington Street. The north/south orientation of Botany Road and Cope Street were noted to make the pedestrian footpath areas susceptible to the predominant north-easterly and southerly winds. This is a direct result of the exposed nature of the development site, as the incoming predominant winds are able to flow freely throughout these streetscapes, hence being the main contributor to the wind effects within these regions. This has been an important consideration during the development of the concept proposal, to ensure that these predominant winds are not further accentuated by the future built forms.

2.3 Implementation Plan & Strategy

This section will review the proposed massing model to identify key wind sensitive ground locations within and around the site which will be quantitatively assessed by conducting a wind tunnel test of the massing model.

In analysing the initial wind conditions of the existing site for the Metro Quarter development, a baseline scenario has been established, which has provided design guidance for the massing model. The existing site wind conditions, as outlined above in Section 2.2, have been considered and a proposed massing model has been developed by the design team within the design parameters and principals presented during the concept stage. Given the baseline wind conditions, the design team have prepared a massing model, which requires further investigation of wind conditions to be undertaken to determine the suitability of areas for pedestrian comfort and safety.

The testing procedures are as outlined in Section 2.2. The wind climate model for the Sydney region and the Boundary Layer wind flow model used in this study is outlined in Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.3, respectively.

Wind tunnel testing of the proposed Metro Quarter development was undertaken, based on the 3D Sketchup massing model received from UrbanGrowth NSW, January 2018. The massing model of the proposed development was initially tested in the wind tunnel without the effect of any forms of wind ameliorating devices such as screens, balustrades, etc. that are not already shown in the architectural drawing package. The effect of vegetation was also excluded from the testing.

The wind conditions were assessed at critical outdoor ground level locations including retail and residential entrances, pedestrian footpath areas and through site links, public/communal open space locations, the metro station entries and bus stop areas. Elevated pedestrian accessible areas were not tested and will be further investigated during the detailed design stage.

If the results of the massing model study indicate that any ground level area is exposed to strong winds, in-principle treatments have been recommended and discussed in Section 2.4. These treatments could be in the form of wind deflective elements such as screens, awnings, etc. or vegetation that is already proposed for the site, and/or additional trees, shrubs, etc.

2.3.1 The Wind Tunnel Model

Measurements were made in the wind tunnel at selected critical trafficable outdoor locations within and around the development from 16 wind directions at 22.5 degree increments using a 1:400 scale detailed model of the proposed development. The massing study model incorporates all necessary architectural features on the development to ensure an accurate wind flow is achieved. Testing of the proposed Metro Quarter development was undertaken, based on the 3D Sketchup massing model received from UrbanGrowth NSW, January 2018. The effect of nearby buildings and land topography has been accounted for through the use of a proximity model, which represents a radius of approximately 600 metres. Photographs of the wind tunnel model are presented below for the existing site conditions in Figures 19 to 25 on the following pages. Figure 26 depicts a plan view of the proximity model.

The model of the proposed development was tested in the wind tunnel without the effect of any forms of wind ameliorating devices such as screens, balustrades, awnings, etc., which are not already shown in the architectural drawings.

Figure 20: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the North-West)



Figure 21: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the South-East)

Figure 22: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the North-West)

Figure 23: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the North)



Figure 24: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the East)

Figure 25: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the South)

Figure 26: Photograph of the Wind Tunnel Model – (View from the West)



Figure 27: Map of Proximity Model

2.3.2 Pedestrian Wind Comfort and Safety

The acceptability of wind conditions of an area is determined by comparing the measured wind speeds against an appropriate criteria. The methodology to obtain the measured wind speeds and the criteria considered for the development is detailed in Section 2.2.4.

2.3.3 Layout of Study Points, and Relevant Wind Speed Criteria

For this study a total of 51 ground level study points have been selected for analysis in the wind tunnel located within and around various locations of the proposed development site.

The locations of the study points tested for this study are presented in Figures 29 and 30 in the form of marked-up plan drawings. The target wind speed criteria for the outdoor trafficable areas within and around the development is also indicated in these figure which are based on the intended use (length of stay).

The ground level plan includes retail and residential entrances, pedestrian footpath areas and through site links, public/communal open space locations, the Metro Station entries and bus stop areas. For the purpose of this study the selected pedestrian comfort criteria applied to the site is both the standing and walking comfort, as described in Table 2.10. All areas have been assessed against the safety criteria.

A discussion of the results for the areas within the Public Plaza and along Raglan Street compared against the seating comfort criteria is provided in Section 2.4.3.

It should also be noted that only the most critical outdoor locations of the development have been selected for analysis which will help with the masterplan design input. Elevated pedestrian accessible areas were not tested and will be investigated at a later design stage.



Figure 28: Study Point Locations and Target Criteria – Ground Level



Figure 29: Study Point Locations and Target Criteria – Surrounding Study Points

2.3.4 Discussion

A detailed investigation into the ground level wind environment conditions for the proposed massing model of the Metro Quarter development has been undertaken. Wind tunnel testing of the proposed Metro Quarter development was undertaken, based on the 3D Sketchup massing model received from UrbanGrowth NSW, January 2018.

The wind conditions were assessed at critical outdoor ground level locations including retail and residential entrances, pedestrian footpath areas, through site links, public/communal open space locations, the metro station entries and bus stop areas. For the purpose of the study the ground level areas have been assessed against the pedestrian walking and standing comfort criteria, given the usage of the site, as described in Table 2.10. Should the usage of an area require the stricter seating criteria to be assessed, further treatment investigation would be required, which could be further investigated during the detailed design stage. It is noted that the metro station is the subject of a separate planning approval (CSSI Approval), however the study has considered the potential wind impacts on the station entries, public domain and interchange areas such as bus stops to ensure the proposed development does not create unacceptable impacts on Sydney Metro customers.

If the results of the study indicate that any ground level area is exposed to strong winds, in-principle treatments have been recommended to assist the design team during the design stage. Elevated pedestrian accessible areas were not tested and will be further investigated for wind comfort/safety during the detailed design stage.

Review of the proposed massing model as provided by UrbanGrowth NSW indicates that the built form of the towers and podiums incorporate setbacks along certain aspects, which assist in reducing downwash winds. The building form setback along Raglan Street frontage and the proposed incorporation of awnings has the potential to improve wind conditions. However, the east/west orientation of the through site links is noted to have the potential to result in adverse wind conditions due to the funnelling of the predominant north-easterly and westerly winds. Review of the design layout indicates that the location of the public plaza space should provide protection to the prevailing southerly and westerly winds.

The results of the wind tunnel test for the massing model ground level areas are detailed and discussed in Section 2.4, and if any areas are exposed to adverse wind conditions, in-principle treatments have been recommended. These treatments could be in the form of wind deflective elements such as screens, awnings etc. or vegetation that is already proposed for the site, and/or additional trees, shrubs, or wind ameliorative elements such as screens, awnings, etc. Specific treatment strategies would be resolved as part of the detailed design and detailed SSD Application supported by wind tunnel testing.

2.4 Assessment

2.4.1 Ground Level Results

The results of the study are summarised in Table 2.12. The wind speed criteria that the wind conditions should achieve at each study point location are also listed in Table 2.12 and shown in Figures 29 and 30. The results for all study point locations can be seen in the form of directional wind speed plots presented in Figures 31 and 32, and in the Appendix A plots.

Table 2.12: Wind Tunnel Results Summary

Study Point	Desired Criterion (m/s)		Equivalent to or Better than Existing Site Wind Conditions?	Treatment Necessary to Pass?	Description of Suggested Treatment/ Notes
	Weekly GEM	Annual Peak			
P01	8.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P02	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P03	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P04	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P05	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P06	8.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P07	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P08	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P09	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P10	6.0	24.0	-	NO	
P11	6.0	24.0	-	NO	
P12	6.0	24.0	-	NO	
P13	6.0	24.0	-	NO	
P14	6.0	24.0	-	NO	
P15	6.0	24.0	-	NO	
P16	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P17	6.0	24.0	-	NO	
P18	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P19	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P20	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P21	8.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P22	8.0	24.0	-	NO	

Study Point	Desired Criterion (m/s)		Equivalent to or Better than Existing Site Wind Conditions?	Treatment Necessary to Pass?	Description of Suggested Treatment/ Notes
	Weekly GEM	Annual Peak			
P23	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P24	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P25	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P26	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P27	6.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P28	6.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P29	6.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P30	6.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P31	6.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P32	6.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P33	6.0	24.0	-	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P34	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P35	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P36	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P71	8.0	24.0	NO	NO	
P72	8.0	24.0	NO	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P73	8.0	24.0	YES	NO	
P74	8.0	24.0	NO	NO	
P75	8.0	24.0	NO	YES	Refer to Figure 32
P76	8.0	24.0	NO	NO	
P100	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P101	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P102	8.0	24.0	YES	NO	
P103	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P104	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P105	8.0	24.0	YES	NO	
P106	8.0	24.0	-	NO	
P903	8.0	24.0	NO	NO	
P905	8.0	24.0	NO	NO	



Figure 30: Wind Directionality Plots – Ground Level

Figure 31: Wind Directionality Plots – Surrounding Study Points



Figure 32: Metro Quarter Building Names

Due to the mid to low-rise nature of the development site and surrounding areas the site is exposed to the predominant north-easterly, southerly and westerly winds due to limited shielding. The north-west corner of the development site (Point P01) is exposed to localised effects due to the direct westerly winds which travel along Henderson Road wrapping around the corner. Furthermore, the westerly winds are seen to downwash off the western aspect of the north-west tall building (Building A) and onto the ground floor areas. Similarly, the north-east corner of the development site (Points P06 and P72) is prone to localised adverse wind conditions due to the prevailing north-easterly winds. These winds are seen to downwash off the northern aspect of the northern tall building and its corresponding podium, impacting the north-eastern corner of the ground floor of the development. It is recommended impermeable awnings be incorporated into the design along these corners of the development to assist with the downwash winds.

The pedestrian footpath areas at the south-west and south-east corners of the development are prone to adverse wind conditions. The prevailing westerly winds are seen to downwash off of the south-western aspect of the southern tall building (Building F) and impact the ground level at the south-west corner (Point P75). This area is also impacted by the direct westerly winds which travel along Buckland Street. The south-east corner of the development (Point P21) is prone to adverse wind conditions due to the down washing of the southerly winds onto the ground floor. This area is also impacted by the direct southerly winds interacting with the building form and wrapping around the south-east corner.

Due to the orientation of the proposed through site links (Pedestrian link and New Street) the areas are exposed to the prevailing north-easterly, southerly and westerly winds. The Pedestrian Link (Points P32 and P33) is prone to adverse wind conditions due to the southerly winds being captured and interacting with the northern podium, and funnelling through the space. Due to limited shielding the westerly winds are seen to funnel through this space.

The proposed new shared street located between the church and the central podium (Points P27, P28, P29, P30 and P31) is prone to adverse wind conditions due to the down washing of the southerly winds off of the central tall building (Building E) onto this area. The downwash winds are seen to circulate within this laneway. Furthermore, the direct westerly and north-easterly winds funnel through the laneway worsening conditions in the area. Impermeable awnings are recommended over these areas of the development to assist with the downwash wind. Results indicate that a majority of the areas within the public plaza are exposed to wind conditions which meet the comfort criteria. The public plaza located on the eastern aspect appears to be generally shielded from the prevailing winds by the built form. Addressing the through site link funnelling effects through the detailed design would further enhance the conditions within the public plaza.

All other ground level areas within and around the development site including the surrounding off-site points are exposed to suitable wind conditions.

The results of the study indicate that treatments are required for particular locations to achieve the desired criteria for pedestrian comfort and safety. The recommended in-principle treatments are detailed in the marked-up plan presented in Figure 2.17. These treatments are summarised as follows:

- The inclusion of an impermeable awning along the four corners of the development as well as along the western aspect of the central building podiums (Buildings D and E).
- Recommended change in building form for some of the areas on the central building podiums (Building D and E).
- The inclusion of an impermeable awning or pergola structure over the southern through site link (New Street) between Building E and the Church.

Opportunity to incorporate landscaping within the development (where possible) would also further enhance comfort conditions.

With the inclusion of these treatments to the design, it is expected that the ground level wind conditions for the areas within and around the site will be suitable for their intended uses.

If amelioration measures, such as awnings, are required to be implemented on the metro station components, coordination with the station design team is to be undertaken to ensure the metro station and OSD achieve acceptable conditions. This would be reflected in the SDPP for the CSSI project and in the detailed SSD Application for the Metro Quarter OSD.



Figure 33: Suggested Treatments – Ground Level

2.4.2 Discussion of Updated Drawing Package and Treatments

The information provided from the wind tunnel analysis has been incorporated by the design team to further consolidate the proposed design. An updated drawing package (For Coordination – 11/5/2018) prepared by Turner architects and received from UrbanGrowth NSW, May 2018 has been reviewed.

Upon review of the updated drawings it was noticed that the building form of Tower D had changed from the design presented for the initial massing model. The change in building form is not expected to cause a significant impact on the measured ground level wind conditions.

Review of the drawing package indicates the inclusion of baffle screens at the eastern and western entries to the Pedestrian Link. The inclusion of these elements will assist in mitigating the predominant southerly winds being captured by the protruding building form along Botany Road, which are observed to be funnelling through this space. The inclusion of the impermeable awning along Botany Road and the retention of the baffle screens is expected to provide similar alleviating wind measures as the building form change (recommended in-principle and indicated in Figure 33) and hence is suitable.

The proposed new shared street located between the church and the central podium is noted to include tree planting along the through site link and at the entry along Botany Road. It is noted that the awning does not fully extend across the space as recommended in-principle in Figure 33. However, the inclusion of this proposed awning in combination with the tree planting will assist in mitigating the wind conditions within this area and has the potential to provide similar ameliorative impacts as the recommended awning and building form change (recommended in-principle and indicated in Figure 33). The tree planting is recommended to be of a dense evergreen species, capable of growing to a height of 4-6 metres.

As an appraisal, the results of the analysis indicate that all study point locations along the Pedestrian Link and new street, when compared against the comfort criteria for walking meet the criteria without the inclusion of ameliorative treatments. The safety criteria is satisfied along these areas.

Review of the updated drawings indicate that the recommended awnings over the pedestrian footpath areas around the development have been incorporated. The surrounding pedestrian footpath areas and the community square indicate the inclusion of landscaping and tree planting located in wind sensitive areas, which have the potential to further enhance the wind comfort conditions.

Hence, with the inclusion of the abovementioned design changes to the design of the development, it is expected that the wind conditions for all outdoor trafficable areas within and around the development will be suitable for their intended uses.

2.4.3 Public Plaza and Raglan Street Seating Criteria Comparison

The wind condition results for the areas within the Public Plaza and along Raglan Street were compared against the seating comfort criteria and are summarised in Table 2.13. These results were obtained by comparing the initial wind tunnel results obtained from the massing model study as described in Section 2.3. The model of the proposed development was tested in the wind tunnel without the effect of any forms of wind ameliorating devices such as screens, balustrades, awnings, etc., which are not already shown in the architectural drawings.

Table 2.13: Wind Tunnel Test Results Summary compared against Seating Criteria

Study Point	GEM (5% exceedance)			Annual Gust			Final Result
	Criterion (m/s)	Results (%)	Grade	Criterion (m/s)	Results (m/s)	Grade	
Point 01	4.0	40%	Fail	24	31	Fail	Fail
Point 02	4.0	24%	Fail	24	20	Pass	Fail
Point 03	4.0	1%	Pass	24	10	Pass	Pass
Point 04	4.0	36%	Fail	24	22	Pass	Fail
Point 05	4.0	25%	Fail	24	21	Pass	Fail
Point 06	4.0	54%	Fail	24	26	Fail	Fail
Point 71	4.0	21%	Fail	24	14	Pass	Fail
Existing		18%	Fail		14	Pass	Fail
Point 72	4.0	46%	Fail	24	22	Pass	Fail
Existing		38%	Fail		15	Pass	Fail
Point 10	4.0	10%	Fail	24	18	Pass	Fail
Point 11	4.0	18%	Fail	24	17	Pass	Fail
Point 12	4.0	25%	Fail	24	17	Pass	Fail
Point 13	4.0	17%	Fail	24	16	Pass	Fail
Point 14	4.0	14%	Fail	24	13	Pass	Fail
Point 15	4.0	18%	Fail	24	16	Pass	Fail

Review of the initial testing results indicate that a majority of areas do not achieve the seating comfort criteria. As discussed in section 3.6 the existing site wind conditions indicate the areas along Raglan Street are exposed to the predominant north-easterly and westerly winds. The existing site results, when compared against the seating comfort criteria, indicate that wind conditions will exceed this criteria. Points 1 and 6 indicate strong wind conditions due to the predominant north-easterly and southerly winds accelerating around the building massing corners. Points 02 and 05 are observed to be impacted by the predominant north-

easterly and westerly winds. The area represented by Point 3 indicates wind conditions that does satisfy the seating comfort criteria.

The wind conditions within the Public Plaza do not satisfy the seating comfort criteria. These locations are observed to be impacted by the predominant north-easterly and southerly winds.

Note that these results are obtained from the testing undertaken based on the initial massing model, hence no treatments have been applied to these results. With the inclusion of the impermeable awnings as indicated in the latest drawing package (discussed in Section 2.4.2) and the inclusion of the landscaping, it is expected that wind conditions would improve.

It is recommended that further investigation of the wind conditions for the ground level areas along Raglan Street and within the Public Plaza be undertaken at a later stage, during the design development, if the uses of the proposed areas are intended for activities that are required to satisfy seating comfort criteria.

2.4.4 Various Private Balconies and Podia and Communal Spaces

The effect of wind activity is examined for the three predominant wind directions for the Sydney region. The desktop analysis of the wind effects relating to the elevated balcony areas has been carried out in the context of the local wind climate, building morphology and land topography.

The conclusions in this section of the report are drawn from our extensive experience in this field and are based on an examination of the architectural drawings received June, 2018. No wind tunnel tests have been undertaken for these areas of the subject development, and hence this only addresses the general wind effects and any localised effects that are identifiable by visual inspection. Any recommendations in this report are made only in-principle and are based on our extensive experience in the study of wind environment effects. Wind tunnel testing can be performed to quantitatively assess the wind effects to ensure pedestrian comfort and safety at a more detailed design stage.

The wind conditions for the various private balconies are heavily dependent on their location and design. The majority of the private balconies are only exposed to winds on a single aspect and hence are expected to be suitable for their intended use. The balconies would also benefit from the setback design. However, it is noted that there are several balconies exposed to two aspects on Building B, C, and G which may cause prevailing winds to accelerate though these areas as these winds move around the building. Generally, the wind speeds at the corners of the building form are expected to be the highest due to the winds accelerating around the corner of the building. Provisions should be made to limit the exposure of these balconies to a single aspect by considering a wind deflective element such as a full-height screen to be added along one of the aspects. This can be in the form of

glazing, louvres, etc. (which can be operable) which are expected to mitigate this effect. It is recommended to incorporate impermeable balustrades for all balconies.

The buildings themselves can shield the balconies from the prevailing winds. For example, the southern aspect balconies on Building E has the potential to be shielded from the direct southerly winds from Building F.

The elevated communal outdoor areas are located at various locations and heights within the proposed development. The northern communal open space (Building B) is exposed to the prevailing north-easterly, southerly and westerly winds. The wind impacts that are expected to affect this space are the direct north-easterly and southerly winds, and the potential for the westerly winds to side stream along the curved façade of Building A. Winds impacting the façade can also upwash and cause adverse winds on the communal open space.

The communal open spaces (Building C, G and F) are exposed to the prevailing north-easterly, southerly and westerly winds. The wind impacts that are expected to affect these spaces are the north-easterly and westerly winds, especially the communal open spaces that are potentially exposed to the funnelling of winds between Building B and C and Building E and F. The southerly winds are expected to affect these spaces due to limited shielding, with the potential for the southerly winds to side stream along the curved façade of Building F and impact the adjacent communal spaces. Winds impacting the façade can also upwash and cause adverse winds on the communal open space.

Within these communal open spaces, landscaping is recommended to reduce the effect of the adverse winds. In order to be effective as a wind mitigation measure, the recommended planting should be densely foliating with interlocking canopies, rather than planted in isolation. Due to its exposure to the prevailing westerly winter winds, the planting should be of an evergreen variety to ensure its effectiveness throughout the year. The perimeter of the terraces should incorporate wind screening to redirect the winds above the trafficable space. For the abovementioned corner accelerations, wind screens connected to the façade are expected to be required to be implemented to mitigate this effect. These screens can be supplemented with additional planting in these areas to further improve conditions.

The future building manager would also need to consider the use of the upper level outdoor terraces and balconies to ensure winds do not result in damage (e.g. securely attached furniture).

3.0 Conclusion

This report presents the results of a detailed investigation into the wind environment conditions for the proposed Metro Quarter development. The wind conditions for the existing site and proposed massing model of the Metro Quarter site were tested at critical ground level locations within and around the site.

The existing site wind conditions were measured with the incorporation of the existing site (pre-demolition) developments. Wind tunnel testing allowed for a baseline wind case for the existing site conditions of the proposed development to be established, taking into account the prevailing wind directions for the area, as well as the local topographical effects of the terrain and the surrounding buildings of the proposed site. An assessment of the wind conditions was made and the information used by the design team to coordinate a massing model.

Wind tunnel testing of the proposed Metro Quarter development indicated that a number of localised areas are subject to wind conditions that do not achieve the desired criteria for pedestrian comfort and safety. In-principle treatments have been recommended to address the adverse wind conditions. The recommended in-principle wind ameliorative treatments include impermeable awnings at strategic locations and an investigation of a building form change. The inclusion of strategically located densely foliating evergreen tree planting/shrubs within and around the development is expected to further enhance wind comfort conditions. With the inclusion of these treatments to the design, it is expected that the ground level wind conditions for the areas within and around the site will be suitable for their intended uses.

The information provided from the analysis has been incorporated by the design team to further consolidate the proposed design. An updated drawing package (For Coordination – 11/5/2018) prepared by Turner architects and received from UrbanGrowth NSW, May 2018 has been reviewed. Upon review of the updated drawings it was noticed that the building form of Tower D had changed from the initial massing model. The change in building form is not expected to cause a significant impact on the measured ground level wind conditions. Review of the drawing package indicates the incorporation of alternative wind ameliorative devices in wind sensitive areas such as the through-site link and new shared street. These include baffle screens, awnings and densely foliating evergreen tree planting, which are expected to provide similar alleviating wind measures as the recommended in-principle treatments.

The majority of the private balconies are only exposed to winds on a single aspect and also benefit from the setback design, hence are expected to be suitable for their intended use. Recommendations have been made to address the balconies exposed to two aspects, through the recommended incorporation of deflective elements such as full-height screens to be added along one of the aspects. The elevated communal open spaces are exposed to

the prevailing north-easterly, southerly and westerly winds due to their locations. With the recommended incorporation of wind deflective elements and strategic landscaping within these areas the wind conditions are expected to be acceptable for their intended uses.

It is recommended that further investigation of the wind conditions for the ground level and elevated areas within and around the development be undertaken at a later stage during the detailed design development to verify the suitability of the areas.

References

American Society of Civil Engineers, ASCE-7-10, 2010, “Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures”.

Australasian Wind Engineering Society, QAM-1, 2017, “Quality Assurance Manual”.

Australasian Wind Engineering Society, 2014, “Guidelines for Pedestrian Wind Effects Criteria”

Aynsley, R.M., Melbourne, W.H., Vickery, B.J., 1977, “Architectural Aerodynamics”. Applied Science Publishers.

City of Sydney Council, 2012, “City of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012”

City of Sydney Council, 2016, “City of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012: Central Sydney Planning Strategy Amendment”

Council on Tall Buildings and Urban Habitat (CTBUH), 2013, “Wind tunnel testing of high-rise buildings”, CTBUH Technical Guides.

Davenport, A.G., 1972, “An approach to human comfort criteria for environmental conditions”. Colloquium on Building Climatology, Stockholm.

Davenport, A.G., 1977, “The prediction of risk under wind loading”, 2nd International Conference on Structural Safety and Reliability, Munich, Germany, pp511-538.

Deaves, D.M. and Harris, R.I., 1978, “A mathematical model of the structure of strong winds.” Construction Industry and Research Association (U.K), Report 76.

Engineering Science Data Unit, 1982, London, ESDU82026, “Strong Winds in the Atmospheric Boundary Layer, Part 1: Hourly Mean Wind Speeds”, with Amendments A to E (issued in 2002).

Engineering Science Data Unit, 1983, London, ESDU83045, “Strong Winds in the Atmospheric Boundary Layer, Part 2: Discrete Gust Speeds”, with Amendments A to C (issued in 2002).

International Organisation for Standardisation, ISO4354, 2009, “Wind Actions on Structures”.

Lawson, T.V., 1973, “The wind environment of buildings: a logical approach to the establishment of criteria”. Bristol University, Department of Aeronautical Engineering.

Lawson, T.V., 1975, “The determination of the wind environment of a building complex before construction”. Bristol University, Department of Aeronautical Engineering.

Lawson, T.V., 1980, “Wind Effects on Buildings - Volume 1, Design Applications”. Applied Science Publishers Ltd, Ripple Road, Barking, Essex, England.

Melbourne, W.H., 1978, “Criteria for Environmental Wind Conditions”. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, vol. 3, pp241-249.

Melbourne, W.H., 1978, “Wind Environment Studies in Australia”. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, vol. 3, pp201-214.

Penwarden, A.D., Wise A.F.E., 1975, “Wind Environment around Buildings”. Building Research Establishment Report, London.

Rofail, A.W., 2007, “Comparison of Wind Environment Criteria against Field Observations”. 12th International Conference of Wind Engineering, Cairns, Australia.

Standards Australia and Standards New Zealand, AS/NZS 1170.2, 2011, “SAA Wind Loading Standard, Part 2: Wind Actions”.

Appendix A –
Directional Plots of the Wind Tunnel Results

Measured Wind Speeds at P01

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
13%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P02

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P03

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P04

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
2%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P05

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P06

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
14%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P07

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
5%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P08

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P09

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P10

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P11

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
3%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P12

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
4%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P13

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
3%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P14

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P15

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
3%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P16

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P17

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
5%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P18

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P19

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
2%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P20

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P21

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
9%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P22

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P23

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P24

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
3%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P25

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P26

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P27

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
21%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P28

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
14%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P29

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
13%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P30

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
10%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P31

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
12%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P32

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
18%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P33

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
6m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
12%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P34

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P35

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P36

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
2%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.

With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P71

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.
Existing Site Conditions

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P72

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
9%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.
Existing Site Conditions

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P73

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.
Existing Site Conditions

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P74

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
4%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.
Existing Site Conditions

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P75

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
4%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
12%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.
Existing Site Conditions

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P76

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
5%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
With the Waterloo Metro development as proposed. No vegetation or other treatments.
Existing Site Conditions

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P100

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
Surrounding Points Point

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P101

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
Surrounding Points Point

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P102

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
3%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
3%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

- *Criterion.*
- *Surrounding Points Point*
- *Existing Site Conditions*

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P103

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
Surrounding Points Point

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P104

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
Surrounding Points Point

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P105

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
Surrounding Points Point
Existing Site Conditions

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P106

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
N/A

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
1%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
Surrounding Points Point

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P903

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

Criterion.
Surrounding Points Point
Existing Site Conditions

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Measured Wind Speeds at P905

Weekly Maximum GEM (m/s)



Desired Criterion
8m/s

Prob. of Criterion Exceedence (existing site conditions)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (initial test)
0%

Probability of Criterion Exceedence (final retest)
N/A

NOTE: The desired criterion is exceeded if the probability of exceedence is greater than 5%

- *Criterion.*
- *Surrounding Points Point*
- *Existing Site Conditions*

Annual Maximum Gust (m/s)



Desired Criterion
24m/s

Appendix B –
Velocity and Turbulence Intensity Profiles


Mean Velocity and Turbulence Intensity for Suburban/Forest Terrain (0.2m < z0 < 0.3m) (TC3) at a 1:400 Scale
Height (m)
450
400
350
300
250
200
150
100
50
0
0.00
0.20
0.40
0.60
0.80
1.00
1.20
Turbulence Intensity
Normalised Velocity
Measured Wind Tunnel Velocity Profile
Measured Wind Tunnel Turbulence Intensity
Turbulence Intensity Profile (from ISO 4354:2009)
Normalised Velocity Profile (from ISO 4354:2009)
Turbulence Intensity Profile (from AS/NZS1170.2:2011)
Normalised Velocity Profile (from AS/NZS1170.2:2011)


Longitudinal Spectra Density for Suburban/Forest Terrain (0.2m < z0 < 0.3m) (TC3) at a 1:400 Scale
Normalised Spectral Density
0.30
0.25
0.20
0.15
0.10
0.05
0.00
1.E-05
1.E-04
1.E-03
1.E-02
1.E-01
Reduced Frequency, f/U (1/m)
Measured Wind Tunnel Spectral Density
Von Karman Harris Spectral Density from ESDU 85020 , Lu = 525 m
Von Karman Harris Spectral Density Fit to Wind Tunnel Data, Lu = 285 m

Appendix C –
Published Environmental Criteria

Wind Effects on People

The acceptability of wind in an area is dependent upon the use of the area. For example, people walking or window-shopping will tolerate higher wind speeds than those seated at an outdoor restaurant. Quantifying wind comfort has been the subject of much research and many researchers, such as A.G. Davenport, T.V. Lawson, W.H. Melbourne, and A.D. Penwarden, have published criteria for pedestrian comfort for pedestrians in outdoor spaces for various types of activities. This section discusses and compares the various published criteria.

C.1.1 A.D. Penwarden (1973) Criteria for Mean Wind Speeds

A.D. Penwarden (1973) developed a modified version of the Beaufort scale which describes the effects of various wind intensities on people. Table C.1 presents the modified Beaufort scale. Note that the effects listed in this table refers to wind conditions occurring frequently over the averaging time (a probability of occurrence exceeding 5%). Higher ranges of wind speeds can be tolerated for rarer events.

Table C.1: Summary of Wind Effects on People (A.D. Penwarden, 1973)

Type of Winds	Beaufort Number	Hourly Mean Wind Speed (m/s)	Effects
Calm	0	0 - 0.25	
Calm, light air	1	0 25 - 1.55	No noticeable wind
Light breeze	2	1.55 - 3.35	Wind felt on face
Gentle breeze	3	3.35 - 5.45	Hair is disturbed, clothing flaps, newspapers difficult to read
Moderate breeze	4	5.45 - 7.95	Raises dust, dry soil and loose paper, hair disarranged
Fresh breeze	5	7.95 – 10.75	Force of wind felt on body, danger of stumbling
Strong breeze	6	10.75 – 13.85	Umbrellas used with difficulty, hair blown straight, difficult to walk steadily, wind noise on ears unpleasant
Near gale	7	13.85 – 17.15	Inconvenience felt when walking
Gale	8	17.15 - 20.75	Generally impedes progress, difficulty balancing in gusts
Strong gale	9	20.75 – 24.45	People blown over

C.1.2 A.G. Davenport (1972) Criteria for Mean Wind Speeds

A.G. Davenport (1972) also determined a set of criteria in terms of the Beaufort scale and for various return periods. Table C.1 presents a summary of the criteria based on a probability of exceedance of 5%.

Table C.1: Criteria by A.G. Davenport (1972)

Classification	Activities	5% exceedance Mean Wind Speed (m/s)
Walking Fast	Acceptable for walking, main public accessways.	7.5 - 10.0
Strolling, Skating	Slow walking, etc.	5.5 - 7.5
Short Exposure Activities	Generally acceptable for walking & short duration stationary activities such as window-shopping, standing or sitting in plazas.	3.5 - 5.5
Long Exposure Activities	Generally acceptable for long duration stationary activities such as in outdoor restaurants & theatres and in parks.	0 - 3.5

C.1.3 T.V. Lawson (1975) Criteria for Mean Wind Speeds

In 1973, T.V. Lawson, while referring to the Beaufort wind speeds of A.D. Penwarden (1973) (as listed in Table C.1), quoted that a Beaufort 4 wind speed would be acceptable if it is not exceeded for more than 4% of the time, and that a Beaufort 6 wind speed would be unacceptable if it is exceeded more than 2% of the time. Later, in 1975, T.V. Lawson presented a set of criteria very similar to those presented in A.G. Davenport (1972) (as listed in Table C.1). These criteria are presented in Table C.1 and Table C.2 for safety and comfort respectively.

Table C.1: Safety Criteria by T.V. Lawson (1975)

Classification	Activities	Annual Mean Wind Speed (m/s)
Safety (all weather areas)	Accessible by the general public.	0 – 15
Safety (fair weather areas)	Private areas, balconies/terraces, etc.	0 – 20

Table C.2: Comfort Criteria by T.V. Lawson (1975)

Classification	Activities	5% exceedance Mean Wind Speed (m/s)
Business Walking	Objective Walking from A to B.	8 - 10
Pedestrian Walking	Slow walking, etc.	6 - 8
Short Exposure Activities	Pedestrian standing or sitting for short times.	4 – 6
Long Exposure Activities	Pedestrian sitting for a long duration.	0 - 4

C.1.4 W.H. Melbourne (1978) Criteria for Gust Wind Speeds

W.H. Melbourne (1978) introduced a set of criteria for the assessment of environmental wind conditions that were developed for a temperature range of 10oC to 30oC and for people suitably dressed for outdoor conditions. These criteria are presented in Table C.1, and are based on maximum gust wind speeds with a probability of exceedance of once per year.

Table C.1: Criteria by W.H. Melbourne (1978)

Classification	Human Activities	Annual Gust Wind Speed (m/s)
Limit for Safety	Completely unacceptable: people likely to get blown over.	23
Marginal	Unacceptable as main public accessways.	16 - 23
Comfortable Walking	Acceptable for walking, main public accessways	13 - 16
Short Exposure Activities	Generally acceptable for walking & short duration stationary activities such as window-shopping, standing or sitting in plazas.	10 - 13
Long Exposure Activities	Generally acceptable for long duration stationary activities such as in outdoor restaurants & theatres and in parks.	0 - 10

C.2 Comparison of the Published Wind Speed Criteria

W.H. Melbourne (1978) presented a comparison of the criteria of various researchers on a probabilistic basis. Figure C.1 presents the results of this comparison, and indicates that the criteria of W.H. Melbourne (1978) are comparatively quite conservative. This conclusion was also observed by A.W. Rofail (2007) when undertaking on-site remedial studies. The results of A.W. Rofail (2007) concluded that the criteria by W.H. Melbourne (1978) generally overstates the wind effects in a typical urban setting due to the assumption of a fixed 15% turbulence intensity for all areas. It was observed in A.W. Rofail (2007) that this value tends to be at the lower end of the range of turbulence intensities, and in an urban setting the range of the minimum turbulence intensities is typically in the range of 20% to 60%.



Figure C.1: Comparison of Various Mean and Gust Wind Environment Criteria, assuming 15% turbulence and a Gust Factor of 1.5 (W.H. Melbourne, 1978)

C.3 References relating to Pedestrian Comfort Criteria

Davenport, A.G., 1972, “An approach to human comfort criteria for environmental conditions”. Colloquium on Building Climatology, Stockholm.

Davenport, A.G., 1977, “The prediction of risk under wind loading”, 2nd International Conference on Structural Safety and Reliability, Munich, Germany, pp511-538.

Lawson, T.V., 1973, “The wind environment of buildings: a logical approach to the establishment of criteria”. Bristol University, Department of Aeronautical Engineering.

Lawson, T.V., 1975, “The determination of the wind environment of a building complex before construction”. Bristol University, Department of Aeronautical Engineering.

Melbourne, W.H., 1978, “Criteria for Environmental Wind Conditions”. Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, vol. 3, pp241-249.

Penwarden, A.D. (1973). “Acceptable Wind Speeds in Towns”, Building Science, vol. 8: pp259–267

Penwarden, A.D., Wise A.F.E., 1975, “Wind Environment Around Buildings”. Building Research Establishment Report, London.

Rofail, A.W., 2007, “Comparison of Wind Environment Criteria against Field Observations”. 12th International Conference of Wind Engineering, Cairns, Australia.

Appendix D –
Data Acquisition

The wind tunnel testing procedures for this study were based on the guidelines set out in the Australasian Wind Engineering Society Quality Assurance Manual (AWES-QAM-1-2017), ASCE 7-10 (Chapter C31), and CTBUH (2013).

The wind speed measurements for the wind tunnel study were acquired as coefficients by Dantec hot-wire anemometers and converted to full-scale wind speeds using details of the regional wind climate obtained from an analysis of directional wind speed recordings from the local meteorological recording station(s).

D.1 Measurement of the Velocity Coefficients

The study model and proximity model were setup within the wind tunnel which was configured to the appropriate boundary layer profile, and the wind velocity measurements were monitored using Dantec hot-wire probe anemometers at selected critical outdoor locations. The anemometers were positioned at each study location at a full-scale height of approximately 1.5m above ground/slab level. The support of the probe was mounted such that the probe wire was vertical as much as possible to ensure that the measured wind speeds are independent of wind direction along the horizontal plane. In addition, care was taken in the alignment of the probe wire and in avoiding wall-heating effects.

Wind speed measurements were made in the wind tunnel for 16 wind directions, at 22.5° increments. The output from the hot-wire probes was obtained using a National Instruments 12-bit data acquisition card. The data was acquired for each wind direction using a sample rate of 1024Hz. The sample length was determined to produce a full-scale sample time that is sufficient for this type of study.

The mean, gust and standard deviation velocity coefficients were measured in the wind tunnel. The gust velocity coefficients were also derived for each wind direction from by the following relation:

$$\hat{C}_V = \bar{C}_V + g \cdot \sigma_{C_V} \qquad \text{D.1}$$

Where:

$\hat{C}_V$ is the gust coefficient.

$\bar{C}_V$ is the mean coefficient.

g is the peak factor, taken as 3.0 for a 3s gust and 3.4 for a 0.5s gust.

σ_{C_V} is the standard deviation of coefficient measurement.

D.2 Calculation of the Full-Scale Results

The full-scale results determine if the wind conditions at a study location satisfy the designated criteria of that location. More specifically, the full-scale results need to determine the probability of exceedance of a given wind speed at a study location. To determine the probability of exceedance, the measured velocity coefficients were combined with a statistical model of the local wind climate that relates wind speed to a probability of exceedance. Details of the wind climate model are outlined in Section 3.1 and 4.1 of the main report.

The statistical model of the wind climate includes the impact of wind directionality as any local variations in wind speed or frequency with wind direction. This is important as the wind directions that produce the highest wind speed events for a region may not coincide with the most wind exposed direction at the site.

The methodology adopted for the derivation of the full-scale results for the maximum gust and the GEM wind speeds are outlined in the following sub-sections.

Maximum Gust Wind Speeds

The full-scale maximum gust wind speed at each study point location is derived from the measured coefficient using the following relationship:

$$V_{study} = V_{ref,RH}\left(\frac{k_{200m,tr,T=1hr}}{k_{RH,tr,T=1hr}}\right)C_V \qquad \text{D.1}$$

Where:

V_{study} is the full-scale wind speed at the study point location, in m/s.

$V_{ref,RH}$ is the full-scale reference wind speed, measured 3m upstream at the study reference height. This value is determined by combining the directional wind speed data for the region (detailed in Section 4.1) and the upwind terrain and height multipliers for the site (detailed in Section 4.3).

$k_{200m,tr,T=1hr}$ is the standard deviation of the wind speed.

$k_{RH,tr,T=1hr}$ is the hourly mean terrain and height multiplier at the study reference height (see Section 3.3 and 4.3).

C_V is the velocity coefficient measurement obtained from the hot-wire anemometer, which is derived from the following relationship:

$$C_V = \frac{C_{V,study}}{C_{V,200m}} \qquad \text{D.2}$$

Where:

$C_{V,study}$ is the coefficient measurement obtained from the hot-wire anemometer at the study point location.

$C_{V,200m}$ is the coefficient measurement obtained from the hot-wire anemometer at the free-stream reference location at 200m height upwind of the model in the wind tunnel.

The value of $V_{ref,RH}$ varies with each prevailing wind direction. Wind directions where there is a high probability that a strong wind will occur have a higher directional wind speed than other directions. To determine the directional wind speeds, a probability level must be assigned for each wind direction. These probability levels are set following the approach used in AS/NZS1170.2:2011, which assumes that the major contributions to the combined probability of exceedance of a typical load effect comes from only two 45 degree sectors.

Maximum Gust-Equivalent Mean Wind Speeds

The contribution to the probability of exceedance of a specified wind speed (ie: the desired wind speed for pedestrian comfort, as per the criteria) was calculated for each wind direction. These contributions are then combined over all wind directions to calculate the total probability of exceedance of the specified wind speed. To calculate the probability of exceedance for a specified wind speed a statistical wind climate model was used to describe the relationship between directional wind speeds and the probability of exceedance. A detailed description of the methodology is given by T.V. Lawson (1980).

The criteria used in this study is referenced to a probability of exceedance of 5% of a specified wind speed.

D.3 References relating to Data Acquisition

American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), ASCE-7-10, 2010, “Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures”.

Australasian Wind Engineering Society (AWES), QAM-1, 2017, “Quality Assurance Manual”.

Council on Tall Buildings and Urban Habitat (CTBUH), 2013, “Wind tunnel testing of high-rise buildings”, CTBUH Technical Guides.

Lawson, T.V., 1980, “Wind Effects on Buildings - Volume 1, Design Applications”. Applied Science Publishers Ltd, Ripple Road, Barking, Essex, England.

Standards Australia and Standards New Zealand, AS/NZS 1170.2, 2011, “SAA Wind Loading Standard, Part 2: Wind Actions”.