

# Does a thermal stratification make ventilation more robust to wind gusts?

John Craske<sup>1</sup> and Graham O. Hughes<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Imperial College London,  
London SW7 2AZ, UK

(Last updated: August 27, 2018)

In this note we show that the ventilation of a confined space whose buoyancy field is stratified is less susceptible to being permanently reversed by the wind than the ventilation of a space whose buoyancy field is uniform. Our formulation determines the smallest instantaneous increase in the opposing wind strength that is necessary to permanently reverse the forward flow that is driven by a two-layer thermal stratification. The work extends a previous formulation of the problem (Lishman & Woods, 2009, *Building and Env.* **44**, pp.666-673) by accounting for the transient dynamics associated with the homogenisation of the interior, which proves to play a significant role in buffering temporal variations in the wind.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

In contrast to indoor conditions that are controlled mechanically, naturally ventilated spaces surrender themselves to the forces and fluctuations of their surrounding environments (see e.g. Linden, 1999). In addition to the prediction of the mean state of a system, one should therefore be concerned with its robustness or its propensity to switch abruptly to an alternative mean state.

In the specific case of an indoor space subjected to a source of heating and an external wind load, the governing equations admit multiple steady state solutions (Hunt & Linden, 2005). The solutions correspond to either *forward flow* or *reverse flow*, for which discharge occurs through the opening at the top or bottom of the space, respectively. From an operational point of view it is necessary to consider the transient route towards these steady states from time-dependent governing equations (Kaye & Hunt, 2004; Coomaraswamy & Caulfield, 2011). The analysis of the system's transient behaviour leads naturally to questions relating to the sensitivity and robustness of steady states to random or controlled variations in design or environmental conditions.

There exist reverse flows that are unstable, in the sense that infinitesimal changes in the wind load will cause a dramatic change in the system's state. In contrast, there exist stable reverse and forward flows that are insensitive to infinitesimal changes in the wind. Finite changes in the wind, however, can result in a transition between stable forward flow and stable reverse flow and provide the motivation for the present study.

Previous work (Yuan & Glicksman, 2008; Lishman & Woods, 2009) has determined the minimum instantaneous amount by which an opposing wind must increase to force a transition from forward flow to reverse flow, under the assumption of an initial state consisting of uniform buoyancy. Given that isolated sources of buoyancy and heterogeneous boundary conditions result in spatially non-uniform distributions of buoyancy (see e.g. Linden *et al.*, 1990), we relax the assumption of uniform buoyancy and quantify the extent to which the destruction of a stratified interior enhances the system's robustness to fluctuations in the wind. In §1.2 we describe the key features of the general problem and in §1.3 we focus on the response of a two-layer stratification, before presenting results in §2.




FIGURE 1: The ventilation driven by (a) a well-mixed interior of uniform buoyancy and (b) a stably-stratified interior. Schematic (c) illustrates reverse flow, for which the interior is well mixed and assumed to be of uniform buoyancy. Consideration of buoyancy conservation shows that the average buoyancy and ventilation rate in (a) exceeds that of (b), provided that their opposing wind strengths and heating are equal.

### 1.2 An illustration of the general problem

Consider a volume with low- and high-level openings, as depicted in figure 1. In (a), following Lishman & Woods (2009), the heating of the space is distributed evenly over the floor and the resulting buoyancy field is assumed to be uniform. In (b), which is the starting point for the present work, the heating occurs unevenly over localised sources to produce a buoyancy field that is non-uniform (i.e. stratified). Ventilation of the space is driven by pressure differences resulting from the average internal buoyancy and external forces arising from the wind. In a steady state, the rate at which buoyancy drains from the top of the space is equal to the rate at which it is supplied to the space in the form of heat, which we assume to be the same in (a) – (c) in figure 1.

We now argue that the average buoyancy and ventilation rate is greater in (a) than in (b). To show this, we first note that the ventilation rate increases with pressure difference through the upper opening, which in turn increases with average buoyancy in the volume. We further note that, for a given average buoyancy, the buoyancy at the top of the volume in (a) is less than for any stable stratification in (b). Thus, for the product of the uppermost buoyancy and the ventilation rate (i.e. the buoyancy flux through the upper opening) to be the same in both cases, we conclude that the ventilation rate – and therefore the average buoyancy – must be a maximum in (a).

If the force from the wind exceeds the force from the internal buoyancy, the reverse flow illustrated in figure 1(c) results, accompanied by an approximately well-mixed interior of uniform buoyancy, regardless of the way in which the space is heated (Hunt & Linden, 2005). Assuming that the wind strength in (a),(b) and (c) is identical, the uniform buoyancy in (c) is necessarily less than both the average buoyancy in (b) and the uniform buoyancy in (a).

A transient increase in the opposing wind strength can cause a transition from the forward flow in figure 1 (a) and (b) to the reverse flow in (c). The question that our work addresses is whether the minimum increase in the wind strength that is required for the transition is greater for system (a) than it is for system (b). Whilst the required reduction in average buoyancy is greater for system (a), the wind must perform additional work to destroy the stratification in system (b), making it more robust to fluctuations in the wind than one might otherwise expect.




FIGURE 2: Wind-opposed buoyancy driven ventilation resulting in (a): forward flow; (b): transient reverse flow with a stratification and (c): mixed reverse flow. A sufficiently large increase in the opposing wind results in a transition from (a) to (c).

### 1.3 Theoretical model

We will assume that buoyancy is introduced as a point source located at the bottom of a domain, whose ventilation is facilitated by low- and high-level openings. For forward flow, the resulting two-layer stratification, illustrated in 2(a), is a special example of the stratified environments that were considered in figure 1(b). The state of the system can be described by the dimensionless height of the resulting interface  $h$  and the dimensionless buoyancy  $b$  of the upper layer, which, following Coomaraswamy & Caulfield (2011), are non-dimensionalised using the total domain height and plume buoyancy flux. Following Hunt & Linden (2005), the volume flow rate through the space is determined by the pressure difference  $P$ :

$$P = \underbrace{b(1-h)}_{\text{buoyancy}} - \underbrace{W}_{\text{wind}}, \quad (1)$$

between the dimensionless stack-driven pressure  $b(1-h)$  and the dimensionless wind-induced pressure difference between the windward and leeward openings  $W$ , which corresponds to the square of a Froude number based on the wind speed. In adopting this notation, which differs slightly from the explicit use of the Froude number  $\text{Fr} = \sqrt{W}$  by Hunt & Linden (2005) to express the same physical concepts, we follow Coomaraswamy & Caulfield (2011). Further details pertaining to the non-dimensionalisation of the problem can be found in Coomaraswamy & Caulfield (2011).

In an unsteady state the governing equations comprise statements of volume conservation and buoyancy conservation in the upper layer:

$$\frac{dh}{dt} = \begin{cases} -h^{5/3} + |VP|^{1/2}, & P \geq 0, h \geq 0 \\ -h^{5/3} - |VP|^{1/2}, & P < 0, h > 0 \\ 0, & P < 0, h = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}b(1-h) = \begin{cases} 1 - |VP|^{1/2}b, & P \geq 0, h \geq 0 \\ 1, & P < 0, h > 0 \\ 1 - |VP|^{1/2}b, & P < 0, h = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

respectively, where  $V$  is a dimensionless opening area and also accounts for discharge coefficients. The  $h^{5/3}$  in (2) corresponds to the volume flux in an axisymmetric plume at  $z = h$ , which would cause the height of the interface to reduce in the absence of the stack-driven discharge  $|VP|^{1/2}$ . The sub-equations in (2) and (3) refer to forward displacement ventilation ( $P \geq 0, h \geq 0$ ), reverse displacement ventilation ( $P < 0, h > 0$ ) and reverse mixing ventilation ( $P < 0, h = 0$ ), as depicted in figure 2. If a well-mixed interior of

uniform buoyancy is assumed from the outset (as it is in Lishman & Woods, 2009), the system's state can be uniquely described by the buoyancy  $b$  alone, which evolves according to (3) with  $h = 0$ .

When  $W$  exceeds a critical value  $W_c = \sqrt[3]{27/4V}$ , the system has three fixed points, each corresponding to a different steady-state solution (Hunt & Linden, 2005). For  $W > W_c$  there exists two stable solutions and an unstable steady-state solution describing reverse flow. Reverse flow is not possible when  $W < W_c$  and, as pointed out by Lishman & Woods (2009), stable reverse flow subjected to decreasing wind will jump to displacement ventilation when  $W < W_c$ .

The fixed point for forward flow through a stratified environment satisfies (2) and (3) for  $P \geq 0$ :

$$b = h^{-5/3}, \quad Vh^{-5/3}(1-h) - h^{10/3} - VW = 0. \quad (4)$$

The fixed points for reverse flow when  $W > W_c$  satisfy (3) for  $h = 0$  and are therefore real roots of the cubic

$$b^3 - Wb^2 + V^{-1} = 0. \quad (5)$$

When  $W \rightarrow \infty$  in (5), either  $b \rightarrow 0$ , which corresponds to a stable state in which the interior is constantly and rapidly flushed by the wind, or  $b \rightarrow W$ , which corresponds to an unstable state in which the relatively large buoyancy of the interior is sufficient to balance the wind-induced pressure difference.

It is useful to regard the two-dimensional phase space for the system, shown in figure 3, as a projection of the space to which states  $(b, h, W, V)$  belong. Constant values of  $V$  and  $W$  correspond to a particular plane or slice through the entire space. The features of phase space that are shown in the projection in figure 3 therefore depend on particular values of  $V$  and  $W$ , whose axes are hidden from view. Whilst the grey arrows correspond to the system's time derivatives when  $V = 1$  and  $W = 2 > W_c$ , we have also included the system's trajectory for other values of  $W$  to indicate how the system would evolve if the wind were to change.

As discussed in Coomaraswamy & Caulfield (2011), states for which  $h > b^{-3/5}$ , representing an upper layer whose buoyancy exceeds the buoyancy in the plume at the interface, are beyond the scope of the model equations and therefore not included in figure 3. The phase space is partitioned by a separatrix curve (thick dashed line) emanating from the unstable fixed point for  $h = 0$  ( $\circ$ ) into basins of attraction corresponding to each of the stable fixed points ( $\nabla$  and  $\triangle$ ). The fixed point to which a system's state eventually evolves is determined by whether its initial state lies to the left or to the right of the separatrix curve. The separatrix curve can be obtained by adding a small positive perturbation to  $h = 0$  at the unstable fixed point, to provide initial conditions for the integration of the governing equations *backwards* in time until  $h = b^{-3/5}$ .

## 2 Flow reversal

### 2.1 Physical explanation

The direction of the flow through the system can be permanently reversed by a sustained increase  $\Delta W$  in the wind strength. The resulting pressure difference must be larger than the favourable pressure difference created by the upper layer of warm fluid during the transition (i.e.  $P < 0$  in (2)-(3)). Without an internal heat source *any* increase in adverse pressure across the space would reverse the flow. With an internal heat source the




FIGURE 3: The projected phase space for a two-layer stratification. The grey arrows denote the time derivatives of a given state  $(b, h)$  for an opposing wind of strength  $W = 2$  with  $V = 1$ . The symbols  $\Delta$ ,  $\circ$  and  $\nabla$  denote the stable (forward flow), unstable and stable (reverse flow) fixed points of the system, respectively. The thick dashed line denotes the separatrix curve for  $W = 2$  and  $V = 1$ , which partitions the phase space into basins of attraction for stable forward and stable reverse flow. The thick lines emanating from  $\Delta$  denote the trajectories taken by the system following step changes  $\Delta W = 0.5 < \Delta W_*$  (blue) and  $\Delta W = 1.0 > \Delta W_*$  (red). The thin dashed lines denote the separatrix curves corresponding to  $\Delta W = 0.5$  and  $\Delta W = 1.0$ , from left to right, respectively.

situation is more complicated, because during its transition between states, the average buoyancy of the space increases. During a transition towards a permanent reversal of the flow, the density interface descends and fluid of zero buoyancy from the lower layer leaves the space. The average buoyancy of the space therefore increases until the interface reaches the level of the low-level opening. The precise behaviour of the interface height and the buoyancy of the upper layer during the transition is governed by the system's dynamical equations (2) and (3).

### 2.2 The critical change in wind speed $\Delta W_*$

If the system's state starts at the fixed point corresponding to forward flow ( $\Delta$ ), a step increase  $\Delta W$  will cause its state to change. Where the state of the system eventually lands depends on the magnitude of  $\Delta W$ . For  $\Delta W < \Delta W_*$ , where  $W_*$  is a critical step increase that will be discussed below, the system will return to a state corresponding to forward flow (the blue line in figure 3). For  $\Delta W > \Delta W_*$  the system will transition to a state corresponding to stable reverse flow (the red line in figure 3). Whether a transition to stable reverse flow occurs depends on whether the step increase  $\Delta W$  moves the separatrix curve to the left or to the right of the system's initial state, as indicated by the arrows in figure 3. When  $\Delta W > \Delta W_*$ , the separatrix curve is moved to the right of the fixed point for forward flow and the system is placed in the basin of attraction for stable reverse flow.

The strength of the optimal (minimum) wind increase  $\Delta W_*$  places the separatrix curve exactly on the fixed point for forward flow corresponding to  $W$ , as shown in figure 4. The increase would need to be sustained for at least as long as it would take for the system's state to cross the separatrix curve associated with the original wind strength (the white




FIGURE 4: The projected phase space for a two-layer stratification. The grey arrows denote the time derivatives of a given state  $(b, h)$  for an opposing wind of strength  $W = 2$  with  $V = 1$ . The thick (orange) line emanating from  $\triangle$  denotes the trajectory taken by the system following the minimal step change  $\Delta W_* \approx 0.79$  in the base wind strength and coincides with the system’s separatrix curve for the wind strength  $W + \Delta W_*$ . Along the thin solid line culminating in  $\star$ , the average buoyancy  $b(1 - h)$  is constant. The thin dashed line emanating from  $\star$  is the separatrix curve corresponding to the increase in wind strength  $\Delta W < \Delta W_*$  for which the buoyancy of the unstable fixed point is equal to  $b(1 - h)$ . The location of the fixed point for forward flow, under the assumption of a well-mixed interior (Lishman & Woods, 2009), is denoted  $\blacklozenge$ .

circle  $\circ$  at the bottom of figure 4). No instantaneous increase for which  $\Delta W < \Delta W_*$  can reverse the flow because  $\Delta W_*$  is the smallest step change that places the system’s state in the basin of attraction for stable reverse flow<sup>1</sup>.

The base wind strength that corresponds to  $W + \Delta W_*$  can be found by integrating the governing equations backwards in time along the separatrix curve emanating from the unstable fixed point for  $W + \Delta W_*$ , which satisfies a modified version of equation (5):

$$b^3 - (W + \Delta W_*)b^2 + V^{-1} = 0. \quad (6)$$

The point at which the resulting trajectory intersects the line  $h = b^{-3/5}$  corresponds to the steady-state solution for forward flow for a base wind strength  $W$ . Performing the calculation for different values of  $W + \Delta W_*$  provides the relationship between  $W$  and  $\Delta W$  that is displayed in figure 5.

### 2.3 Comparison with Lishman & Woods (2009)

A steady-state forward flow in the environment of uniform buoyancy considered by Lishman & Woods (2009) satisfies equation (3) with  $P \geq 0$ :

$$b^3 - Wb^2 - V^{-1} = 0. \quad (7)$$

The real solution to equation (7) corresponds to  $\blacklozenge$  in figure 4. It is evident from figure 4 that the buoyancy satisfying (7) is less than the buoyancy satisfying (6) for the unstable fixed point, which is denoted  $\bullet$  in figure 4. The latter corresponds to the buoyancy of

<sup>1</sup>Strictly speaking, the optimal instantaneous increase in the wind strength  $\Delta W_*$  places the system on the separatrix curve; hence increases  $\Delta W > \Delta W_*$  would be required to place the system in the basin of attraction for reverse flow.




FIGURE 5: Stability diagram indicating for the effect of an instantaneous increase in wind strength  $\Delta W$  that causes a reversal of forward ventilation flow. The symbols correspond to those used to annotate the phase space in figure 4. The stable and unstable regions are separated by the minimal instantaneous increase in wind strength  $\Delta W_*$  (thick orange line marked with  $\bullet$ ) that is necessary to permanently reverse the ventilation of a two-layer stratified interior for an opening parameter  $V = 1$  (the dashed lines corresponding to  $V = 0.5$  and  $V = 2.0$  are included for comparison, although  $W_c$  in  $W/W_c$  is consistently based on  $V = 1$ ). The lines in the stable region correspond to the unstratified interior of uniform buoyancy ( $\blacklozenge$ ) considered by Lishman & Woods (2009) and the wind gust estimated from the average buoyancy  $b(1-h)$  of a two-layer stratification ( $\blackstar$ ).

the stratified environment’s ‘upper’ layer when, during application of the step increase in the wind strength, the interface reaches floor level and the upper layer engulfs the entire space. Hence, to answer the question posed in §1.2, the minimal increase in the wind necessary to reverse the flow through an initially stratified environment is greater than it is for an environment whose buoyancy is initially uniform. As can be seen in figure 5, for base wind strengths close to  $W_c = \sqrt[3]{27/4V}$ , the critical increase  $\Delta W_*$  for a two-layer stratification is approximately twice as large as it is for an interior of uniform buoyancy. At larger base wind strengths  $W \gg W_c$  a stratified interior can withstand changes in the wind that are an order of magnitude larger than those that can be withstood by an interior of uniform buoyancy.

We have demonstrated that states of uniform buoyancy satisfying equation (7) are less robust to changes in the wind than states consisting of a two-layer stratification satisfying equation (4). As explained in §1.2, given that the average buoyancy of the two-layer stratification is less than the uniform buoyancy satisfying equation (7), we expect estimations of the system’s robustness based on its average buoyancy  $b(1-h)$  to be conservative. To make the matter precise, it is instructive to trace a line on which  $b(1-h)$  remains unchanged from the initial condition  $\Delta$ , as show in figure 4. As deduced in §1.2 the resulting line intersects the line  $h = 0$  at  $\blackstar$ , which lies to the left of the fixed point  $\blacklozenge$  satisfying (7). Indeed, during flow reversal an environment of uniform buoyancy must pass through the state corresponding to the average buoyancy of the two-layer stratification. Hence, conclusions about the robustness of stratified environments based on their average buoyancy are conservative and provide a lower bound on the strength of the minimal destabilising increase in the wind, as shown in figure 5.

Changing the opening parameter  $V$  affects neither the qualitative aspects of our results concerning the system’s robustness nor our comparisons with interiors of uniform

buoyancy. As shown in figure 5, and consistent with intuition, large values of the opening parameter, corresponding to openings with relatively large area, make the stratified interior more susceptible to flow reversal, whilst small values make it more robust. Interestingly, the enhanced robustness afforded by a reduction in  $V$  entails a reduction in the height of the interface of a two-layer stratification.

### 3 Discussion and conclusions

The transient response of a stratified interior to sudden changes in the strength of the wind plays a significant role in determining the system's robustness. The heating that occurs during the time it takes a wind gust to homogenise a stratification makes existing stability estimations based exclusively on the space's average buoyancy conservative, especially in the case of large opposing wind strengths.

Amongst internal stratified environments, a two-layer stratification is the most robust to changes in the wind because it minimises the buoyancy that is lost at low level during flow reversal. Although our study was limited to an environment generated by point sources of buoyancy (i.e. axisymmetric plumes), a two-layer stratification is produced by a variety of other convective flows such as planar plumes and multiple point sources of buoyancy of equal strength. Each will influence the system's robustness in a different way, depending on the entrainment characteristics of the convective flow, which determine the buoyancy of the upper layer. Our results suggest that splitting a single point source of buoyancy between multiple point sources of equal strength, whose effect is to reduce the opening parameter  $V$ , enhances the system's robustness.

Further considerations are required to quantify the robustness of a given state more precisely. For example, the models that we have used assume that fluid entering the upper layer mixes with the surrounding fluid instantaneously. If relatively cool, dense air descended through the space without mixing significantly with the upper layer, the interface would not be lowered and the critical wind gust might be even larger than our predictions suggest. It should also be noted that our results assume that the low-level openings in the space are of infinitesimal vertical extent. Openings of finite vertical extent place a restriction on the depth to which the interface of a two-layer stratification can descend, and are therefore expected to erode the system's robustness against flow reversal. Such a restriction places a limit on the enhanced robustness associated with a reduction in the opening parameter  $V$  or, equivalently, multiple sources of buoyancy, which would necessarily be accompanied by a lowering of the interface depth.

### 4 Acknowledgements

J.C. gratefully acknowledges an Imperial College Junior Research Fellowship.

### References

- COOMARASWAMY, I. & CAULFIELD, C. 2011 Time-dependent ventilation flows driven by opposing wind and buoyancy. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* pp. 1–28.
- HUNT, G. R. & LINDEN, P. F. 2005 Displacement and mixing ventilation driven by opposing wind and buoyancy. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **527**, 27–55.



- KAYE, N. B. & HUNT, G. R. 2004 Time-dependent flows in an emptying filling box. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **520**, 135–156.
- LINDEN, P. F. 1999 The fluid mechanics of natural ventilation. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* **31** (1), 201–238.
- LINDEN, P. F., LANE-SERFF, G. F. & SMEED, D. A. 1990 Emptying filling boxes: the fluid mechanics of natural ventilation. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **212**, 309–335.
- LISHMAN, B. & WOODS, A. W. 2009 On transitions in natural ventilation flow driven by changes in the wind. *Building and Environment* **44** (4), 666–673.
- YUAN, J. & GLICKSMAN, L. R. 2008 Multiple steady states in combined buoyancy and wind driven natural ventilation: The conditions for multiple solutions and the critical point for initial conditions. *Building and Environment* **43** (1), 62–69.