Influence of evaporative cooling by urban forests on cooling demand in cities

Moss, J. L., Doick, K. J., Smith, S. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5053-4639 and Shahrestani, M. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8741-0912 (2019) Influence of evaporative cooling by urban forests on cooling demand in cities. Urban Forestry and Urban Greening, 37. pp. 65-73. ISSN 1618-8667 doi: 10.1016/j.ufug.2018.07.023 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/74637/

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

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2018.07.023

Publisher: Elsevier

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1
2
3

4 **Influence of evaporative cooling by urban forests**

5 **on cooling demand in cities**

6

7 Joseph L. Moss[1], Kieron J. Doick[1], Stefan Smith[2], Mehdi Shahrestani[2]

8

9 [1] Urban Forest Research Group
10 Centre for Sustainable Forestry and Climate Change
11 Forest Research, Farnham
12 Surrey, GU10 4LH, UK
13 Tel: +44(0)300 067 5601

14 [2] School of the Built Environment
15 University of Reading
16 Whiteknights, Reading RG6 6AH

Influence of evaporative cooling by urban forests

on cooling demand in cities

8   **Abstract**

9   Trees provide important ecosystem services to urban human society. Their absence can lead to more

10 pronounced environmental and social consequences, for example the urban heat island effect.

11 Evapotranspiration (E_t) from trees reduces air temperature in the urban microclimate by converting

12 sensible heat to latent heat. Quantification and valuation of the ecosystem services provided by urban

13 trees is important for improving cost-benefit evaluations in support of protecting tree planting and

14 maintenance budgets and, thus, for building climate change resilience into cities. Inclusion of E_t cooling

15 could improve ecosystem service valuation models by producing a more complete picture of the

16 benefits that urban trees provide to society.

17

18 This study explores two approaches for evaluating climate regulation as an ecosystem service of urban

19 trees. Firstly, an enthalpy-based approach was adopted to valuate latent heat of evaporation from tree

20 transpiration (in three case study urban forests) by equating it to an equivalent service from an active

21 direct evaporative cooling system. Secondly, energy savings to air-conditioned buildings was modelled

22 using TRNSYS and TRNFLOW simulation programs with and without air precooled and humidified by

23 urban trees.

24

25 Trees are shown to provide substantial urban cooling with an annual valuation of £84 m estimated using

26 the enthalpy-based approach, or ranging from £2.1 m to £22 m using TRNSYS and TRNFLOW dynamic

27 simulation programs; both for inner London case study. The latter savings arose from a modelled 1.28 –

28 13.4% reduction in air-conditioning unit energy consumption. Challenges around assumptions of

29 homogeneity in both built form and urban forest canopy effects are discussed.

30

31 The case study examples highlighted differences in E_t cooling between tree species, with *Castanea*

32 *sativa*, *Prunus avium*, *Quercus petraea*, *Platanus hybrida* and *Fagus sylvatica* typically providing more E_t

33 cooling than any of the other tree species commonly found in urban forests. The research highlighted a

34 shortage of published E_t data, particularly for urban environments.

35

36 **Key Words:**

37 Ecosystem services; Evapotranspiration; Urban cooling; Heat comfort; Bowen ratio.

2

Introduction

Trees provide many benefits to people (Davies et al., 2017) and these have been collectively termed as ecosystem services (ES) (Reid *et al.*, 2005). Urban environments typically have considerably fewer trees than rural environments, meaning that urban populations may have less access to the ES that trees provide. In dense urban environments these ES can be of significant importance, for example helping to mitigate the urban heat island (UHI) effect. This effect occurs where built-up areas absorb more heat energy than surrounding rural environments and together with the high density energy fluxes from human activity lead to pronounced increases in ambient surface and air temperature (Arnfield, 2003). UHIs contribute to human heat stress and the plethora of associated health problems: for example, Health Protection Agency (2012) reported that heat-related mortality already accounted for 2,000 premature deaths in the UK and forecast this to increase to around 10,800 premature deaths by 2080. Mora et al. (2017) reviewing the international literature from 1980 to 2014 found 783 cases of heat-related excess human mortality from 164 cities in 36 countries.

There is a positive correlation between locations that suffer from UHI and those that lack evapotranspiring surfaces (Ca *et al.*, 1998; Leuzinger et al., 2010) and the inclusion of green infrastructure in urban environments has been identified as an effective way to mitigate UHI through evapotranspiration (E_t) (Gill *et al.*, 2008; Ballinasa and Barradasa, 2015; Saaroni, *et al.*, 2018). E_t associated with trees results in the release of water vapour from leaves into the air (Kozlowski and Pallardy, 1997) that reduces the surrounding ambient air temperature through an evaporative cooling process (Akbari, 2002). Trees and vegetation growing on or in close proximity to buildings also provide multiple other benefits (Davies *et al.*, 2017), including supporting biodiversity and reducing air pollutant loading (Varghese *et al.*, 2015). However, while urban forests (herein defined as "all the trees in the urban realm" Davies *et al.*, 2017) in temperate climates can produce a net cooling benefit by E_t, not all trees offer the same level of cooling: canopy size and leaf amount are important determinants of species and cultivar differences in water use (Stratópoulos *et al.*, 2018), trees with high leaf area and transpiration rate are the most effective in reducing air temperatures (Gillner *et al.*, 2015; Rahman *et al.*, 2018) and urban forests vary in their size and species and age-class composition (UFWAC, 2016).

Under a changing climate, cooling loads in buildings are expected to increase in the future (Jenkins *et al.*, 2008). Mechanical cooling requirements can exacerbate the UHI effect by heat ejection to the surrounding environment, adding to cooling loads across a city (Masson *et al.*, 2014). Energy demand for

3

70 cooling services can be reduced by the presence of urban trees through both shade casting (so called: shade-effect trees) and E_t cooling (so called: climate-effect trees) (Akbari et al., 2001). Noting that peak urban electric demand rose by 2-4% for each 1°C rise in daily maximum temperature, Akbari (2002) reported potential cost savings of up to $200 per tree. However, the effect of E_t was not considered and the level of benefit varied by climate region. Reviewing the literature, Doick et al. (2013) reported that in temperate climates the role of shading and evapotranspiration are approximately equal. This study is concerned with the E_t cooling of urban trees.

78 i-Tree Eco is a tool within the i-Tree suite of peer-reviewed software tools (i-Tree, 2017). It is based on the UFORE (Urban Forest Effects) methods (Nowak and Crane, 1998) and has been developed to support urban forest management through the quantification of urban forest characteristics, and analysis and valuation of the ES that they provide (i-Tree, 2017). Climate regulation from E_t cooling is an ES not currently included in i-Tree Eco. However, the UFORE method has the capability to model leaf area at the species level and total canopy surface area for a given location (Nowak and Crane, 2003). Latent heat transfer across an urban forest could be calculated if appropriate E_t rates were considered. Indeed, E_t cooling is likely to be substantial on a city-wide scale (Gillner et al., 2015) given maximum transpiration rates for individual trees can be many hundreds of litres per day (Hsieh et al., 2018; Stratópoulos et al., 2018).

89 The quantification and valuation of ES is of growing international interest within a context of natural capital accounting (NCA) (UN et al., 2012). Indeed, the UK government is interested in developing accounts for a broad range of UKNEA habitats including woodland and urban (Defra/ONS, 2017). A scoping study to develop an urban NCA for the UK incorporated inter alia the climate regulation ES, with valuation based upon both the ISO standard 7243 estimates of productivity loss at different outdoor temperatures and an i-Tree Eco based estimation of building energy use avoided due to the presence of urban trees (Eftec, 2017). The former determines the loss in productivity with and without air temperature reduction by urban green infrastructure to value the contribution of this ES in terms of maintaining productivity and notes methodological limitations of an assumed average cooling effect of parks and woodland. The latter considers the impact of tree shade and shelter on summer cooling energy (avoided use of air conditioning) as well as winter warming (reduced requirement for electrical warming). This approach is limited however by the lack of adaptation of the i-Tree module for UK building types. Both approaches excluded the saving related to the non-emission of CO_2. Indeed, a

225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280

102 comprehensive valuation of this ES is complicated by the multiple ways that trees impact urban

103 temperatures and, thus, the numerous savings mechanisms that could be considered.

104

105 This study aimed to evaluate the impact of urban trees on 1) mechanical cooling loads in buildings, and

106 2) energy cost savings associated with cooling ambient air by mechanical means. Energy saving was

107 evaluated through a) direct comparison of E_t to evaporative cooling using an enthalpy-based approach

108 to valuate latent heat of evaporation from tree transpiration, and b) by incorporation of E_t into

109 established dynamic building thermal and air flow modelling programs - TRNSYS and TRNFLOW.

110 Valuation of the climate regulation ES could provide a useful complement to tools, such as i-Tree, that

111 show the wide range of benefits of urban trees, as well as emergent NCA methodologies.

112

113 **Methodology**

114 *Evapotranspiration rate of trees*

115 Values for E_t and stomatal conductance (g_s) were gathered from published literature for tree species

116 relevant to urban environments within a temperate oceanic climate: namely 'Cfb' from the Koppen-

117 Geiger Climate Classification (Kottek *et al.*, 2006) and 'Do' from the Köppen-Trewartha Climate

118 Classification (Belda *et al.*, 2014). Where only g_s data was available, E_t rate (E_tR) was calculated using

119 Fick's law of diffusion, after Rahman *et al.* (2011), and converted to units of $g/m^2/s$. Table 1 presents the

120 minimum, mean and maximum E_t for the range of species and cultivars used in this study.

121

122 [Insert table 1: Evapotranspiration rates for tree species, sourced from the published literature.]

123

124 Analysis of E_tR was conducted to consider the range of values reported in the literature. Stomatal

125 conductance, and therefore E_tR, has high temporal (especially daily) and spatial variability, affected by

126 factors such as water vapour pressure deficit, soil moisture, plant health, position orientation and age of

127 leaves (or needles) (Breuer *et al.*, 2003). To account for such variations as far as reasonably possible

128 minimum, mean and maximum values from the literature were considered in this study. Figure 1 shows

129 the mean E_tR for eight tree species and three genera where multiple records are reported; minimum

130 and maximums are shown as vertical bars. Single E_tR values for the other 17 tree species and one genus

131 listed in Table 1 are also shown. The average E_tR across all records was 0.058 +/- 0.012 $g/m^2/s$ (95%

132 confidence interval; solid and dashed blue horizontal bars, respectively, in Figure 1). Three of the genus

133 values and twelve of the tree species E_tR (minimum, mean or maximum) values fell within the 95%

134 confidence intervals of the all-data average. E_tR has a linear relationship to the amount of cooling

281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336

135   provided; therefore the range of E_tR for each of the species is indicative of the uncertainty associated

136   with the cooling results.

137

138

139   Figure 1. Mean evapotranspiration rates (E_tR; black diamonds) for all of the tree species considered; sourced from

140   the published literature. Minimum and maximum E_tR are shown by vertical bars. For genera with multiple values in

141   the literature, the genus average and range are shown. The mean of all the species and genera E_tR and the 95%

142   confidence interval of this mean are presented (solid horizontal line, upper and lower intervals as dash horizontal

143   lines).

144

145   *Evapotranspiration from an urban forest*

146   Three case studies were considered, each having a completed i-Tree Eco survey: Edinburgh (Hutchings *et*

147   *al.*, 2012), Greater London (Rogers *et al.*, 2015), and Wrexham (Rumble *et al.*, 2015). For Greater

148   London, the Outer and Inner London figures as detailed in the study are used. The species composition

149 and total leaf area values, as reported by i-Tree Eco, were used in conjunction with Table 1 E_tR values to

150 provide a total E_t for each case study urban forest. Total E_t was determined using the species mean E_tR

151 where possible; where a species mean was not available, the genus average E_tR was adopted. Where

152 neither species nor genus data were available, the all-data mean E_tR was used (Table 1). E_t was

153 normalised across the case studies according to land surface area (E_t/km^2; assuming an even distribution

154 of trees).

155

156 The rate of water mass transfer, $\dot{m}$ (g/m²/s), for E_t was converted into rate of thermal energy absorbed,

157 $\dot{q}$ (kJ/m²/s), from the surrounding environment using Eq. 1:

158

159 $$\dot{q} = \dot{m} \times \lambda_{vH_2O} \tag{1}$$

160

161 Where λ_{vH_2O} is the latent heat of vapourisation of water ($\lambda_{vH_2O} = $ 2.456 kJ/g at 292 K and atmospheric

162 pressure; Wagner and Pruss, 2002). Calculating energy transfer rate allowed E_t to be related to cooling

163 as a measure of power (i.e. E_t power). For modelling purposes, it was assumed that tree leaves had zero

164 heat capacity (Ca $et\ al.$, 1999).

165

166 The distribution of heat from E_t cooling can be generally characterised by the Bowen ratio (B)

167 (Santamouris, 2013). Guided by Taha (1997), the Bowen ratios of 'typical' UK urban and wooded areas

168 were used to apply an adjustment factor of 0.5.(B_{tree}+1/B_{urban}+1) to calculated E_t energy values. This

169 generalised adjustment factor does not consider local spatial factors, but provides an estimate for the

170 amount of energy that equates to cooling, i.e. the effective E_t cooling potential.

171

172 A common method of assigning a monetary value to ES is to use a comparative service as an economic

173 benchmark (Defra/ONS, 2017). Following the methodology of Rahman $et\ al.$ (2011), an economic

174 assessment of E_t cooling from trees was made through direct comparison with the cost to provide

175 equivalent cooling from operating an air conditioning (A/C) unit. An active direct evaporative cooling

176 system (DEC) was used for comparison because the cooling mechanism is the same as E_t from trees

177 (Amer $et\ al.$, 2015). A mid-sized evaporative cooler was selected (model ECP07, EcoCooling Ltd,

178 www.ecocooling.org). This model provides 35 kW of cooling from 1.5 kW of electricity and a flow rate

179 range 10-14.5 m³/hr. The B-adjusted E_t cooling power of the trees was divided by the rated cooling

180 capacity of the evaporative cooler (35 kW) to give the number of A/C units required to deliver an

181 equivalent amount of cooling as the three case study urban forests. This value was then multiplied by

182 electricity consumption of the cooler (1.5 kW) and an electricity unit price of 0.14 £/kWh (UK average

183 electricity variable unit 'Direct Debit' and 'Prepayment' tariffs for 2017; BEIS, 2018) to provide an

184 equivalent cooling value (£/hr). The comparison is made with the operational cost of A/C units and does

185 not include purchasing or maintenance costs.

186

187 *The potential energy impact of evapotranspiration on building cooling systems*

188 The direct comparison method described above is limited conceptually as A/C units are not designed for

189 outdoor use. However, the results provide useful comparison to previous work. A more realistic, though

190 novel, approach is to recognise that trees are cooling the outdoor ambient air, which in turn impacts the

191 cooling load placed on A/C systems. Through building energy modelling the energy dynamics and local

192 spatial factors of different types of building structures found in UK cities were used to assess the impact

193 of E_t cooling by urban trees on building energy consumption. This approach provided a practical scenario

194 that is transferable to building energy cost savings.

195

196 *Modelling energy impact on a single building and a street canyon*

197 To evaluate how trees cooling the surrounding environment impacts on a building's cooling requirement

198 a dynamic thermal energy model: TRaNsient SYstems Simulation package (TRNSYS) (TRNSYS, 2010) with

199 airflow analysis by TRNFLOW (TRNFLOW, 2009), was employed to capture both the indoor and outdoor

200 processes. TRNSYS is a reference software and one of the listed simulation programs in the

201 European/British Standard on thermal solar systems and components: BS/EN12977 (2018). TRNSYS is a

202 recognised simulation package within the 'Best Directory of Building Energy Software Tools' (formerly

203 hosted by US Dept. of Energy) and has been tested and validated by International Energy Agency (IEA;

204 under Task 34/43). The IEA comprehensive study demonstrated the robustness of the algorithms used in

205 the TRNSYS (Loutzenhiser et al., 2007; Neymark et al., 2008). In addition, the software has been

206 successfully used over multiple decades in a broad range of built environment research (Bradley and

207 Utzinger, 2007; Shahrestani et al., 2013; Shahrestani et al., 2017; Antoniadis and Martinopoulos, 2018;

208 Stritih et al., 2018).

209

210 While, ultimately, the cooling load of a building is determined by the many different physical attributes

211 of the indoor and outdoor environment (i.e. solar gains, humidity, surface temperatures, air

212 temperature, wind speed, heat capacity and orientation), the indoor air conditions control the level of

213 cooling demand and the outdoor air temperature influences the energy requirement to meet that

8

214 cooling demand. For this reason, the modelling was broken into two conceptual parts: (i) E_t influence on

215 outdoor air temperature, and (ii) a simplified representation of a building to understand cooling demand

216 at a given cooling set-point temperature, as the energy needs for cooling are also impacted by relative

217 humidity (RH).

218

219 For this element of the research, Inner London was adopted as the case study area. Using the i-Tree Eco

220 published leaf area density and the average E_tR for the urban forest composition of Inner London it was

221 possible to determine the change in absolute humidity of the volume of air surrounding a building (or in

222 a street canyon, see below) at a given moment in time. Modelling the E_t effect of trees as an evaporative

223 cooling process with constant enthalpy, a psychrometric chart (Supplemental Figure 1) was used to

224 determine a temperature drop in the air surrounding the trees, assuming that the entire E_t was used in

225 cooling the air, and that effects remained local to the tree and buildings (i.e. no boundary layer mixing).

226 The minimum, mean and maximum E_tR (Table 1) were applied to the leaf area density of Inner London

227 (from Table 2) and scaled to a modelled building area (Figure 2). This scaled E_tR was used to calculate a

228 temperature drop in a volume of air immediately surrounding the simplified representations of a

229 building, and these representations were assumed to be homogenously representative of Inner London

230 when scaling the energy efficiencies for valuation purposes.

231

232 Two zonal models were developed using TRNSYS: (i) a single zone building in isolation, and (ii) a street

233 canyon consisting of two single zone building blocks in parallel (Figure 2). In each, shade-casting by trees

234 onto the buildings is not considered by the model; in the latter case, mutual shading of buildings is

235 modelled. Each considered the influence of regional weather conditions (larger scale weather systems)

236 on cooling as well as capturing some of the mixing processes of buoyancy and forced flow direction of

237 air. A weather file representative of conditions of London (after: Levermore and Parkinson, 2006),

238 determined the boundary conditions of the model at each time step. The single zone isolated building

239 was 10m x 10m x 20m (h;w;l) and situated centrally in a total volume of 20m x 30m x 20m (h;w;l). For

240 the street canyon, each building block was 18m x 20m x 100m (h;w;l) in a total volume of 36m x 80m x

241 100m (h;w;l). Simulations ran at 1 hr time steps from January 1st to December 31st.

242

243 The cooling season was taken as June 1st to September 30th - the warmest of the British summer

244 months. A constant E_t was applied for the single building case and for the street canyon a fixed daily

245 profile of E_t was applied following a simple polynomial curve based on work by Gerosa *et al*. (2012) to

9

246 account for hourly changes in canopy transpiration. A 4th order polynomial was applied (Equation 2).

247 Building cooling was considered to be available 24 hr a day with the cooling limited to a temperature

248 set-point of 23˚C and a RH set-point of 50%, or 60%. A constant system Coefficient of Performance (CoP)

249 of 2.0 was applied, as was the electricity unit price (0.14 £/kWh; BEIS, 2018).

250

251

252
$$E_t = \begin{cases} (0.00022\ (t-13)^4 - 0.03\ (t-13)^2 + 1) \times E_{t\,max} & 6 \le t < 21 \\ 0 & t < 6\ \ or\ \ t \ge 21 \end{cases}$$
(2)

253 where E_{tmax} is the maximum E_t for the day and t is time, in 24 hr clock system.

254

255 Each building block had the same schedule of operation, set point cooling temperature, occupant

256 density and internal heat gains (see Supplemental Material: Table S1).

257

(a)   **(b)**

258

259 Figure 2. Model dimensions for representing (a) single, isolated building, and (b) a street canyon and
260 row of buildings with each row considered as a single open plan zone. The surrounding volume (black
261 dashed line) determined the area for calculating availability of E_t. Air flow from wind and buoyancy
262 effects was considered by splitting the surrounding volume into equally sized sub-volumes, as depicted
263 by the blacked dotted line. Each cuboid represents a different microclimate surrounding the building
264 cuboid (solid black lines).

265

266 Ambient conditions are not only important to determining the loads under which a cooling system

267 operates, but are also important for determining the influence of air infiltration and ventilation rates on

268 cooling demands. For this study, the building ventilation was considered to be 100% mechanically driven

269 in order to ascertain the level of cooling load offset provided by trees. Infiltration, however, is

270 dependent on the pressure coefficients (C_p) on the surface of a building – important to airflow network

271 programs (Cóstola *et al.*, 2009). Whilst there is recognised uncertainty in use of standard C_p values, for a

272 first approximation the values provided by (Grosso, 1992) using the CpCalc+ calculation program were

273 applied to provide representative values of a building over 3 storeys in height. C_p values applied in the

274 two models are shown as Supplemental Material (Table S2).

275

276 Results

277 *Case study areas*

278 Urban forest composition was similar across each case study area and for many of the genera E_tR values

279 were available from the literature (Table 1). The most important species for providing E_t cooling were

280 also similar across the case studies, with at least two of *Castanea sativa*, *Prunus avium* or *Platanus*

281 *hybrida* featuring in the top three (Table 2). Edinburgh had the second highest number of trees per km^2,

282 but the lowest normalised leaf area (Table 3). Outer London had fewer trees/km^2 but 27% more leaf

283 area than Edinburgh, suggesting that Outer London's trees have larger canopies or species with larger

284 leaves. Inner London's trees evapotranspired the most: on average 26.5 kg H_2O/tree/hr (Table 3). Total

285 transpiration varied from 1,420 kg H_2O/s in Wrexham to 44,900 kg H_2O/s in Outer London (Table 3).

286 When normalised by leaf area or case study area E_t ranged 47.4-54.1 kg H_2O/s/km^2 (by leaf area, Table

287 3) or 30.4-37.7 kg H_2O/s/km^2 (by land area, data not shown).

288

289 [insert Table 2. The three most common tree species and most important species for delivering E_t

290 cooling in each of the case study urban forests]

291 [insert Table 3. Evapotranspiration across the case study urban forests]

292

293 Table 4 presents results for E_t cooling for each of the case study urban forests. Adjusted total E_t cooling

294 energy (*q*) is presented along with the equivalent number of A/C units required to provide the same

295 amount of cooling, value of cooling and the 95% confidence interval. Outer London with the largest

296 urban forest and corresponding leaf-area (Table 3) produced the greatest total amount of cooling at

297 55,200 MW (Table 4) or £321 m/annum in A/C unit equivalents (assuming cooling 8 hr/day, June

298 through Sept; £83.9 m/annum for Inner London). When normalised 'per tree' the range in the average

299 values of cooling was 4.8 kW/tree (Wrexham) to 9.1 kW/tree (Inner London); equivalent to 0.03 to 0.05

300 (+/-0.01) £/hr/tree across the three urban forests (Table 4). The power ratings on a per tree basis are

301 comparable to those reported by Rahman et al. (2011) who reported 1.4, 3 and 7 kW/tree for *Pyrus*

302 *calleryana* in August growing in Amsterdam soil, grass verge or pavement, respectively.

303

304 [insert Table 4. Summary of the estimated value of the effective cooling from each urban forest case

305 study]

306

307 *Urban building energy savings* - Single building model

308 On average, the level of reduction in cooling resulting from current levels of tree provision in Inner

309 London ranged between 0.6 and 0.9% depending on indoor RH control levels (Table 5). Day *et al.* (2009)

310 estimated that London accounted for 11% of Britain's total cooling load. Assuming that this almost

311 exclusively applies to Inner London (i.e. 9 of the 11%), and taking the official government figures on total

312 cooling load for the UK in 2016 to be 13,037 GWh (BEIS, 2017), then the trees in Inner London provide a

313 cooling benefit of 7.0 – 10.6 GWh. Taking a midpoint of 8.8 GWh and a unit price of £0.14/kWh, the

314 saving equates to £1.23 million per year under the current assumptions.

315 [inset Table 5: Total cooling supplied to single building with and without tree E_t cooling applied and for

316 different RH control set points]

317

318 *Urban building energy savings* - Street canyon building model

319 The cooling energy provided by Inner London trees at the three rates of E_t (minimum, mean, maximum)

320 are presented in Table 6. In the case of sensible cooling loads, trees in Inner London produced between

321 1.28% and 13.4% energy saving when RH of the building indoor environment was not controlled for.

322 However, the latent cooling load increased in all instances as a result of the increased moisture from the

323 E_t of trees. Accounting for both sensible and latent cooling loads, the presence of trees would cause an

324 increase of between 0.09 - 1.15% when controlling indoor environments to 23°C at 50% RH, but would

325 result in a decrease in cooling load of between 0.9% and 3.09% for an indoor RH of 60%. Cooling systems

326 rarely (if at all) operate to tightly control indoor RH and as such the latent energy component of a

327 building cooling system is likely to be much lower than shown here. Looking, therefore, at the effect on

328 sensible cooling alone, a reduction of 1.28 - 13.4% in cooling demand for a typical summer could be

329 associated with the presence of trees in Inner London when considering the full 95% confidence interval

330 of species E_t rates. This equates to an annual cost saving of between £2.1 million to £22.0 million for a

331 typical cooling season in Inner London (assuming that the savings in energy usage are applicable pan-

332 Inner London and that 9% of the 13,037 GWh (BEIS, 2017) total cooling load for the UK applies to Inner

333 London, as above).

12

334   [insert Table 6. Cooling energy demand and saving potential from trees for a range of E_t for the street

335   canyon model scenario and with separation of sensible and latent cooling loads]

336

337   **Discussion**

338   *Evapotranspiration Data*

339   Review of the available literature revealed that E_tR is significantly influenced by the characteristics of

340   plants and weather conditions (Heath, 1998; Atkinson *et al.*, 2004). In this study, therefore, E_t data were

341   only used from studies in regions with similar climate to the UK. Of the 25 species for which E_t data were

342   available, ten were not present in any of the case study's urban forests (Table 1); data for these

343   subsequently featured in the genus average values. The influence of sunlight, temperature, humidity,

344   water availability, and wind speed on E_t means that even within a single species, variation within a city

345   due to microclimatic effects should be expected. Kruijt *et al.* (2008) and Bernacchi *et al.* (2011) have

346   shown the impact of air quality (CO_2 and O_3 concentrations) on the rate of E_t; and Heath (1998) showed

347   daily variation in g_s due to meteorological conditions. In this study, the variation of these influencing

348   factors was accounted for through the use of minimum, mean and maximum E_t, only. One limitation of

349   the study, therefore, is uncertainty due to changes in E_t under prolonged drought-stress conditions. Gill

350   *et al.* (2013) note: increased length and frequency of summer droughts is likely to decrease the cooling

351   potential of E_t, when it is most needed. Furthermore, E_tR values were not available at the species-level

352   for ca. 90% of the three urban forests (data not shown). However, applying the range of E_tR values

353   allowed estimation of a range of E_t cooling provided and further insight to the benefit of trees in urban

354   settings that may otherwise go unrecognised yet is useful in urban planning and urban forestry

355   management policy creation.

356

357   *Evapotranspiration from an urban forest*

358   The two defining parameters of E_t in this study are E_tR and leaf area. Species, genus and overall-average

359   E_tR were assumed not to differ between the three case studies. The validity of this assumption should be

360   tested further to check the applicability of the approach to cities across UK, Europe and areas of similar

361   climate; however it was considered appropriate for this study due to the use of minimum, mean and

362   maximum published values. Given this assumption, leaf area was the main parameter determining total

363   E_t and hence cooling. An urban forest with more healthy mature and large stature trees will typically

364   have a larger leaf area and, therefore, offer greater cooling potential. The case for more large stature

365   trees in the urban environment is frequently made (e.g., UFWACN, 2015) on intuitive (a larger canopy *de*

13

366   *facto* casts more shade) as well as scientific argument (Rahman, *et al.*, 2018; Smithers, *et al.*, 2018, for

367   example). Our results support such claims: by virtue of their greater cumulative leaf areas larger

368   canopied trees provided more of the climate regulation ES. Table 1 illustrates, however, that small

369   stature trees including: *Crataegus laevigata*, *Prunus 'Umineko'*, *Pyrus calleryana* and *Sorbus arnoldiana*

370   have average E_t rates that suggest they can be significant contributors to latent heat transfer (E_t >0.075

371     $g/m^2/s$). Their size means that these species can be suited to a range of planting locations, for example

372   where there is insufficient room for a tree of large stature. Stratópoulos et al. (2018) showed that some

373   small to medium stature trees, including *Acer campestre* and *Ostrya carpinifolia*, showed higher

374   flexibility in response to changing weather with increased growth and transpiration under favourable

375   conditions and more conservative water use when dry. Their inclusion in the urban forest may thus

376   support efforts to build resilience to a changing climate through species diversification, however

377   widespread use may reduce delivery of evapotranspirational cooling due to the regulated water use of

378   these species.

379

380   *Building energy efficiency*

381   The results showed that E_t from the trees in Inner London is likely to provide significant energy savings

382   due to the already high and increasing cooling energy demand. Even a reduction as small as 1% equated

383   to a substantial financial benefit - £1.64 m - yet the study revealed that evaporative cooling may

384   contribute a saving of up to a 13.4% reduction in energy consumption for sensible heat cooling. At the

385   same time, moisture content in the microclimate is increased and this may increase the demand for

386   latent cooling in buildings, which highly depends on the approach of humidity control in the indoor

387   environment. For instance, under a very tight control of RH to 50%, E_t may lead to an increase to total

388   cooling demand by up to 1.15%. But this is without consideration of other cooling mechanisms

389   associated with trees (shading and short-wave energy reflection; Smithers et al., 2018). Furthermore, it

390   is highly atypical for cooling systems to operate under tight humidity control, especially in the UK. Under

391   the more realistic RH control mechanisms and set-point of 60%, the modelling showed that E_t from trees

392   contributed an annual energy consumption saving across Inner London of up to 3.1% (when considering

393   sensible and latent cooling together), equivalent to £5.09 m. If energy savings due to the shade-effect

394   was also valued, the climate regulation ES valuation is likely to be even greater (Akbari et al., 2001;

395   Akbari, 2002; Hsieh et al., 2018).

396

397   In using a combination of published E_t rates, tree population survey data and a first order modelling

398   estimate of impact on cooling load, certain limitations in the estimates must be recognised. The results

399   demonstrate value can be attributed to tree cooling, however the assumptions of homogeneity in both

400   built form and urban forest canopy effects are limiting factors. The figures should be considered as

401   estimates on order of magnitude. The mixing of air in the urban canopy layer and impact of building

402   height on availability of tree cooling needs further consideration to demonstrate the impact of trees on

403   cooling energy demand. Addressing some of the assumptions in this work could lead to a reduction in

404   this estimated potential saving. Consideration of specific microclimatic effects – such as increased

405   localised air temperatures leading to increased vapour pressure deficit and thus increased E_t (Peters et

406   al., 2010) – could also, however, demonstrate increased cooling load offsets. Turbulence and mixing of

407   air in the canopy layer immediately around a building have in part been accounted for by use of a zonal

408   model that captured some of the mixing processes of buoyancy and forced flow direction of air. To

409   represent the diffusion of cooling to the wider urban boundary layer and to take account of local (urban

410   canyon) temperature variations (Grimmond, 2007) a more sophisticated modelling approach may be

411   warranted. Furthermore, the study has not considered the influence that vegetative and built surface

412   fractions can have on energy fluxes (Lorridon and Grimmond, 2012). Selection of different sites could

413   lead to more representative values of overall city energy fluxes (Ward et. al., 2014).

414

415   *Improving the valuation of urban tree ecosystem service provision*

416   i-Tree Eco has been developed to help assess and manage urban tree populations for the benefits they

417   can provide (i-Tree, 2017). To this end, a primary function of the tool is to quantify and monetarise

418   environmental functions of the urban forest. The economic case for urban trees is stronger where a

419   more comprehensive range of the benefits are valued. The current i-Tree Eco (version 6) provides *inter*

420   *alia* an estimate of building energy use avoided based upon shade provision (summer time) and shelter

421   provision (winter time) that result in decreases in electricity and gas consumption for cooling and

422   heating, respectively. However the valuation is not fit-for-purpose internationally, where the model has

423   not been parameterised for different construction materials. The first of our two modelling approaches

424   is consistent with the i-Tree Eco approach with its calculation of leaf area according to urban forest

425   (species) composition and deferring to genus data where species specific values are not available.

426   However, as this approach is not a direct analogue of an anthropogenic service equivalent it's suitability

427   in natural capital accounting type situations should be further tested (Defra/ONS, 2017).

428

15

429 Comparisons to A/C units is limited since they are intended to cool air in enclosed buildings, not open air

430 environments. However, they are useful conceptually to provide a comparative monetary value for the

431 cooling service. The value produced here for the E_t cooling potential of Inner London was £84 m/annum.

432 In comparison, the building energy modelling provided a cost saving, directly attributable to the trees, of

433 between £2.1 m and £22.0 m annually (for Inner London) based upon the practical energy costs to

434 cooling indoor environments in the same situations. As such, a way to value a particular outcome of E_t

435 has been explored and shown to be significant. The sophistication of the evaluation is currently limited

436 by its consideration of one hypothetical street scene, only. Modelling street canyons of varying size

437 more representative of the heterogeneity of a large city such as London and comparison to other

438 cityscapes needs to be tested prior to its application within or alongside a tool like i-Tree.

439

440 **Conclusion**

441 Evapotranspiration rate (E_tR) data proved to be limited. New data collection on g_s and E_tR of different

442 tree species is required to improve understanding of the role of urban trees in cooling cities. Within

443 these limitations, the study showed that the range of cooling potential provides energy saving

444 associated with the sensible cooling load of buildings. The sensitivity to cooling regime (i.e. sensible

445 versus latent), simplifications in the modelling approach, and focus on E_t effects demonstrate there is

446 more to be done to understand the full impact of urban forest on building energy saving use. Such work

447 must consider varying climatic conditions if the role of climate change and microclimatic effects are to

448 be understood. Furthermore, transferability of E_t measures could be improved through the publication

449 of standard metrics of tree height, trunk diameter and canopy sizes, which were often missing from the

450 literature reviewed.

451

452 The case study results show that the amount of evapotranspirational cooling has substantial economic

453 value – in the order of 10^6 £/annum when calculated through comparison with a replacement service or

454 via direct impacting on building air-conditioning. Growing city populations, increased energy density and

455 projected climate change (IPCC, 2014) are already causing city authorities to plan the mitigation of and

456 adaptation to future heat stress. Including the assessment of E_t cooling energy into tools such as i-Tree

457 Eco could improve the effectiveness of urban tree planning and management under a changing climate.

458

459 **Acknowledgements**

460

462 **References**

463 Akbari, H., Pomerantz, M. and Taha, H. (2001). Cool surfaces and shade trees to reduce energy use and
464 improve air quality in urban areas. *Solar Energy*, 70(3), 295–310.

465 Akbari, H. (2002). Shade trees reduce building energy use and CO_2 emissions from power plants.
466 *Environmental Pollution*, 116(1), S119-S126.

467 Amer, O., Boukhanouf, R. and Ibrahim, H. G. (2015). A Review of Evaporative Cooling Technologies.
468 *Interantional Journal of Environmental Science and Development*, 6(2), 111–117.

469 Antoniadis, C. N. and Martinopoulos, G. (2018). Optimization of a building integrated solar thermal
470 system with seasonal storage using TRNSYS. *Renewable Energy, (*In Press).

471 Arnfield, A. J. (2003). Two decades of urban climate research: A review of turbulence, exchanges of
472 energy and water, and the urban heat island. *International Journal of Climatology*, 23(1), 1–26.

473 Atkinson, C. J., Hipps, N. A., Davies, M. J., Dunn, J. and Griffiths, H. (2004). Controlling Water Use of
474 Trees to Alleviate Subsidence Risk. *Horticulture LINK Project 212*. BRE, UK. Ballinasa, M., Barradasa, V.L.
475 (2015). The Urban Tree as a Tool to Mitigate the Urban Heat Island in Mexico City: A Simple
476 Phenomenological Model. Special section: The Urban Forest and Ecosystem Services. J. of Environmental
477 Quality, doi:10.2134/jeq2015.01.0056.

478 BEIS (Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy). (2018). Statistical data set: Annual
479 domestic energy bills, file: Average annual domestic electricity bills by various consumption levels (QEP
480 2.2.5). Available online at: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/annual-domestic-
481 energy-price-statistics. Accessed 24th May 2018.

482 BEIS (Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy). (2017). Energy consumption in the UK.
483 Available online from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/energy-consumption-in-the-uk Energy
484 consumption in the UK (ECUK) 2017 Data Tables: Table 1.04. Accessed 29th May 2018.

485 Belda, M., Holtanová, E., Halenka, T. and Kalvová, J. (2014). Climate classification revisited: From Köppen
486 to Trewartha. *Climate Research*, 59(1), 1–13.

487 Bernacchi, C. J., Leakey, A. D. B., Kimball, B. A. and Ort, D. R. (2011). Growth of soybean at future
488 tropospheric ozone concentrations decreases canopy evapotranspiration and soil water depletion.
489 *Environmental Pollution*, 159(6), 1464–1472.

490 Betson, M. and Scholefield, P. (2004). *Review of the Evapotranspiration of Herbaceous and Afforested
491 Duneland Ecosystems, Anglesey, Wales*. Wolverhampton, UK.

492 Bradley, D. E. and Utzinger, D. M. (2007). Enhancement and Use of Combined Simulation Tools in the
493 Assessment of Hybrid Natural/Mechanical Ventilation Systems. *ASHRAE Transactions*, 113(2) .

494 Breuer, L., Eckhardt, K. and Frede, H. G. (2003). Plant parameter values for models in temperate
495 climates. *Ecological Modelling*, 169(2-3), 237–293.

496 BS/EN12977 (2018). Thermal solar systems and components - Custom built systems. London:
497 British/European Standard.

498 Ca, V. T., Asaeda, T. and Abu, E. M. (1998). Reductions in air conditioning energy caused by a nearby
499 park. *Energy and Buildings*, 29(1), 83–92.

500 Ca, V. T., Asaeda, T. and Ashie, Y. (1999). Development of a numerical model for the evaluation of the
501 urban thermal environment. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, 81(1-3), 181–
502 196.

503 Cóstola, D., Blocken, B. and Hensen, J. L. M. (2009). Overview of pressure coefficient data in building
504 energy simulation and airflow network programs. *Building and Environment*, 44(10), 2027–2036.

505 Davies, H.J., Doick, K.J., Handley, P., O'Brien, L. and Wilson, J. (2017). *Delivery of Ecosystem Services by*
506 *Urban Forests*. Forestry Commission Research Report 26. Forestry Commission, Edinburgh, 34pp.

507 Day, A. R., Jones, P. G. and Maidment, G. G. (2009). Forecasting future cooling demand in London.
508 *Energy and Buildings*, 41 (9), 942–948.

509 Defra/ONS (2017). Principles of Natural Capital Accounting.
510 https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/methodologies/principlesofnaturalcapitalac
511 counting

512 Doick, K.J., Hutchings, T.R. (2013). Air temperature regulation by urban trees and green infrastructure.
513 Research note 12 (FCRN012). Forestry Commission, Edinburgh, 10pp.

514 Eftec (2017). A study to scope and develop urban natural capital accounts for the UK. A report for Defra.
515 (June 2017). Eftec, London. 128pp. Available online from:
516 http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=14143_UrbanNC_Account_FinalReportAugust201
517 7.pdf. Accessed: 23rd May, 2018.

518 Fini, A., Ferrini, F., Frangi, P., Amoroso, G. and Piatti, R. (2009). Withholding irrigation during the
519 establishment phase affected growth and physiology of Norway maple (Acer platanoides) and linden
520 (Tilla spp.). *Arboriculture and Urban Forestry*, 35 (5), 241–251.

521 Gerosa, G., Mereu, S., Finco, A. and Marzuoli, R. (2012). Stomatal Conductance Modeling to Estimate the
522 Evapotranspiration of Natural and Agricultural Ecosystems. Chapter 18. In: *Evapotranspiration - Remote*
523 *Sensing and Modeling*. Irmak, A. (Ed.). 403–420.

524 Gill, S. E., Handley, J. F., Ennos, A. R., Pauleit, S., Theuray, N. and Lindley, S. J. (2008). Characterising the
525 urban environment of UK cities and towns: A template for landscape planning. *Landscape and Urban*
526 *Planning*, 87(3), 210–222.

527 Gill, S. E., Rahman, M. A., Handley, J. F. and Ennos, A. R. (2013). Modelling water stress to urban amenity
528 grass in Manchester UK under climate change and its potential impacts in reducing urban cooling. *Urban*
529 *Forestry and Urban Greening*, 12(3), 350–358.

530 Gillner, S., Vogt, J., Tharang, A., Dettmann, S. and Roloff, A. (2015). Role of street trees in mitigating
531 effects of heat and drought at highly sealed urban sites. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 143, 33–42.

532 Grimmond, S. (2007). Urbanization and global environmental change: local effects of urban warming. *Geographical Journal*, 173(1), 83–88.

534 Grosso, M. (1992). Wind pressure distribution around buildings: a parametrical model. *Energy and Buildings*, 18(2), 101–131.

536 Health Protection Agency (2012). Health Effects of Climate Change in the UK 2012: Current evidence, recommendations and research gaps. Health Protection Agency, London.

538 Heath, J. (1998). Stomata of trees growing in CO_2-enriched air show reduced sensitivity to vapour pressure deficit and drought. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, 21(11), 1077–1088.

540 Hipps, N. A., Davies, M. J., Dunn, J. M., Griffiths, H. and Atkinson, C. J. (2014). Effects of two contrasting canopy manipulations on growth and water use of London plane (Platanus x acerifolia) trees. *Plant and Soil*, 382(1-2), 61–74.

543 Hsieh, C-M., Li, J-J., Zhang, L., Schwegler, B. (2018). Effects of tree shading and transpiration on building cooling energy use. Energy and Buildings, 159, 382-397.

545 Hutchings, T., Lawrence, V. and Brunt, A. (2012). Estimating the Value of Ecosystem Services Value of Edinburgh's Trees: Results of a 2011 Survey. *Forest Research*, Farnham. 45pp.

547 IPCC. (2014). Climate Change 2014 Synthesis Report. *Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, 151pp.

549 i-Tree. (2017). *What is i-Tree?* Available online: www.itreetools.org. [Accessed: 3rd July 2017].

550 Jenkins, D., Liu, Y. and Peacock, A. D. (2008). Climatic and internal factors affecting future UK office heating and cooling energy consumptions. *Energy and Buildings*, 40(5), 874–881.

552 Kottek, M., Grieser, J., Beck, C., Rudolf, B. and Rubel, F. (2006). World map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification updated. *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 15(3), 259–263.

554 Kozlowski, T. T. and Pallardy, S. G. (1997). *Physiology of Wood Plants*. Second. Academic Press.

555 Kruijt, B., Witte, J. P. M., Jacobs, C. M. J. and Kroon, T. (2008). Effects of rising atmospheric CO2 on evapotranspiration and soil moisture: A practical approach for the Netherlands. *Journal of Hydrology*, 349(3-4), 257–267.

558 Leuzinger, S., Vogt, R. and Körner, C. (2010). Tree surface temperature in an urban environment. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 150 (1), 56–62.

560 Levermore, G. J. and Parkinson, J. B. (2006). Analyses and algorithms for new Test Reference Years and Design Summer Years for the UK. *Building Services Engineering Research and Technology*, 27(4), 311–325.

563 Loridan, T. and Grimmond, C. S. B. (2012) Characterization of energy flux partitioning in urban environments: links with surface seasonal properties. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 51 (2), 219¬241.

566 Loutzenhiser, P., Manz, H. and Maxwell, G. (2007). Empirical validations of shading/daylighting/load
567 interactions in building energy simulation tools. Report for the International Energy Agency's SHC Task
568 34.

569 Masson, V., Marchadier, C., Adolphe, L., Aguejdad, R., Avner, P., Bonhomme, M., Bretagne, G., Briottet,
570 X., Bueno, B., de Munck, C., Doukari, O., Hallegatte, S., Hidalgo, J., Houet, T., Le Bras, J., Lemonsu, A.,
571 Long, N., Moine, M. P., Morel, T., Nolorgues, L., Pigeon, G., Salagnac, J. L., Viguié, V. and Zibouche, K.
572 (2014). Adapting cities to climate change: A systemic modelling approach. *Urban Climatology*, 10, 407–
573 429.

574 Mora, C., Dousset, B., Caldwell, I. R., Powell, F.E., Geronimo, R.C., Bielecki, C.R., Counsell, C.W.W,
575 Dietrich, B.S., Johnston, E.T., Louis, L.V., Lucas, M.P., McKenzie, M.M., Shea, A.G., Tseng, H.,
576 Giambelluca, T.W., Leon, L.R., Hawkins E., Trauernicht, C. (2017). Global risk of deadly heat. *Nature
577 Climate Change letters*, 7(July), 501-506. DOI: 10.1038/NCLIMATE3322

578 Neymark, J., Judkoff, R., National Renewable Energy, and International Energy, A. (2008). International
579 Energy Agency Building Energy Simulation Test and Diagnostic Method (IEA BESTEST): multi-zone non-
580 airflow in-depth diagnostic cases: MZ320 - MZ360.Nowak, D. and Crane, D. (1998). The urban forest
581 effects (UFORE) model: quantifying urban forest structure and function. *Integrated Tools Proceedings*,
582 714–720.

583 Peters, E.B., McFadden, J.P., Montgomery, R.A. (2010). Biological and environmental controls on tree
584 transpiration in a suburban landscape. *Journal of Geophysical Research, Biogeosciences*, 115:G04006.

585 Rahman, M. A., Armson, D. and Ennos, A. R. (2015). A comparison of the growth and cooling
586 effectiveness of five commonly planted urban tree species. *Urban Ecosystems*, 18, 371–389.

587 Rahman, M.A., Moser, A., Gold, A., Rötzer, T., Pauleit, S. (2018) Vertical air temperature gradients under
588 the shade of two contrasting urban tree species during different types of summer days. *Science of the
589 Total Environment*, 633, 100–111.

590 Rahman, M. A., Smith, J. G., Stringer, P. and Ennos, A. R. (2011). Effect of rooting conditions on the
591 growth and cooling ability of Pyrus calleryana. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 10(3), 185–192.

592 Reid, W. V., Mooney, H. A., Cropper, A., Capistrano, D., Carpenter, S. R., Chopra, K., Dasgupta, P., Dietz,
593 T., Duraiappah, A. K., Hassan, R., Kasperson, R., Leemans, R., May, R. M., McMichael, T. A. J., Pingali, P.,
594 Samper, C., Scholes, R., Watson, R. T., Zakri, A. H., Shidong, Z., Ash, N. J., Bennett, E., Kumar, P., Lee, M.
595 J., Raudsepp-Hearne, C., Simons, H., Thonell, J. and Zurek, M. B. (2005). *Ecosystems and human well-
596 being: Synthesis*. Sarukhán, J. and Whyte, A. (eds.). Island Press.

597 Rogers, K., Sacre, K., Goodenough, J. and Doick, K. (2015). *Valuing London's Urban Forest*. Treeconomics,
598 London. 82pp.

599 Rumble, H., Rogers, K., Doick, K., Albertini, A. and Hutchings, T. (2015). *Valuing Wrexham's Urban Forest
600 - assessing the ecosystem services of Wrexham's urban forest*. Forest Research, Farnham. 45pp.

601 Saaroni, H., Amorim, J.H., Hiemstra, J.A., Pearlmutter, D. (2018). Urban Green Infrastructure as a tool
602 for urban heat mitigation: Survey of research methodologies and findings across different climatic
603 regions. *Urban Climate*, 24, 94-110.

604 Santamouris, M. (2013). The Role of Green Spaces. In: *Energy and Climate in the Urban Built*
605 *Environment*, Routledge.

606 Shahrestani, M., Yao, R. and Cook, G. K. (2013). Characterising the energy performance of centralised
607 HVAC&R systems in the UK. *Energy and Buildings*, 62, 239-247.

608 Shahrestani, M., Yao, R., Essah, E., Shao, L., Oliveira, A. C., Hepbasli, A., Biyik, E., Caño, T. d., Rico, E. and
609 Lechón, J. L. (2017). Experimental and numerical studies to assess the energy performance of naturally
610 ventilated PV façade systems. *Solar Energy*, 147, 37-51.

611 Smithers, R.J., Doick, K.J., Burton, A., Sibille, R., Steinbach, D., Harris, R., Groves, L., Blicharska, M. (2018).
612 Comparing the relative abilities of tree species to cool the urban environment. Urban Ecosystems.
613 (May), 1-12.

614 Stratópoulos, L.M.F., Duthweiler, S., Häberle, K.-H., Pauleit, S. (2018). Effect of native habitat on the
615 cooling ability of six nursery-grown tree species and cultivars for future roadside plantings. *Forestry and*
616 *Urban Greening*, 30, 37–45.

617 Stritih, U., Charvat, P., Koželj, R., Klimes, L., Osterman, E., Ostry, M. and Butala, V. (2018). PCM thermal
618 energy storage in solar heating of ventilation air: Experimental and numerical investigations. *Sustainable*
619 *Cities and Society*, 37, 104-115.

620 Taha, H. (1997). Urban climates and heat islands: albedo, evapotranspiration, and anthropogenic heat.
621 *Energy and Buildings*, 25(2), 99–103.

622 TRNFLOW. (2009). *A module of an air flow network for coupled simulation-manual*. Stuttgart: Transsolar
623 Energietechnik.

624 TRNSYS. (2010). *TRNSYS 17: a transient system simulation program*. Wisconsin: Solar Energy Laboratory,
625 University of Wisconsin.

626 UFWACN. (2015). Our Vision for Our Urban Forest. *Urban Forestry and Woodlands Advisory Committees*
627 *Network*, p.1–15. Available online: https://www.forestry.gov.uk/urbanforestry. Accessed 23rd May 2018.

628 UFWACN. (2016). Introducing England's urban forests: Definition, distribution, composition and
629 benefits. UFWACN (Urban Forestry and Woodlands Advisory Committees (FWAC) Network), 14pp.
630 Available online from: https://www.forestry.gov.uk/urbanforestry. Accessed 23rd May 2018.

631 United Nations et al., (2012). System of Environmental-Economic Accounting: Central Framework.
632 Available online: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/White_cover.pdf

633 Varghese, J. T., Ghosh, S., Pandey, S. and Samanta, R. (2015). Evaluating the cleansing efficiency of an
634 extended living façade draped with *vernonia elaegnifolia*. *Journal of Green Building*, 10, 157-177.

635 Wagner, W. and Pruss, A. (2002). The IAPWS Formulation 1995 for the Thermodynamic Properties of
636 Ordinary Water Substance for General and Scientific Use. *Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference*
637 *Data*, 31(2), 387-535.

638 Ward, H. C., Evans, J. G. and Grimmond, C. S. B. (2014) Multi-scale sensible heat fluxes in the urban
639 environment from large aperture scintillometry and eddy covariance. *Boundary- Layer Meteorology*, 152

640   (1), 65-89.

641   Wullschleger, S. D., Meinzer, F. C. and Vertessy, R. A. (1998). A Review of Whole-Plant Water Use Studies
642   in Tree. *Tree Physiology*, 18(8-9), 499–512.

643 Table 1 – Evapotranspiration rates for tree species taken from literature. "spp." used to indicate where

644 species not specified. Underlined values calculated from the reported stomatal conductance values.

645 (References are: [1]Heath, 1998; [2]Wullschleger et al., 1998; [3]Breuer et al., 2003; [4]Atkinson et al., 2004;

646 [5]Betson and Scholefield, 2004; [6]Fini et al., 2009; [7]Leuzinger et al., 2010; [8]Hipps et al., 2014; [9]Rahman

647 et al., 2015; [10]Gillner et al., 2015).

648

Common Name	Scientific Name	Experiment Conditions	Age (years)	Height (m)	DBH* (cm)	E_t min (g m^{-2} s^{-1})	E_t max (g m^{-2} s^{-1})	Mean E_t (g m^{-2} s^{-1})	Genus E_t (Mean) (g m^{-2} s^{-1})
Norway Maple[6,7]	*Acer platanoides*	Irrigated	n/a	n/a	3.5	0.034	0.075	**0.053**	0.037
Red Maple[2]	*Acer rubrum*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.021	0.021	**0.021**	
Red Horse Chestnut[7,10]	*Aesculus × carnea Hayne*	n/a	15	9.2	20.75	0.009	0.009	**0.009**	
Horse Chestnut[7]	*Aesculus hippocastanum*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.053	0.053	**0.053**	0.032
Chestnut spp.[1]	*Aesculus spp.*	In Ambient Air	2	n/a	n/a	0.029	0.041	**0.035**	
Turkish Hazel[10]	*Corylus corluna L.*	n/a	13	8.5	15.75	0.034	0.034	**0.034**	0.034
Midland Hawthorn[9]	*Crataegus laevigata*	n/a	n/a	6	1.37	0.074	0.089	**0.081**	0.081
Beech spp.[1]	*Fagus spp.*	In Ambient Air	2	n/a	n/a	0.035	0.045	**0.040**	
Common Beech[2]	*Fagus sylvatica*	100-yr-old plantation	n/a	35	54	0.039	0.039	**0.039**	0.039
Red Beech[2]	*Nothofagus fusca*	Pristine forest	n/a	34	60	0.077	0.077	**0.077**	0.077
Maidenhair Tree[10]	*Ginkgo biloba L.*	n/a	19	12.6	25.5	0.014	0.014	**0.014**	0.014
Tulip Tree[10]	*Liriodendron tulipifera L.*	n/a	14	10.65	19.75	0.004	0.004	**0.004**	0.004
Crabapple Tree[9]	*Malus 'Rudolph'*	n/a	n/a	6	1.37	0.046	0.077	**0.062**	
Common Apple[3]	*Malus domestica*	n/a	9	n/a	n/a	0.063	0.063	**0.063**	0.062
Sitka Spruce[3]	*Picea sitchensis*	n/a	n/a	11.5	n/a	0.044	0.044	**0.044**	0.044
Corsican Pine[5]	*Pinus nigra*	Forest	n/a	15	n/a	0.040	0.040	**0.040**	
Cluster Pine[2]	*Pinus pinaster*	n/a	n/a	20	34	0.019	0.019	**0.019**	0.030
London Plane[3,7]	*Platanus acerifolia*	fully expanded leaves	28	20	n/a	0.031	0.096	**0.063**	0.063

1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295

Common Name	Scientific Name	Experiment Conditions	Age (years)	Height (m)	DBH* (cm)	E_t min (g m^{-2} s^{-1})	E_t max (g m^{-2} s^{-1})	Mean E_t (g m^{-2} s^{-1})	Genus E_t (Mean) (g m^{-2} s^{-1})
Black Cottonwood[2]	*Populus trichocarpa*	n/a	n/a	15	15	0.120	0.120	**0.120**	**0.120**
Umineko Cherry Blossom[9]	*Prunus 'Umineko'*	n/a	n/a	6	1.37	0.070	0.085	**0.077**	**0.063**
Cherry spp.[4]	*Prunus spp.*	wild	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.048	0.048	**0.048**	
Callery pear[9]	*Pyrus calleryana*	n/a	n/a	6	1.37	0.097	0.155	**0.126**	**0.126**
Oak spp.[1]	*Quercus spp.*	In Ambient Air	2	n/a	n/a	0.041	0.058	**0.049**	**0.049**
Mountain Ash[9]	*Sorbus arnoldiana*	n/a	n/a	6	1.37	0.074	0.076	**0.075**	**0.075**
Small leaved lime[6,7,10]	*Tilia cordata*	Irrigated	n/a	n/a	3.5	0.031	0.075	**0.057**	
Broad leaved lime[6,7]	*Tilia platyphyllos*	Irrigated	n/a	n/a	3.5	0.023	0.054	**0.041**	**0.053**
Silver lime[6,7]	*Tilia tomentosa*	Irrigated	n/a	n/a	3.5	0.040	0.086	**0.061**	
Common lime[6]	*Tilia x europaea*	Irrigated	n/a	n/a	3.5	0.028	0.075	**0.052**	
Dutch Elm[10]	*Ulmus x hollandica Mill. 'Lobel'*	n/a	14	12.88	23.5	0.023	0.023	**0.023**	**0.023**
E_t average (all genera):									**0.054**

649 * DBH: diameter at breast height

650

651   Table 2. The three most common tree species and the three most important species for delivering E_t

652   cooling in each of the urban forest case studies.

		Edinburgh	Inner London	Outer London	Wrexham
Most common species	1st	*Acer pseudoplatanus*	*Betula spp.*	*Acer pseudoplatanus*	*Acer pseudoplatanus*
	2nd	*Ilex aquifolium*	*Tilia x vulgaris*	*Quercus robur*	*Crataegus monogyna*
	3rd	*Betula pendula*	*Magnolia spp.*	*Crataegus pedicellata*	*Betula pendula*
Top E_t providers	1st	*Castanea sativa*	*Platanus hybrid*	*Castanea sativa*	*Platanus hybrida*
	2nd	*Acer platanoides*	*Quercus petraea*	*Crataegus monogyna*	*Fagus sylvatica*
	3rd	*Prunus avium*	*Prunus avium*	*Populus* spp	*Castanea sativa*

653

654

655   Table 3. Evapotranspiration across the three case study urban forests.

City	Area size (km^2)	Number of trees (000's)	Total leaf area (km^2) (000's)	Total E$_t$ (kg s^{-1})	Mean E$_t$ per leaf area (kg s^{-1} km^{-2})	Mean E$_t$ per tree (kg hr^{-1} tree^{-1})
Edinburgh	115	638	74	3,500	47.4	19.8
Inner London	310	1,587	217	11,700	53.9	26.5
Outer London	1,285	6,807	1,047	44,900	54.1	23.7
Wrexham	38	364	29	1,420	48.9	14.0

656

657

26

658   Table 4. Summary of the estimated value of the effective cooling from each urban forest case study.

City	Adjusted total q	A/C unit* equivalents	Cooling Value†	Average q	A/C unit* equivalents	Cooling value†
	(MW)	(000's)	(k £ hr⁻¹)	(kW tree⁻¹)	(tree⁻¹)	(£ hr⁻¹ tree⁻¹)
Edinburgh	4,290 (±1,300)	123	26 (±8)	6.7 (±2.0)	0.2	£ 0.04 (±0.01)
Inner London	14,400 (±4,300)	411	86 (±25)	9.1 (±2.7)	0.3	£ 0.05 (±0.02)
Outer London	55,200 (±16,000)	1,580	329 (±97)	8.1 (±2.4)	0.2	£ 0.05 (±0.01)
Wrexham	1,740 (±510)	50	10 (±3)	4.8 (±1.4)	0.1	£ 0.03 (±0.01)
*based on 1.5 kW evaporative cooler (EcoCooling Ltd).						
†at the 2017 UK Average rate of 0.14 £/kWh (BEIS, 2018)						

659
660

661   Table 5: Total cooling (and energy demand for cooling) supplied to a single building with and without

662   tree E_t cooling applied and for different relative humidity (RH) control set points.

| Description | Cumulative cooling (and energy) demand MWh | | | | | |
| | Indoor RH=50% | | | Indoor RH=60% | | |
	E_t=0.015	E_t=0.055	E_t=0.165	E_t=0.015	E_t=0.055	E_t=0.165
With trees	6.68 (3.34)	6.65 (3.33)	6.57 (3.29)	5.51 (2.75)	5.47 (2.74)	5.37 (2.68)
Without trees	6.69 (3.35)	6.69 (3.35)	6.69 (3.35)	5.52 (2.76)	5.52 (2.76)	5.52 (2.76)
Cooling demand reduction (summer)	0.15%	0.60%	1.82%	0.24%	0.92%	2.73%

663
664
665

666 Table 6. Changes in cooling (and energy) demand with and without trees in the street canyon model
667 scenario, over the one-year modelling period for a range of E_t values and relative humidity (RH) set-
668 points of 50% and 60% (based upon a CoP=2).

669

| Description | Cumulative cooling (and energy) demand MWh Indoor RH=50% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E_t=0.015 | | | | E_t=0.055 | | | | E_t=0.165 | | | |
	Eva Clg*	Sensible	Latent	Total	Eva Clg	Sensible	latent	Total	Eva Clg	Sensible	latent	Total
With trees	51.6 (25.8)	291.7 (145.9)	129.2 (64.6)	420.9 (210.5)	177.3 (88.7)	278.2 (139.1)	144.9 (72.5)	423.1 (211.6)	532.1 (266.0)	255.8 (127.9)	169.6 (84.8)	425.4 (212.7)
Without trees	0	295.5 (147.7)	125.1 (62.5)	420.6 (210.2)	0	295.5 (147.7)	125.1 (62.5)	420.6 (210.3)	0	295.5 (147.7)	125.1 (62.5)	420.6 (210.3)
% change in demand		-1.28%	3.30%	0.09%		-5.85%	15.9%	0.61%		-13.4%	35.6%	1.15%

| Description | Cumulative cooling (and energy) demand MWh Indoor RH=60% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | E_t=0.015 | | | | E_t=0.055 | | | | E_t=0.165 | | | |
	Eva Clg	Sensible	Latent	Total	Eva Clg	Sensible	latent	Total	Eva Clg	Sensible	latent	Total
With trees	51.6 (25.8)	291.7 (145.9)	58.3 (29.2)	350.0 (175.0)	177.3 (88.7)	278.2 (139.1)	68.0 (34.0)	346.1 (173.1)	532.1 (266.0)	255.8 (127.9)	84.4 (42.2)	340.2 (170.1)
Without trees	0	295.5 (147.7)	55.6 (27.8)	351.0 (175.6)	0	295.5 (147.7)	55.6 (27.8)	351.0 (175.5)	0	295.5 (147.7)	55.6 (27.8)	351.0 (175.5)
% change in demand		-1.28%	4.95%	-0.29%		-5.85%	22.4%	-1.39%		-13.4%	52.0%	-3.09%

670
671 * Eva Clg: evaporative cooling
672

1   **Material to be supplied as Supplemental Information**

2

3

4   Figure S1. Psychrometric Chart for determining cooling from increased humidity (from:
5   http://www.handsdownsoftware.com).

6

7

8   Table S1: Modelled internal gains, cooling system set points and daily period of operation used in the
9   calculations.

Attribute	Value	Units
Indoor Setpoint Temperature	23	°C
Relative Humidity (RH) Set-point	50,60	%
Period Building Occupied	7am to 6pm	-
Occupant Density	12	m^2/person
Occupant Heat Gain (sensible)	60	W/person
Occupant Heat Gain (latent)	40	W/person
Equipment Heat Gain (sensible)	140	W/person
Lighting Heat Gain (sensible)	10	W/m^2

10
11
12
13
14   Table S2. Wind pressure coefficients of infiltration effects on building cooling requirements.

Façade Orientation (Height)*	Wind direction (Degree) **			
	0	90	180	270
South (9m)	-0.017	-0.039	0.02	-0.039
South (27m)	-0.022	-0.051	0.061	-0.051
East (9m)	-0.057	0.001	-0.057	-0.024
East (27m)	-0.028	-0.116	-0.028	-0.012
North (9m)	0.02	-0.039	-0.017	-0.039
North (27m)	0.061	-0.051	-0.022	-0.051
West (9m)	-0.057	-0.024	-0.057	0.001
West (27m)	-0.028	-0.012	-0.028	-0.166
Roof (36m)	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008

* Height refers to the height of the location that the C_p value is calculated for.
** Direction of wind is determined from the North, e.g. 90 degrees represents Easterly winds.
Derived from: Cpcalc+ for buildings more than 3-storeys in height (Grosso, 1992)

15
16