

The influence of street layouts and viaduct settings on daily carbon monoxide exposure and intake fraction in idealized urban canyons

Article

Accepted Version

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

Hang, J., Luo, Z. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2082-3958, Wang, X., He, L., Wang, B. and Zhu, W. (2017) The influence of street layouts and viaduct settings on daily carbon monoxide exposure and intake fraction in idealized urban canyons. Environmental Pollution, 220 (Part A). pp. 72-86. ISSN 0269-7491 doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.024 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/66739/

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

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.024

Publisher: Elsevier

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <u>End User Agreement</u>.



www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1	Revision to Environmental Pollution 2016
2	
3	The influence of street layouts and viaduct settings on daily carbon monoxide
4	exposure and intake fraction in idealized urban canyons
5	
6	Jian Hang ¹ , Zhiwen Luo ^{2*} , Xuemei Wang ¹ , Lejian He ¹ , Baomin Wang ¹ , Wei Zhu ¹
7	
8	¹ School of Atmospheric Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, P.R. China
9	² School of the Built Environment, University of Reading, Reading, UK
10	
11	*Corresponding author. Zhiwen Luo
12	Tel: +44(0) 1183785219 fax: +44(0) 1183785219
13	E-mail address: z.luo@reading.ac.uk
14	

15 ABSTRACT

16 Environmental concerns have been raised on the adverse health effects of vehicle emissions in micro-scale traffic-crowded street canyons, especially for pedestrians 17 and residents living in near-road buildings. Viaduct design is sometimes used to 18 improve transportation efficiency but possibly affects urban airflow and the resultant 19 20 exposure risk, which have been rarely investigated so far. The personal intake fraction (P_IF) is defined as the average fraction of total emissions that is inhaled by each 21 person of a population (1ppm= 1×10^{-6}), and the daily carbon monoxide (CO) 22 pollutant exposure (E_t) is estimated by multiplying the average concentration of a 23 specific micro-environment within one day. As a novelty, by considering time activity 24 patterns and breathing rates in various micro-environments for three age groups, this 25 paper introduces IF and Et into computational fluid dynamic (CFD) simulation to 26 quantify the impacts of street layouts (street width/ building height W/H=1, 1.5, 2), 27 source location, viaduct settings and noise barriers on the source-exposure correlation 28 29 when realistic CO sources are defined. Narrower streets experience larger P_IF (1.51-5.21 ppm) and CO exposure, and leeward-side buildings always attain higher 30

31 vehicular pollutant exposure than windward-side. Cases with a viaduct experience 32 smaller *P_IF* (3.25-1.46 ppm) than cases without a viaduct (*P_IF*=5.21-2.23 ppm) if the single ground-level CO source is elevated onto the viaduct. With two CO sources 33 (both ground-level and viaduct-level), daily CO exposure rises 2.80-3.33 times but 34 35 *P_IF* only change slightly. Noise barriers above a viaduct raise concentration between barriers, but slightly reduce vehicular exposure in near-road buildings. Because 36 people spend most of their time indoors, vehicular pollutant exposure within 37 38 near-road buildings can be 6-9 times that at pedestrian level. Although further studies are still required to provide practical guidelines, this paper provides effective 39 40 methodologies to quantify the impacts of street/viaduct configurations on human exposure for urban design purpose. 41

42

43 ***Capsule (Limit 185 Characters)**

Wider street and urban viaduct with a single elevated source could alleviate indoor
exposure and building intake fraction. Adding noise barriers has no significant impact.

Keywords: Street canyon, Intake fraction, Daily pollutant exposure, Viaduct, Noise
barrier

49

50 1. Introduction

51 Following the ongoing worldwide urbanization, traffic exhaust and non-exhaust

52 emissions in cities constitute the major sources of urban air pollution, including fine

53 particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), carbon monoxide, nitric oxide and benzene etc (Fenger,

54 1999; Pu and Yang, 2014). The population exposure to high air pollutant

55 concentration is one of the major factors resulting in adverse health problems in cities

- 56 (Luo et al., 2010; Zhou et al., 2013; Ji and Zhao, 2015), especially for sensitive
- 57 groups like children and the elderly. Moreover, on average people spend more than 90%
- of their time indoors, the traditional epidemiology study linking mortality directly to
- 59 outdoor pollution concentration may cause bias and give rise to exposure
- 60 misclassification (Chen et al., 2012a,b) as outdoor air pollutants could penetrate

indoors via doors/windows, ventilation systems and building cracks and cause indoor
exposure to outdoor origins (Chen et al., 2012c; Ji and Zhao, 2015). Thus, improving
the dispersion of vehicular pollutants in the urban environment can help improving
urban air quality and reducing population exposure for both pedestrians and people
living in near-road buildings (Zhang and Gu, 2013; Ng and Chau, 2014).

Extremely narrow street configurations, heavy traffic volumes and unfavourable 66 meteorological conditions are the main reasons of serious vehicular street air pollution. 67 68 As recently reviewed by the literature (Fernando et al., 2010; Kumar et al., 2011; Di Sabatino et al., 2013; Blocken, 2015; Meroney et al., 2016; Lateb et al., 2016), 69 numerous field/wind tunnel experiments and computational fluid dynamic (CFD) 70 simulations have contributed to understanding the impacts of urban design on the flow 71 72 and urban air pollution. It has been widely confirmed as the most effective design approach to improve street pollutant dispersion by lowering street aspect ratios (street 73 height/street width, H/W in two-dimensional (2D) street canyons (Oke, 1988; 74 Meroney et al., 1996; Vardoulakis et al., 2003; Li et al., 2006; Xie et al., 2006; Li et 75 76 al., 2009; Liu and Wong, 2014; Zhong et al., 2015) and building packing densities in three-dimensional (3D) urban-like models (Chang and Meroney, 2003; Di Sabatino et 77 al., 2007; Hang and Li, 2011; Buccolieri et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2013; Ramponi et al., 78 2015). Other key urban parameters include building height variations (Gu et al., 2011; 79 80 Hang et al., 2012) and typical high-rise buildings (Zhang et al., 2015), ambient wind directions (Kanda, 2006; Yassin, 2013; Lin et al., 2014; Kwak et al., 2016), street 81 vegetation (Buccolieri et al., 2011; Gromke and Blocken, 2015a and 2015b), building 82 roof shape (Takano and Moonen, 2013; Liu et al., 2015), traffic-flow patterns (Thaker 83 84 and Gokhale, 2016) and real-time boundary wind conditions (Zhang et al., 2011) etc. 85 In addition, thermal buoyancy forces induced by wall heating and solar shading can significantly influence (Cai, 2012; Allegrini et al., 2014; Yang and Li, 2015; Cui et al., 86 2016; Nazarian and Kleissl, 2016) or dominate (Yang and Li, 2009; Luo and Li, 2011; 87 Dallman et al., 2014; Wang and Li, 2016) urban airflows and pollutant dispersion if 88 89 Richardson (Froude) number is relatively large (small),

90

The adverse effects of vehicle emissions on people in near-road buildings require

91 special concern (Zhou and Levy, 2008; Ng and Chau, 2014; Habilomatis and 92 Chaloulakou, 2015) where the health risk is much higher than in other microenvironments. Most studies investigated the wind flow and emphasized spatial 93 distribution of pollutant concentration in street canyons (e.g. Meroney et al., 1996; 94 Xie et al., 2006; Li et al., 2009; Zhong et al., 2015) or near-road buildings 95 96 (Kalaiarasan et al., 2009; Quang et al., 2012). However, the resultant pollutant 97 exposure averaged over the population in the entire street canyon is more important 98 for evaluating the overall impacts on people's health. Vehicular pollutant exposure is 99 determined by three factors: the pollutant emission rate (mass per unit time) depending on traffic density, the capacity of pollutant dispersion associated with 100 urban layouts and meteorological conditions, the distance of people from pollutant 101 102 sources and time activity patterns. Furthermore, viaducts are sometimes used to improve transportation efficiency in traffic-crowded urban areas. Noise barriers at two 103 sides of a viaduct are usually adopted to protect near-road residents from the adverse 104 effects of noise, but possibly influence pollutant exposure. To date, there remains a 105 106 shortage of studies reporting on how street layouts coupled with viaduct settings and noise barriers influence pollutant exposure in near-road buildings. 107

108 The concept of intake fraction (IF) represents the fraction of total pollutant emissions that is inhaled by a population (Bennett et al., 2002). Only a few studies 109 110 estimated IF within micro-scale urban canyons (Zhou and Levy, 2008; Habilomatis and Chaloulakou, 2015). But the existing studies only considered realistic streets as 111 case studies and did not examine how IF would be affected by street layouts and 112 viaduct settings for design purpose. By conducting CFD simulations coupling with 113 114 daily pollutant exposure, Ng and Chau (2014) assessed how the designs of building 115 permeability and street setbacks influence daily population exposure inside idealized street canyons, but they did not look at the interactive flow between urban space and 116 interior building space. As a novelty, this paper introduces two metrics, i.e., both 117 118 intake fraction (IF) and daily pollutant exposure into CFD simulations to quantify the 119 impacts of street aspect ratios, viaduct settings, noise barriers and source locations on vehicular exposure under neutral meteorological conditions, for street and viaduct 120

121 design purpose.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 describes the concepts of personal intake fraction (P_IF) and daily pollutant exposure. Section 3 introduces CFD setups and test cases investigated, while Section 4 presents CFD validation using wind tunnel data. Results are discussed in Section 5 and conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

127

128 **2. Human exposure indices to vehicle emissions**

129 2.1. Personal intake fraction (P_IF)

An intake fraction (IF) of 1 ppm (part per million) indicates that 1 g of air 130 pollutants is inhaled by an exposed population from one ton of pollutants emitted 131 from the source. Obviously IF depends on population density, but is independent of 132 the pollutant release rate. IF has been widely used to determine the fraction of total 133 emissions that is inhaled by a population at various scales. Indoor IF is commonly 134 high ($\sim 2-20 \times 10^3$ ppm) (Nazaroff, 2008) due to human's close proximity to pollutant 135 136 sources. City-scale and regional-scale vehicular IF are relatively small, for example, IF of 1-10 ppm in US cities (Marshall et al., 2005) and 270 ppm in Hong Kong (Luo 137 et al., 2010), and IF of primary PM_{2.5} for the entire continental United States was 138 reported at 0.12-25 ppm (Greco et al., 2007). 139

The high-resolution vehicular IF in micro-scale street canyons should be further 140 emphasized. So far, only a few researchers examined street-scale IF for case studies. 141 Recently, Habilomatis and Chaloulakou (2015) conducted CFD simulations to 142 calculate IF of vehicular ultrafine particles in a 2D street canyon (H/W=1.5) of the 143 central Athens in Greece reporting an overall IF of 371 ppm. By using modelling data 144 145 (not CFD), Zhou and Levy (2008) investigated IF for a typical street canyon in midtown Manhattan, New York, obtaining an overall IF of 3000 ppm due to the high 146 population density and poor urban ventilation. This paper aims to examine how 147 idealized street layouts and viaduct settings affect vehicular pollutant distribution and 148 149 its resultant exposure to inform future urban design.

150 For a specific vehicular pollutant, the intake fraction (*IF*) is defined as below

151 (Zhou and Levy, 2008; Luo et al., 2010; Habilomatis and Chaloulakou, 2015):

152
$$IF = \sum_{i}^{N} \sum_{j}^{M} P_{i} \times Br_{i,j} \times \Delta t_{i,j} \times Ce_{j} / m$$
(1)

where *m* is the total emission rate over the period considered (kg), *N* is the number of population groups defined and *M* is the number of different microenvironments considered, P_i is the total number of people exposed in the *i*th population group; Br_{ij} is the average volumetric breathing rate for individuals in the *i*th population group (m³/s) in the microenvironment *j*; Δt_{ij} is the time spent in the microenvironment *j* for people group of *i*(s); and *Ce_j* is the pollutant concentration attributable to traffic

159 emissions in the microenvironment j (kg/m³).

As referred to the literature (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), breathing rates

161 in four micro-environmental categories (M=4) for three age groups (N=3) were

162 defined (Fig. A1a in Appendix): indoors at home (j=1), other indoor locations (j=2),

163 near vehicles (j=3), and other outdoor locations away from vehicles (j=M=4). The

164 2004 population census data for the Hong Kong (Luo et al., 2010) were adopted (Fig.

165 A1b). Moreover, some assumptions were further proposed: The near-road buildings

166 were residential, and only j=1 (Indoors at home) and j=3 (near vehicles, i.e.

pedestrian level) were considered to assess *IF* for local residents and pedestrians (Fig.A1a).

Because *IF* for the entire population rises linearly with the increasing population density, this paper proposes the average personal intake fraction (P_IF) for a virtual person. This virtual person has an average breathing rate TBr_j combining the population subgroups for each time-activity pattern *j* (*j*=1 and 3). Thus P_IF is independent of population density.

174
$$P_{IF} = IF / \sum_{i}^{N} P_{i} = \sum_{j}^{M} TBr_{j} \times \Delta t_{j} \times Ce_{j} / m$$
(2)

175 Here $\triangle t_j$ is the time spent in the microenvironment *j* for the entire population. 176

177 **2.2.** Daily Pollutant exposure of $CO(E_t)$

178 The daily pollutant exposure is defined as the extent of human beings' contact

179 with different air pollutants within one day which is estimated indirectly by

180 multiplying the average concentration of a specific micro-environment within the time

181 people spend in it. Different from the intake fraction, daily pollutant exposure

182 depends on the realistic pollutant emission rates. Mathematically, for a specific

183 population subgroup, it is calculated as below (Ng and Chau, 2014):

184
$$E_t = \sum_{j=1}^{M} E_{t,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} C_{real,j,k} \times t_j$$
 (3)

185 where $E_{t,j}$ is the daily pollutant exposure (mg/m³/day) of the *j*th microenvironment, 186 and *j*=1, 2, 3, 4 representing the time activity pattern in Fig. A1a. Thus, E_t is the total 187 pollutant exposure for all microenvironments. $C_{real,j,k}$ is the exposed pollutant 188 concentration in the *j*th microenvironment at the *k*th side (leeward or windward side). 189 Similarly, we only considered the time t_j people spend indoors at home (*j*=1) or near 190 vehicles (*j*=3) within a day (Fig. A1a) assuming near-road buildings are residential.

191

192 **3. CFD methodologies**

193 **3.1.** Description of CFD test cases and flow modelling

Large Eddy Simulations (LES) are known to perform better in predicting 194 turbulence than the Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) approaches in urban 195 airflows and pollutant dispersion modelling (Kanda, 2006; Gu et al., 2011; Li et al., 196 197 2009 and 2015; Liu et al., 2014 and 2015; Zhong et al., 2015). But there are still challenges to LES applications including the much longer computational time, the 198 development of advanced sub-grid scale models, the difficulty in specifying appropriate 199 time-dependent inlet and wall boundary conditions. We are aware that steady RANS 200 201 turbulence models have deficiencies in predicting turbulence, for example they fail to 202 predict the sizes of reattachment lengths behind buildings and under-predict the velocity in weak wind regions (Yoshie et al., 2007). In spite of its limitations, the 203 RNG k- ε model (Yakhot and Orszag, 1986) has been successfully validated in 204 205 predicting mean airflows and pollutant dispersion in urban-like models (e.g. Tominaga 206 and Stathopoulos, 2013; Ho et al., 2015; Blocken, 2015; Meroney, 2016; Habilomatis and Chaloulakou, 2015) and those coupling indoor-outdoor airflows (e.g. Gao et al., 207

208 2008; van Hooff and Blocken, 2010 and 2013; Ramponi and Blocken, 2012; Jin et al., 209 2015; Hang et al., 2016). Thus CFD software Ansys FLUENT (Fluent, 2006) with the 210 RNG k- ε model was used to solve the steady-state isothermal urban airflows. The 211 governing equations were discretized by a finite volume method with the second order 212 upwind scheme. The SIMPLE scheme was used for the pressure and velocity 213 coupling.

Fig. 1 depicts full-scale urban models investigated by CFD simulations. The 214 215 height of all buildings stays as constant as H=24 m (y direction), and the width of target street canyon varies from W=24, 36 to 48 m (W/H=1, 1.5, 2) with its span-wise 216 (or lateral) length of L=12 m (y direction). There are two identical street canyons 217 (W=24 m) neighbour to the target street canyon with one in the upstream and the 218 other in the downstream to explicitly reproduce roughness elements. There are 219 220 eight-storey buildings at both leeward and windward sides with a door at the first floor (2 m tall, 4 m wide) and windows (1 m tall, 4 m wide) at the other storeys. Each 221 222 storey is 3m high with the room height of 2.7 m and room floor thickness of 0.3 m. 223 For cases with a viaduct, the width of the viaduct is fixed as $W_{\rm b}$ =16 m. The viaduct is elevated as 9 m above the ground, and its thickness is 1m. In addition, there are noise 224 225 barriers installed at the sides of the viaduct. Two barrier heights are considered, i.e., 2m and 4m respectively. The birds' eye view in cases with a viaduct are depicted in 226 Fig. A2. The model description in test cases without a viaduct is also displayed in Fig. 227 1. At two lateral domain boundaries, symmetrical boundary conditions are assumed. 228 We are aware that, an idealized 2D street canyon with symmetrical lateral boundary 229 condition represents a simplified urban geometry of an infinitely long street with a 230 231 perpendicular approaching wind to street axis, but it can serve as a platform to 232 synthesize the physical and chemical processes found in the urban environment which is currently still and commonly investigated (Allegrini et al., 2014; Ho et al., 2015; 233 Liu et al., 2014 and 2015; Li et al., 2015; Zhong et al., 2015). The similar 2D urban 234 235 model coupling indoor and outdoor airflows have been adopted by Gao et al. (2008) 236 and Hang et al. (2016).

237

All test cases are summarized in Table 1. Three kind of street canyons with W/H

=1, 1.5 or 2 (H=24 m) are included, and four types of viaduct settings are considered, 238 i.e. with no viaduct (Case Nv[W/H]), with viaduct but no noise barriers (Case 239 V[W/H]), with viaduct and barrier 1 (2 m tall, Case Vb1[W/H]), with viaduct and 240 barrier 2 (4 m tall, Case Vb2[W/H]). The grid size normal to wall surfaces is 0.1 m 241 (0.004H) which is based on the grid independence study in the CFD validation case. 242 243 CFD grid arrangement in cases with a viaduct is depicted in Fig. A2. The total number of hexahedral cells is about 1.3 million to 2.1 million. For Case Nv[1], we also used a 244 245 finer grid arrangement with grid size of 0.05m at wall surfaces to perform a mesh-dependency test, finding that CFD results change little with the finer grid. 246

No-slip wall boundary condition with standard wall function was applied for near-wall treatment. Zero normal gradient conditions were used at the domain top (i.e. symmetry), domain outlet (i.e. outflow) and two lateral domain boundaries (i.e. symmetry). At the domain inlet, a power-law velocity profile was applied as below.

251
$$U_0(z) = U_{ref} \left(\frac{z - H}{z_{ref}}\right)^{\alpha}$$
 (4a)

252
$$k_{in}(z) = (U_{in}(z) \times I_{in})^2$$
 (4b)

253
$$\varepsilon_{in}(z) = \frac{C_{\mu}^{3/4} k_i^{3/2}}{\kappa z}$$
 (4c)

where $U_{ref}=3$ m/s is the reference velocity, H=24 m and z_{ref} is the reference height of 40 m. The power-law exponent of $\alpha=0.22$ denotes the underlying surface roughness depending on the terrain category of a medium-dense urban area. $I_{in}=0.1$ is turbulence intensity, $C_{\mu}=0.09$ and κ is the von Karman constant ($\kappa=0.41$).

The reference Reynolds number based on the building height ($\text{Re} = U_{ref}H/v$, vis the kinematic viscosity, H=24 m) is about 4.8×10^6 and that based on the room window height is 19733 ($\text{Re} = U_{ref}h_w/v$, $h_w=0.1$ m). Both are much greater than 11000 to ensure Reynolds number independence (Snyder, 1972).

262

263 **3.2.** CFD setups in dispersion modelling

In this study, carbon monoxide (CO) was selected as a vehicular pollutant being

emitted from volumetric sources in the target street canyon. For cases with a viaduct 265 (Fig. 1), there are two situations of CO sources: (1.) a single CO source (Source 1) is 266 fixed above the viaduct (i.e. viaduct-level only, no source near the ground), (2.) two 267 CO sources are present at viaduct-level (Source 1) and ground-level (Source 2, near 268 the ground). The geometry sizes and emission rates of CO sources are fixed as 269 constants (width $W_{\rm b}$ =16 m, length L=12 m). Ng and Chau (2014) adopted a realistic 270 total traffic emission of carbon monoxide (CO) with the release rate of 6503.6 (g/h) 271 272 by counting traffic numbers in a realistic street (source length=street length=180 m) in Mongkok, Hong Kong, as proposed by Xia and Shao (2005). This paper utilizes the 273 same emission rate per unit street length (36.1 g/h/m, source length L=12m, Fig. 1) 274 for each CO source. Obviously with two CO sources the total realistic CO emission 275 rate doubles. For cases without a viaduct, only ground-level Source 2 exists within the 276 pedestrian regions (z=0 to 2 m, Fig. 1). 277

278

The governing equation of time-averaged CO concentration C (kg/m³) is:

279
$$\overline{u}_{j} \frac{\partial C}{\partial x_{j}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{j}} ((D_{m} + D_{t}) \frac{\partial C}{\partial x_{j}}) = S$$
 (5)

where \overline{u}_{j} is the time-averaged velocity component, *S* is the CO emission rate, D_{m} and D_{t} are the molecular and turbulent diffusivity of pollutants. Here $D_{t} = v_{t} / Sc_{t}$, v_{t} is the kinematic eddy viscosity and Sc_{t} is turbulent Schmidt number (Sc_{t} =0.7) (Hang et al., 2012; Di Sabatino et al., 2007).

For the boundary condition of Eq. (5), the zero normal flux condition was set at wall surfaces, and zero normal gradient conditions at the domain outlet and domain roof. At the domain inlet, the concentration was defined as zero. It is worth mentioning that, in present CFD simulations, the density of air is 1.177 kg/m^3 (average molecular weight 28.966) which is a little greater than the density of CO 1.138 kg/m^3 (average molecular weight 28.011). Thus the buoyancy effects due to the density difference is little. After Eq. (5) was solved, the personal intake fraction and daily CO exposure were analysed. Here we mainly considered two microenvironments (Fig. A1a), in near-road buildings (indoors at home) and for pedestrian regions (near vehicles).

294

295 **4. CFD validation studies**

296 4.1 CFD Validation of single-sided ventilation flow modelling

Wind tunnel data from the literature (Jiang et al., 2003) were used to evaluate the 297 298 numerical accuracy of isothermal flows in single-sided ventilation by coupling indoor and outdoor airflows. As depicted in Fig. A3, the dimension of the reduced-scale 299 cubic building is 0.25m×0.25m×0.25m, with a wall thickness of 0.006 m and opening 300 size of 0.125 m×0.084 m at both windward-side or leeward-side walls. The 301 302 time-averaged stream-wise velocity U and vertical velocity V along 10 vertical lines at the building centre section were measured by a laser Doppler anemometer (Jiang et al., 303 2003). In CFD simulations (Fig. A3a), full-scale models with a building size of 304 $2.5m \times 2.5m \times 2.5m$ and opening size of $1.25m \times 0.84m$ were used (scale ratio is 10:1). x, 305 306 y and z are the stream-wise, span-wise (lateral) and vertical directions. x/H=0 is the location of the windward building surface. The computational domain has a 307 downstream length of 28H, an upstream length of 6H, a lateral length of 7.5H on both 308 sides, and a height of 6H. 309

310 At the domain inlet, the vertical profiles of stream-wise velocity $U_0(z)$, turbulent 311 kinetic energy (*k*) and its dissipation rate (ε) were adopted the same as in the wind 312 tunnel (Jiang et al., 2003).

313
$$U_0(z) = \frac{u_*}{\kappa} \ln(\frac{z}{z_0})$$
 (6a)

314

$$k_{in}(z) = {u_*}^2 / \sqrt{C_{\mu}}$$
 (6b)

315
$$\varepsilon_{in}(z) = C_{\mu}^{3/4} k^{3/2} / (\kappa z)$$
 (6c)

where u_* is the friction velocity which equals 1.068m/s, z_0 is the aerodynamic roughness height equalling 0.05 m in the full-scale CFD model.

318 The RNG k- ε model with a standard wall function was adopted to solve the

turbulence. To ensure grid independency, the medium and fine grid arrangements were used with the smallest grid size of $\triangle x = \triangle y = \triangle z = 0.1$ m and 0.05 m at wall surfaces respectively. For the medium and fine grid, the hexahedral meshes of 0.49 and 1.14 million are produced (Fig. A3a). All the other CFD setups are similar to subsection 2.1.

324 Figs. A3b and A3c show the vertical profiles $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along the vertical lines at x=-0.04H, x=0.5H for windward single-sided ventilation, and at x=0.5H, x=1.04H for 325 326 leeward single-sided ventilation. Here U_{ref} is the reference velocity (10 m/s). The predicted $U(z)/U_{ref}$ profiles match wind tunnel data well for regions below and near 327 the roof level. The grid independence study shows little difference between two grid 328 329 arrangements. These facts confirm the RNG k- ε model with medium grids (minimum grids of $\triangle x = \triangle y = \triangle z = 0.1 \text{ m}$) performs well in predicting single-sided ventilation 330 airflows. 331

332

333

4.2 CFD Validation of pollutant dispersion modelling in 2D street canyons

334 Meroney et al. (1996) conducted wind tunnel experiments of pollutant dispersion 335 in 2D street canyons with a perpendicular wind to its street axis (Fig. A4 in Appendix). There were 28 parallel 2D street canyons (uniform building height H=W=B=60mm) 336 with 20 street canyons upstream to the target street canyon and 8 downstream. A 337 steady line tracer gas (ethane) source exists in the target street. In CFD simulations, 338 the same model geometry and boundary conditions with wind tunnel experiments 339 were adopted (Fig. A4). The total grid number was 372.889. No slip wall boundary 340 condition was set at wall surfaces. The normalized concentration is defined as $K=\bar{c}$ 341 UHL/Q, where \bar{c} is the measured tracer gas concentration, L is line source length 342 and Q is the source emission rate, U is wind velocity measured in the free stream at 343 0.50 m above wind tunnel floor. With $V_{in}=3m/s$ at the domain inlet, Fig. A4 shows the 344 CFD validation profiles of K along windward and leeward walls. As expected 345 windward K is much lower than that leeward K. Numerical K predicted by the RNG 346 347 k- ε model agree with wind tunnel data generally well.

349 **5. Results and discussion**

350 5.1. Effects of aspect ratio, viaduct and noise barriers on flow and dispersion

Figs. 2 and 3 display streamline, velocity and CO concentration in the lateral 351 centre plane in some example test cases. Note that for cases with a viaduct, two 352 situations are included, i.e. with only a single elevated CO source or two CO sources 353 at the viaduct-level and ground-level. Obviously, as W/H=1 or 2, the single clockwise 354 355 main vortex exists with different locations of vortex centre (Fig. 2), and the leeward-side concentration is always much higher than that on the windward-side (Fig. 356 3). Wider streets (W=2H=48 m) always experience much lower concentrations than 357 narrower streets with W=H=24 m, no matter with or without a viaduct (Fig. 3). These 358 findings are similar to those in the literature representing different types of flow 359 regions in the street canyon (e.g. Oke, 1988; Meroney et al., 1996; Xie et al., 2006; 360 Allegrini et al., 2014). In addition, the existence of a viaduct slightly elevates or 361 changes the vortex centre (Fig. 2). Since the single CO source is elevated onto the 362 363 viaduct, the high-pollution region is raised onto the viaduct level (Fig. 3), moreover, CO concentration in the leeward-side building becomes much lower than that without 364 a viaduct (Fig. 3) because the elevated viaduct reduce the distance of source to street 365 roof level and improve pollutant dispersion out of the street canyon. In principle, it 366 can be regarded as an introduction of a new horizontal surface with the street canyon, 367 therefore the street canyon is divided into two parts vertically. Therefore, the effective 368 aspect ratio is reduced by the elevated viaduct surface. If noise barriers are fixed on 369 viaducts (Case Vb2[W/H]), due to their shelter effect the velocity above viaducts and 370 371 between barriers is relatively small (Fig 2), a much higher pollutant concentration is 372 expected between the barriers (Fig. 3), Therefore, a higher exposure to drivers in the 373 vehicles on the urban viaduct can be envisaged, but noise barriers seem not to raise 374 CO concentration in the near-road buildings.

In cases with a viaduct, we also consider two CO sources (ground-level and viaduct-level), assuming the total realistic pollutant emission rate doubles due to the increase of the traffic capacity. As two examples, Fig. 3 also shows CO concentration 378 in the lateral centre plane in Case Vb2[1] and Vb2[2] with the viaduct and two CO 379 sources (W/H=1 or 2). Obviously, in contrast to those with the single elevated source, even the flow is the same, CO concentration with two sources is much higher. For a 380 street of W=H=24 m, the leeward-side rooms at the first and second floors are 381 polluted more seriously than the upper floors. For a wider street (W=2H=48 m), 382 383 vertical gradient of CO concentration for rooms in both windward and leeward sides 384 are small.

385

5.2. Effects of aspect ratios, viaduct and noise barriers on daily CO exposure 386 Vertical profiles of indoor daily CO exposure at various heights 387

Fig. 4 displays the spatially-averaged indoor daily CO exposure at each floor of 388 near-road buildings with a single ground-level or viaduct-level CO source. Obviously, 389 wider streets (W/H=1, 1.5, 2) are prone to smaller CO exposure for each floor, and 390 leeward-side CO exposures are always greater than windward-side. More importantly, 391 392 in contrast to Case Nv[W/H] without a viaduct (single ground-level source), cases 393 with a viaduct (single viaduct-level source) always attain smaller leeward-side CO exposure but greater windward-side CO exposure. For cases with a viaduct, Figs. 4 394 also compares daily CO exposure in each floor with single source and with two 395 sources. As W/H=1, 1.5 and 2, two sources obviously produce much greater daily CO 396 397 exposure than single source. Moreover noise barriers only slightly affect daily CO exposure in near-road buildings. CO exposure decreases slightly towards upper 398 399 levels ..

400

Total CO exposure (E_t) , for indoors (E_{indoor}) and at pedestrian level (E_{ped})

401 Figs. 5-6 and Table 2 display the average daily CO exposure in the entire 402 near-road buildings (E_{indoor}) and that at the pedestrian level (E_{ped}) with one source or two sources as well as their ratios in all test cases. 403

404 When only one single CO source is presented on the elevated viaduct, viaduct 405 settings (V, Vb1, Vb2) could attain much smaller CO exposure both indoors and at 406 pedestrian level than those without a viaduct (Nv), accounting for only 60-75% of

total CO exposure for non-viaduct cases (Table 2). Meanwhile, the ratios of 407

408 leeward-side CO exposure to windward-side ($E_{\text{leeward1}}/E_{\text{windward1}}$) are 3.34-3.96 in 409 cases without viaduct, but this ratio in cases with viaducts are only 1.16-1.23 (Table 2). These results confirm that, viaduct settings significantly weaken the exposure ratio 410 $E_{\text{leeward1}}/E_{\text{windward1}}$ by reducing leeward-side CO exposure and raising windward-side 411 CO exposure. Furthermore, Figs. 5 and 6 also show that widening the street (from 412 413 W/H=1 to 2) could potentially reduce total daily CO exposure for all the cases. Finally, noise barriers (Vb1, Vb2) do not have significant impact on the daily CO exposure for 414 415 the viaduct settings (Figs. 5-6), however, it should be noted that they may increase the in-vehicle exposure on the viaduct although it is not the focus of current study. 416 When there exist two CO sources (both at the pedestrian and viaduct levels), the 417 418 total CO exposure $(E_{t2}=E_{indoor2}+E_{ped2})$ can be 2.67-3.33 times as great as those with a 419 single CO source $(E_{t1}=E_{indoor1}+E_{ped1})$ (Fig. 5 and Table 2), and $E_{leeward2}/E_{windward2}$ with two sources are 2.40 to 3.52, which is much greater than $E_{\text{leeward}1}/E_{\text{windward}1}(1.16 \text{ to})$ 420 1.23) with a single source (Table 2). Irrespective of the number of CO sources, $E_{indoors}$ 421 are always 6-9 times of E_{ped} since people spend much shorter time outdoors (at 422 423 pedestrian level) than indoors (Fig. 5 and Table 2), highlighting the importance of necessity to include indoor exposure to outdoor origins into the traditional 424 epidemiological pollution exposure study. 425 426 5.3. Effects of aspect ratios, viaduct and noise barriers on intake fraction 427 Personal intake fraction (*P_IF*) are depicted in Fig. 7 and Table2. For all cases 428 investigated, wider streets (or greater W/H) experience smaller P_IF . 429 For cases with the single CO source, the values of P IF for non-viaduct cases 430 431 (Nv[W/H]) are 5.21, 3.06 and 2.23 ppm respectively for W/H=1, 1.5, 2. With viaduct setting and a single elevated CO source (V[W/H]), P_IF exhibits smaller values 432 (1.46-3.59 ppm). Moreover, the introduction of noise barrier on the viaduct (Vb1[W/H] 433 and Vb2[W/H]) show similar P_{IF} as those without noise barrier (V[W/H]) but are 434 435 still much smaller than non-viaduct cases (Nv[W/H]). 436 If two CO sources are introduced in cases with viaduct settings, personal intake

437 fraction (P_IF_2) is obviously greater than the one with a single source (P_IF_1) . The

ratio of P_IF_2/P_IF_1 ranges from 1.34 to 1.66, which is only half of the CO exposure ratio $E_{t2}/E_{t1}(2.67 \text{ to } 3.33)$. It is reasonable that the intake fraction is an index normalized by the total pollutant emission rate whereas CO exposure is not. No matter one source or two sources, noise barriers (Vb1[*W*/*H*], Vb2[*W*/*H*]) seem to have little influence on personal intake fraction.

443 Finally, if it is assumed that 10 persons are living on each floor of the near-road buildings (8 floors, 160 persons), the total intake fraction (Table 2) ranges from 230 444 445 ppm to 834 ppm in cases with one source and 387 ppm to 913 ppm for cases with two sources. Our results are comparable to those in a street canyon (H/W=1.5) in the 446 central Athens urban area, Greece (371 ppm) (Habilomatis and Chaloulakou, 2015), 447 but much smaller than that in a typical deep street canyon in midtown Manhattan, 448 449 New York (3,000 ppm), where a much larger population density was studied (Zhou and Levy, 2008). In this regard, the newly developed index of personal intake fraction 450 show strong merits of independency of population density and emission rate, and is 451 452 mainly decided by urban layouts and meteorological conditions, allowing comparison 453 among different design strategies.

454

455 **5.4** *Limitations*

It should be noted that we assumed the near-road buildings are residential-type. 456 The current CO exposure evaluation possibly changes if different assumptions are 457 adopted, for example the near-road buildings are office-type or mixture of 458 459 office/residential types, or age subgroups and time patterns differ from Figs. 1b-1c. 460 Although further investigations are still required to provide practical guidelines, this 461 paper is one of the first attempts to quantify the significant source-exposure 462 relationship influenced by the key factors of street layouts, configurations of viaducts/noise barriers. The findings can provide meaningful reference for decision 463 464 makers and urban planners in formulating appropriate street and viaduct design 465 policies to reduce near-road pollutant exposures. The methodologies adopted are 466 confirmed promising and effective to assess the effects of various urban layouts and 467 meteorological conditions on vehicular human exposure in more kinds of

468 realistic/idealized urban models, for sustainable urban design purpose.

Our simulations mainly emphasize the cases with all windows open, allowing 469 most potential of indoor-outdoor air exchange, however, in the reality, the windows 470 may be closed or partly closed due to various reasons such as protection from the 471 outside noise and cold air in the winter, using air conditioners in hot summer and 472 473 desirable human behaviour among the others. The status of the windows may have significant impact on the penetration of outdoor pollutions and therefore alter the 474 475 magnitude of indoor exposure to outdoor pollutants, for example, previous studies have found the installation of air-conditioners and close of the windows in winter is 476 linked to the reduced risk to the mortality due to exposure to outdoor pollution (Chen 477 et al., 2012a,b). Future work has been planned to consider such issue by integrating 478 479 CFD and multi-zone building airflow modelling.

480

481 6. Conclusions

482 The present work is devoted to investigating the relationship of urban design and 483 CO exposure both indoors and at pedestrian level to urban vehicular CO emissions, addressing the gap between the urban planning and pollution exposure field. Validated 484 by wind tunnel data, CFD simulations are preformed to assess the effect of widening 485 street (W/H=1, 1.5, 2 as the road-side building height H=24 m) and introducing 486 viaducts and noise barriers on pollutant dispersion and vehicular human exposure 487 when realistic CO sources are defined. As a novelty, both personal intake fraction 488 (P_{IF}) and daily CO exposure (E_t) are used to quantify vehicular pollutant exposure. 489 *P* IF is a dimensionless index for overall exposure which is independent of the 490 491 pollutant emission rate, but CO exposure depends on realistic pollutant emission rates 492 and can show spatial distributions of exposure at various floor heights in near-road 493 buildings.

The simulation results show that wider streets experience smaller P_IF and CO exposure, and leeward-side buildings always attain less vehicular pollutant exposure than windward-side. In contrast to cases without a viaduct (P_IF =5.21-2.23 ppm as W/H=1, 1.5, 2), the viaduct can lead to smaller P_IF (3.25-1.46 ppm) if the single 498 pollutant source is elevated onto the viaduct level. Noise barriers on viaducts can 499 significantly raise CO concentration above the viaduct and between the barriers, but slightly reduce pollutant exposure in near-road buildings. Assuming that 10 persons 500 are living on each floor (8 floors, totalling 160 persons in two near-road buildings), 501 the total intake fractions range from 230-913 ppm, which are the same order with that 502 (371 ppm) in a street canyon (H/W=1.5) of the central Athens urban area in Greece 503 (Habilomatis and Chaloulakou, 2015), but are much smaller than that (3,000 ppm) in 504 505 a deep street canyon in midtown Manhattan, New York, with a large population density (Zhou and Levy, 2008). Because people spend most of their time indoors, 506 pollutant exposure in near-road buildings can be 5-8 times greater than that at the 507 pedestrian level of street canyons. Finally, the introduction of a viaduct tends to 508 509 reduce pollutant exposure in leeward-side buildings but slightly raises that of windward-side. If there are two CO sources (ground-level, viaduct-level) in cases 510 with a viaduct, overall CO exposure is much greater (2.80-3.33 times) than cases with 511 a single elevated source above a viaduct. The ratios of leeward-side and 512 513 windward-side exposure with two CO sources (2.40-3.52) are much greater than those with a single CO source (1.16-1.23). 514

515

516 **Conflict of interest**

517 The authors declare no competing financial interest.

518

519 Acknowledgements

520 This study was financially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation 521 of China (No 51478486) and the National Science Fund for Distinguished Young 522 Scholars (No 41425020) as well as the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central 523 Universities (No 161gzd01).

524

525 References

526 Allan, M., Richardson, G.M., Jones-Otazo, H., 2008. Probability density functions describing 24-hour inhalation rates for use in human health risk assessments: an 527

- ⁵²⁸ update and comparison. Hum. Ecol. Risk. Assess. 14, 372-391.
- Allegrini, J., Dorer, V., Carmeliet, J., 2014. Buoyant flows in street canyons:
 Validation of CFD simulations with wind tunnel measurements. Build. Environ.
 72, 63-74.
- Bennett, D., Margni, M., McKone, T., Jolliet, O., 2002. Intake fraction for multimedia
 pollutants: a tool for life cycle analysis and comparative risk assessment. Risk.
 Assess. 22, 905-918.
- Blocken, B., 2015. Computational fluid dynamics for urban physics: importance,
 scales, possibilities, limitations and ten tips and tricks towards accurate and
 reliable simulations. Build. Environ. 91, 219-245.
- Buccolieri, R., Sandberg, M., Di Sabatino, S., 2010. City breathability and its link to
 pollutant concentration distribution within urban-like geometries. Atmos.
 Environ. 44, 1894-1903.
- Buccolieri, R., Salim, S.M., Leo, L.S., Di Sabatino, S., Chan, A., Ielpo, P., de Gennaro,
 G., Gromke, C., 2011. Analysis of local scale tree-atmosphere interaction on
 pollutant concentration in idealized street canyons and application to a real urban
- 544 junction. Atmos. Environ. 45, 1702-1713.
- Cai, X.M., 2012. Effects of differential wall heating in street canyons on dispersion
 and ventilation characteristics of a passive scalar. Atmos. Environ. 51, 268-277.
- 547 Chang, C.H., Meroney, R.N., 2003. Concentration and flow distributions in urban
 548 street canyons: wind tunnel and computational data. J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodn.
 549 91, 1141-1154.
- Chau, C.K., Tu, E.Y., Chan, D.W.T., Burnett, C.J., 2002. Estimating the total exposure
 to air pollutants for different population age groups in Hong Kong. Environ. Inter.
 27, 617-630.
- Chen, C., Zhao, B., Weschler, C. 2012a. Assessing the Influence of Indoor Exposure
 to "Outdoor Ozone" on the Relationship between Ozone and Short-term
 Mortality in US Communities. Environ. Health. Persp. 120,235-240
- Chen, C., Zhao, B., Weschler, C. 2012b. Indoor Exposure to "Outdoor PM10":
 Assessing Its Influence on the Relationship Between PM10 and Short-term 19

- 558 Mortality in US Cities. Epidemiol., 23,270-278
- Chen, C., Zhao, B., Zhou, W.T., Jiang, X.Y., Tan, Z.C., 2012c. A methodology for
 predicting particle penetration factor through cracks of windows and doors for
 actual engineering application. Build. Environ. 47, 339-348.
- Cui, P.Y., Li, Z., Tao, W.Q., 2016. Wind-tunnel measurements for thermal effects on
 the air flow and pollutant dispersion through different scale urban areas. Build.
 Environ. 97, 137-151.
- Dallman, A., Magnusson, S., Britter, R., Norford, L., Entekhabi, D., Fernando, H. J. S.,
 2014. Conditions for thermal circulation in urban street canyons. Build. Environ,
 80(10),184-191.
- 568 Di Sabatino, S., Buccolieri, R., Pulvirenti, B., Bitter, R., 2007. Simulations of
- pollutant dispersion within idealised urban-type geometries with CFD andintegral models, Atmos. Environ. 41, 8316-8329.
- Di Sabatino, S., Buccolieri, R. Salizzoni, P., 2013. Recent advancements in numerical
 modelling of flow and dispersion in urban areas: a short review. Int. J. Environ.
 Pollut. 52, 172-191.
- 574 Fenger, J., 1999. Urban air quality. Atmos. Environ. 33, 4877-4900.
- Fernando, H.J.S., Zajic, D., Di Sabatino, S., Dimitrova, R., Hedquist, B., 2010. Flow,
 turbulence, and pollutant dispersion in urban atmospheres. Phys. Fluids. 22,
 1-20.
- 578 FLUENT V6.3, 2006 http://fluent.com.
- 579 Gao N.P., Niu J.L., Perino M., Heiselberg P., 2008. The airborne transmission of
- infection between flats in high-rise residential buildings: Tracer gas simulation.
 Build. Environ. 43, 1805-1817.
- Greco, S.L., Wilson, A.M., Spengler, J.D., Levy, J.I., 2007. Spatial patterns of mobile
 source particulate matter emissions-to-exposure relationships across the United
 States. Atmos. Environ. 41, 1011-1025.
- 585 Gromke, C., Blocken, B., 2015. Influence of avenue-trees on air quality at the urban
- 586 neighborhood scale. Part I: Quality assurance studies and turbulent Schmidt
- number analysis for RANS CFD simulations. Environ. Pollut. 196, 214-223.

- Gromke, C., Blocken, B., 2015. Influence of avenue-trees on air quality at the urban
 neighborhood scale. Part II: Traffic pollutant concentrations at pedestrian level.
 Environmental Pollution 196, 176-184.
- Gu, Z.L., Zhang, Y.W., Cheng, Y., Lee, S.C., 2011. Effect of uneven building layout
 on airflow and pollutant dispersion in non-uniform street canyons. Build.
 Environ.46, 2657-2665.
- Habilomatis, G., Chaloulakou, A., 2015. A CFD modelling study in an urban street
 canyon for ultrafine particles and population exposure: The intake fraction
 approach, Sci. Total. Environ. 530-531, 227-232.
- Hang, J, Li, Y.G., 2011. Age of air and air exchange efficiency in high-rise urban areas.
 Atmos. Environ. 45(31),5572-5585.
- Hang, J., Li, Y.G., Sandberg, M., Buccolieri, R., Di Sabatino, S., 2012. The influence
 of building height variability on pollutant dispersion and pedestrian ventilation in
 idealized high-rise urban areas. Build. Environ.56, 346-60.
- Hang J., Lin M., Wong D.C., Wang X., Wang B., Buccolieri R., 2016. On the
- influence of viaduct and ground heating on pollutant dispersion in 2D street
 canyons and toward single-sided ventilated buildings. Atmos. Pollut. Res., 1-16.
- Ho, Y.K., Liu, C.H., Wong, M.S., 2015. Preliminary study of the parameterisation of
 street-level ventilation in idealised two-dimensional simulations. Build. Environ.
 89, 345-355.
- Ji, W.J., Zhao, B., 2015. Estimating mortality derived from indoor exposure to
 particles of outdoor origin. PLOS. ONE. 10, e0124238.
- Jiang, Y., Alexander, D., Jenkins, H., Arthur, R., Chen, Q.Y., 2003. Natural ventilation
 in buildings: measurement in a wind tunnel and numerical simulation with
 large-eddy simulation. J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodn. 91, 331-353.
- Jin, R.Q., Hang, J., Liu, S.S., Wei, J.J., Liu, Y., Xie, J.L., Sandberg, M. 2015.
 Numerical investigation of wind-driven natural ventilation performance in a
 multi-storey hospital by coupling indoor and outdoor airflow. Indoor. Built.
 Environ. 0(0),1-22.
- Kalaiarasan, M., Balasubramanian, R., Cheong, K.W.D., Tham, K.W., 2009. Traffic-

- generated airborne particles in naturally ventilated multi-storey residential
 buildings of Singapore: Vertical distribution and potential health risks, Build.
 Environ. 44, 1493-1500.
- Kanda, M., 2006. Large-eddy simulations on the effects of surface geometry of
 building arrays on turbulent organized structures, Boundary-lay. Meteorol. 18,
 151-168.
- Kumar, P., Ketzel, M., Vardoulakis, S., Pirjola, L., Britter, R., 2011. Dynamics and
 dispersion modelling of nanoparticles from road traffic in the urban atmospheric
 environment—A review. J. Aerosol. Sci. 42, 580-603.
- Kwak, K.H., Lee, S.H., Seo, J.M., Park, S.B., Baik, J.J., 2016. Relationship between
 rooftop and on-road concentrations of traffic-related pollutants in a busy street
 canyon: Ambient wind effects. Environ. Pollut. 208, 185-197.
- Lateb, M., Meroney, R.N., Yataghene, M., Fellouah, H., Saleh, F., Boufadel, M.C.,
- 631 2016. On the use of numerical modelling for near-field pollutant dispersion in
 632 urban environments A review. Environ. Pollut. 208, 271-283.
- Li, X.X., Liu, C.H., Leung, D.Y.C., Lam, K.M., 2006. Recent progress in CFD
 modelling of wind field and pollutant transport in street canyons. Atmos. Environ.
 40, 5640-5658.
- Li, X.X., Liu, C.H., Leung, D.Y.C., 2009. Numerical investigation of pollutant
 transport characteristics inside deep urban street canyons. Atmos. Environ.
 43(15), 2410-2418.
- Li, X.X., Britter, R.E., Norford, L.K., 2015. Transport processes in and above
- two-dimensional urban street canyons under different stratification conditions:
 results from numerical simulation. Environ. Fluid. Mech. 15, 399–417.
- 11 results from numerical simulation. Environ. Fund. Meen. 15, 599–417.
- Lin, M., Hang, J., Li, Y.G., Luo, Z.W., Sandberg, M., 2014. Quantitative ventilation
 assessments of idealized urban canopy layers with various urban layouts and the
 same building packing density. Build. Environ.79, 152-167.
- Liu, C.H., Ng, C.T., Wong, C.C.C., 2015. A theory of ventilation estimate over
- 646 hypothetical urban areas. J. Hazard. Mater. 296, 9-16.

- Liu, C.H., Wong, C.C.C., 2014. On the pollutant removal, dispersion, and entrainment
 over two-dimensional idealized street canyons. Atmos. Res. 135-136,128-142.
- Luo, Z.W., Li, Y.G., Nazaroff, W.W., 2010. Intake fraction of nonreactive motor
 vehicle exhaust in Hong Kong. Atmos. Environ. 44, 1913-1918.
- Luo, Z.W., Li, Y.G., 2011. Passive urban ventilation by combined buoyancy-driven
 slope flow and wall flow: Parametric CFD studies on idealized city models.
 Atmos. Environ. 45, 5946-5956.
- Marshall, J.D., Teoh, S.K., Nazaroff, W.W., 2005. Intake fraction of nonreactive
 vehicle emissions in US urban areas. Atmos. Environ. 39, 1363-1371.
- Meroney, R.N, Pavageau, M., Rafailidis, S., Schatzmann, M., 1996. Study of line
- source characteristics for 2-D physical modelling of pollutant dispersion in street
 canyons. J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodn. 62, 37-56.
- Meroney, R.N., 2016. Ten questions concerning hybrid computational/physical model
 simulation of wind flow in the built environment. Build. Environ. 96,12-21.
- Nazarian, N., Kleissl, J., 2016. Realistic solar heating in urban areas: Air exchange
 and street-canyon ventilation. Build. Environ. 95, 75-93.
- Nazaroff, W.W., 2008. Inhalation intake fraction of pollutants from episodic indoor
 emissions. Build. Environ. 43, 269-277.
- Ng, W., Chau, C., 2014. A modelling investigation of the impact of street and building
- configurations on personal air pollutant exposure in isolated deep urban canyons,
 Sci. Total. Environ. 468-469, 429-448.
- Oke, T.R., 1988. Street design and urban canopy layer climate. Energ. Buildings. 11,
 103-113.
- Pu, Y.C., Yang, C., 2014. Estimating urban roadside emissions with an atmospheric
 dispersion model based on in-field measurements. Environ. Pollut. 192,300-307.
- Quang, T.N., He, C., Morawska, L., Knibbs, L.D., Falk, M., 2012. Vertical particle
 concentration profiles around urban office buildings. Atmos. Chem. Phys. 12,
 5017-5030.
- Ramponi, R., Blocken, B., 2012. CFD simulation of cross-ventilation for a generic
 isolated building: impact of computational parameters. Build. Environ. 53,34-48.

- 677 Ramponi, R., Blocken, B., de Coo, L.B., Janssen, W.D., 2015. CFD simulation of
- outdoor ventilation of generic urban configurations with different urban densitiesand equal and unequal street widths. Build. Environ. 92, 152-166.
- Snyder, W.H., 1972. Similarity criteria for the application of fluid models to the study
 of air pollution meteorology. Bound-Lay. Meteorol. 3,113-134.
- Takano, Y., Moonen, P., 2013. On the influence of roof shape on flow and dispersion
 in an urban street canyon. J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodyn. 123, 107-120.
- Thaker, P., Gokhale, S., 2016. The impact of traffic-flow patterns on air quality in
 urban street canyons. Environ. Pollut. 208,161-169.
- Tominaga, Y., Stathopoulos, T., 2013. CFD simulation of near-field pollutant
- dispersion in the urban environment: a review of current modeling techniques.Atmos. Environ. 79, 716-730.
- van Hooff, T., Blocken, B. 2010. On the effect of wind direction and urban
 surroundings on natural ventilation of a large semi-enclosed stadium. Comput.
 Fluids. 39, 1146-1155.
- van Hooff, T., Blocken, B. 2013. CFD evaluation of natural ventilation of indoor
 environments by the concentration decay method: CO2 gas dispersion from a
 semi-enclosed stadium. Build. Environ. 61,1-17.
- Vardoulakis, S., Fisher, B.E.A., Pericleous, K., Gonzalez-Flesca, N., 2003. Modelling
 air quality in street canyons: a review. Atmos. Environ. 37, 155-182.
- Wang, X.X., Li, Y.G., 2016. Predicting urban heat island circulation using CFD. Build.
 Environ. 99, 82-97.
- Kia, L., Shao, Y., 2005. Modelling of traffic flow and air pollution emission withapplication to Hong Kong Island. Environ. Model. Soft. 20,1175-1188.
- Xie, X.X., Huang, Z., Wang, J.S., 2006. The impact of urban street layout on local
 atmospheric environment. Build. Environ. 41,1352-1363.
- Yakhot, V., Orszag S.A., 1986. Renormalization group analysis of turbulence. I. Basic
 theory. J. Sci. Comput. 3-51.
- Yang, F., Qian, F., Lau, S.S.Y., 2013. Urban form and density as indicators for
- summertime outdoor ventilation potential: A case study on high-rise housing in

- 707 Shanghai. Build. Environ. 70, 122-137.
- Yang, L.N., Li, Y.G., 2009. City ventilation of Hong Kong at no-wind conditions,
 Atmos. Environ. 43, 3111-3121.
- Yang, X.Y., Li, Y.G., 2015. The impact of building density and building height
 heterogeneity on average urban albedo and street surface temperature. Build.
 Environ. 90, 146-156.
- Yassin, M.F., 2013. Numerical modelling on air quality in an urban environment with
 changes of the aspect ratio and wind direction. Environ. Sci. Pollut. R. 20,
 3975-3988.
- 716 Yoshie, R., Mochida, A., Tominaga, Y., Kataoka, H., Harimoto, K., Nozu, T.,
- 717 Shirasawa, T., 2007. Cooperative project for CFD prediction of pedestrian wind
- environment in the Architectural Institute of Japan. J. Wind. Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.
 95, 1551-1578.
- Zhang, Y.W., Gu, Z.L., Cheng, Y., Lee, S.C., 2011. Effect of real-time boundary wind
 conditions on the air flow and pollutant dispersion in an urban street

canyon-Large eddy simulations. Atmos. Environ. 45,3352-3359.

723 Zhang, Y.W., Gu, Z.L., 2013. Air quality by urban design. Nat. Geosci. 6, 506.

- Zhang, Y., Kwok, K. C. S., Liu, X. R., Niu, J. L. 2015. Characteristics of air pollutant
 dispersion around a high-rise building. Environ. Pollut. 204, 280-288.
- Zhong, J., Cai, X., Bloss, W.J., 2015. Modelling the dispersion and transport of
 reactive pollutants in a deep urban street canyon: Using large-eddy simulation,
 Environ. Pollut. 200, 42-52.
- Zhou, B., Zhao, B., Guo, X.F., Chen, R.J., Kan, H.D., 2013. Investigating the
 geographical heterogeneity in PM10-mortality associations in the China Air
 Pollution and Health Effects Study (CAPES): A potential role of indoor exposure
 to PM10 of outdoor origin. Atmos. Environ. 75, 217-223.
- Zhou, Y., Levy, J.I., 2008. The impact of urban street canyons on population exposure
 to traffic-related primary pollutants. Atmos. Environ. 42,3087-3098.
- 735
- 736

738Table 1. Summary of test cases investigated by CFD simulations.739Table 2. Daily CO exposure, personal intake fraction $(P_{-}IF)$ and total intake fraction740 (IF) in Cases $Nv[W/H]$, $V[W/H]$ and $Vb2[W/H]$.741742742Figure list743Fig. 1. CFD domain and model descriptions with or without viaduct.744Fig. 2. Streamline and velocity in the lateral centre plane in Cases $Nv[1]$, $Nv[2]$,745 $Vb2[1]$, $Vb2[2]$.746Fig. 3. Concentration in the lateral centre plane in Cases $Nv[1]$, $Nv[2]$, $V[1]$, $Vb2[1]$, $Vb2[1]$, $Vb2[2]$ with the single CO source or two CO sources.748Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases $Nv[W/H]$,749 $V[W/H]$ and $Vb2[W/H]$ with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases $Nv[W/H]$, $V[W/H]$ 751and $Vb2[W/H]$.752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_i in Cases $Nv[W/H]$, $V[W/H]$ and $Vb2[W/H]$ with one source or two sources.754755754 Appendix 755 Appendix 756Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) $x=-0.04H$ and $x=0.5H$ for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) $x=-1.04H$ and $x=0.5H$ for vertical lines at the centre secti	737	Table list
740(<i>IF</i>) in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>].741742Figure list743Fig. 1. CFD domain and model descriptions with or without viaduct.744Fig. 2. Streamline and velocity in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2],745Vb2[1], Vb2[2].746Fig. 3. Concentration in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2], V[1], V[2],747Vb2[1], Vb2[2] with the single CO source or two CO sources.748Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>],749V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>]751and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>].752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_i in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with one source or two sources.754755754 Appendix 755Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements.760Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. (c) <i>x</i> =1.04 <i>H</i> and <i>x</i> =0.5 <i>H</i> for leeward761or windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) <i>x</i> =1.04 <i>H</i> and <i>x</i> =0.5 <i>H</i> for leeward	738	Table 1. Summary of test cases investigated by CFD simulations.
741742Figure list743Fig. 1. CFD domain and model descriptions with or without viaduct.744Fig. 2. Streamline and velocity in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2],745Vb2[1], Vb2[2].746Fig. 3. Concentration in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2], V[1], V[2],747Vb2[1], Vb2[2] with the single CO source or two CO sources.748Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases Nv[W/H],749V[W/H] and Vb2[W/H] with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[W/H], V[W/H]751and Vb2[W/H].752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_i in Cases Nv[W/H], V[W/H] and Vb2[W/H] with753one source or two sources.754755754Appendix755Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four757microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census758data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along761vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x =-0.04H and x =0.5H for leavard	739	Table 2. Daily CO exposure, personal intake fraction (P_{IF}) and total intake fraction
742Figure list743Fig. 1. CFD domain and model descriptions with or without viaduct.744Fig. 2. Streamline and velocity in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2],745Vb2[1], Vb2[2].746Fig. 3. Concentration in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2], V[1], V[2],747Vb2[1], Vb2[2] with the single CO source or two CO sources.748Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>],749V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with751and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>].752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_i in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with753one source or two sources.754Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four755Appendix756Fig. A2. (a) Birds' cyc view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements.757Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along761vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x =-0.04 <i>H</i> and x =0.5 <i>H</i> 762fig. A3. (a) Single-sided ventilation case, (c) x =1.04 <i>H</i> and x =0.5 <i>H</i> for leavant	740	(<i>IF</i>) in Cases Nv[W/H], V[W/H] and Vb2[W/H].
743Fig. 1. CFD domain and model descriptions with or without viaduct.744Fig. 2. Streamline and velocity in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2],745Vb2[1], Vb2[2].746Fig. 3. Concentration in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2], V[1], V[2],747Vb2[1], Vb2[2] with the single CO source or two CO sources.748Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>],749 $V[W/H]$ and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>]751and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>].752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_t in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with753one source or two sources.754755754Appendix755Appendix756Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four757microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census758data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements.760Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{nef}$ along761vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i> =-0.04 <i>H</i> and <i>x</i> =0.5 <i>H</i> for leeward	741	
744Fig. 2. Streamline and velocity in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2], Vb2[1], Vb2[2].745Fig. 3. Concentration in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2], V[1], V[2], Vb2[1], Vb2[2] with the single CO source or two CO sources.747Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.749Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>].752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_i in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with one source or two sources.754755Appendix756Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements.760Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i> =-0.04 <i>H</i> and <i>x</i> =0.5 <i>H</i> for leeward	742	Figure list
745Vb2[1], Vb2[2].746Fig. 3. Concentration in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2], V[1], V[2],747Vb2[1], Vb2[2] with the single CO source or two CO sources.748Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>],749 $V[W/H]$ and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>]751and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>].752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_t in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with753one source or two sources.754755754755755Appendix756Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four757microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census758data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along761vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x =-0.04 <i>H</i> and x =0.5 <i>H</i> for leeward	743	Fig. 1. CFD domain and model descriptions with or without viaduct.
Fig. 3. Concentration in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2], V[1], V[2],747Vb2[1], Vb2[2] with the single CO source or two CO sources.748Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>],749 $V[W/H]$ and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>]751and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>].752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_t in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with753one source or two sources.754755754Appendix755Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four756rig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four757microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census758data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along760rig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along761vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) $x=-0.04H$ and $x=0.5H$ 762for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) $x=1.04H$ and $x=0.5H$ for leeward	744	Fig. 2. Streamline and velocity in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2],
747Vb2[1], Vb2[2] with the single CO source or two CO sources.748Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>],749 $V[W/H]$ and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>]751and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>].752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_t in Cases Nv[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>] with753one source or two sources.754755754Appendix755Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four757microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census758data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along761vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x=-0.04H and x=0.5H762for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) $x=1.04H$ and $x=0.5H$ for leeward	745	Vb2[1], Vb2[2].
748Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases $Nv[W/H]$, $V[W/H]$ and $Vb2[W/H]$ with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases $Nv[W/H]$, $V[W/H]$ and $Vb2[W/H]$.751and $Vb2[W/H]$.752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_t in Cases $Nv[W/H]$, $V[W/H]$ and $Vb2[W/H]$ with one source or two sources.754755Appendix756Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements.760Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x =-0.04H and x =0.5H for leeward	746	Fig. 3. Concentration in the lateral centre plane in Cases Nv[1], Nv[2], V[1], V[2],
749 $V[W/H]$ and $Vb2[W/H]$ with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.750Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases $Nv[W/H]$, $V[W/H]$ 751and $Vb2[W/H]$.752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_t in Cases $Nv[W/H]$, $V[W/H]$ and $Vb2[W/H]$ with753one source or two sources.754755755 Appendix 756Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four757microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census758data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements.760Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along761vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x =-0.04H and x =0.5H762for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) x =1.04H and x =0.5H for leeward	747	Vb2[1], Vb2[2] with the single CO source or two CO sources.
 Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of <i>E</i>_{indoor}, <i>E</i>_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[<i>W</i>/<i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i>/<i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i>/<i>H</i>]. Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure <i>E</i>_t in Cases Nv[<i>W</i>/<i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i>/<i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i>/<i>H</i>] with one source or two sources. Appendix Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010). Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements. Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of <i>U</i>(<i>z</i>)/<i>U_{ref} along</i> vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i>=-0.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for leeward 	748	Fig. 4. Indoor daily CO exposure at different floors in some example cases $Nv[W/H]$,
751and Vb2[W/H].752Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_t in Cases Nv[W/H], V[W/H] and Vb2[W/H] with753one source or two sources.754755755 Appendix 756Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four757microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census758data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements.760Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along761vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x=-0.04H and x=0.5H762for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) x=1.04H and x=0.5H for leeward	749	V[W/H] and $Vb2[W/H]$ with the single pollutant source or with two CO sources.
 Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure <i>E</i>t in Cases Nv[<i>W</i>/<i>H</i>], V[<i>W</i>/<i>H</i>] and Vb2[<i>W</i>/<i>H</i>] with one source or two sources. Appendix Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010). Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements. Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of <i>U</i>(<i>z</i>)/<i>U</i>_{ref} along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i>=-0.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for leeward for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) <i>x</i>=1.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for leeward 	750	Fig. 5. Daily CO exposure of E_{indoor} , E_{ped} and their ratios in Cases Nv[W/H], V[W/H]
 one source or two sources. Appendix Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010). Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements. Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of <i>U(z)/U_{ref}</i> along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i>=-0.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for leeward for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) <i>x</i>=1.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for leeward 	751	and Vb2[<i>W</i> / <i>H</i>].
 Appendix Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010). Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements. Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of <i>U(z)/U_{ref}</i> along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i>=-0.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) <i>x</i>=1.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for leeward 	752	Fig. 6. Overall daily CO exposure E_t in Cases Nv[W/H], V[W/H] and Vb2[W/H] with
 Appendix Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010). Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements. Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of <i>U(z)/U_{ref}</i> along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i>=-0.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) <i>x</i>=1.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for leeward 	753	one source or two sources.
 Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010). Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements. Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of <i>U(z)/U_{ref}</i> along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i>=-0.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) <i>x</i>=1.04<i>H</i> and <i>x</i>=0.5<i>H</i> for leeward 	754	
microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010). Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements. Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i> =-0.04 <i>H</i> and <i>x</i> =0.5 <i>H</i> for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) <i>x</i> =1.04 <i>H</i> and <i>x</i> =0.5 <i>H</i> for leeward	755	Appendix
758data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).759Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements.760Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along761vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x=-0.04H and x=0.5H762for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) x=1.04H and x=0.5H for leeward	756	Fig. A1. (a) Time patterns/breathing rate for various age subgroups in four
Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements. Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) <i>x</i> =-0.04 <i>H</i> and <i>x</i> =0.5 <i>H</i> for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) <i>x</i> =1.04 <i>H</i> and <i>x</i> =0.5 <i>H</i> for leeward	757	microenvironments (Chau et al., 2002; Allan et al., 2008), (b) the 2004 census
Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x =-0.04 H and x =0.5 H for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) x =1.04 H and x =0.5 H for leeward	758	data of Hong Kong population in Luo et al. (2010).
761 vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) x =-0.04 H and x =0.5 H 762 for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) x =1.04 H and x =0.5 H for leeward	759	Fig. A2. (a) Birds' eye view in cases with viaduct, (b) CFD grid arrangements.
for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) $x=1.04H$ and $x=0.5H$ for leeward	760	Fig. A3. (a) CFD setup in the validation case. Vertical profiles of $U(z)/U_{ref}$ along
	761	vertical lines at the centre section of building model at (b) $x=-0.04H$ and $x=0.5H$
763single-sided ventilation case.	762	for windward single-sided ventilation case, (c) $x=1.04H$ and $x=0.5H$ for leeward
	763	single-sided ventilation case.