

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

Article

Accepted Version

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

Moss, J. L., Doick, K. J., Smith, S. and Shahrestani, M. (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: <https://doi.org/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

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 [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

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

Joseph L. Moss¹, Kieron J. Doick¹, Stefan Smith², Mehdi Shahrestani²

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

² School of the Built Environment
University of Reading
Whiteknights, Reading RG6 6AH

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

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

57
58
59 **8 Abstract**
60

61 9 Trees provide important ecosystem services to urban human society. Their absence can lead to more
62 10 pronounced environmental and social consequences, for example the urban heat island effect.
63 11 Evapotranspiration (E_t) from trees reduces air temperature in the urban microclimate by converting
64 12 sensible heat to latent heat. Quantification and valuation of the ecosystem services provided by urban
65 13 trees is important for improving cost-benefit evaluations in support of protecting tree planting and
66 14 maintenance budgets and, thus, for building climate change resilience into cities. Inclusion of E_t cooling
67 15 could improve ecosystem service valuation models by producing a more complete picture of the
68 16 benefits that urban trees provide to society.
69 17

70 18 This study explores two approaches for evaluating climate regulation as an ecosystem service of urban
71 19 trees. Firstly, an enthalpy-based approach was adopted to value latent heat of evaporation from tree
72 20 transpiration (in three case study urban forests) by equating it to an equivalent service from an active
73 21 direct evaporative cooling system. Secondly, energy savings to air-conditioned buildings was modelled
74 22 using TRNSYS and TRNFLOW simulation programs with and without air pre-cooled and humidified by
75 23 urban trees.
76 24

77 25 Trees are shown to provide substantial urban cooling with an annual valuation of £84 m estimated using
78 26 the enthalpy-based approach, or ranging from £2.1 m to £22 m using TRNSYS and TRNFLOW dynamic
79 27 simulation programs; both for inner London case study. The latter savings arose from a modelled 1.28 –
80 28 13.4% reduction in air-conditioning unit energy consumption. Challenges around assumptions of
81 29 homogeneity in both built form and urban forest canopy effects are discussed.
82 30

83 31 The case study examples highlighted differences in E_t cooling between tree species, with *Castanea*
84 32 *sativa*, *Prunus avium*, *Quercus petraea*, *Platanus hybrida* and *Fagus sylvatica* typically providing more E_t
85 33 cooling than any of the other tree species commonly found in urban forests. The research highlighted a
86 34 shortage of published E_t data, particularly for urban environments.
87 35

88 36 **Key Words:**

89 37 Ecosystem services; Evapotranspiration; Urban cooling; Heat comfort; Bowen ratio.
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112

113
114
115 **38 Introduction**
116

117 39 Trees provide many benefits to people (Davies et al., 2017) and these have been collectively termed as
118 40 ecosystem services (ES) (Reid et al., 2005). Urban environments typically have considerably fewer trees
119 41 than rural environments, meaning that urban populations may have less access to the ES that trees
120 42 provide. In dense urban environments these ES can be of significant importance, for example helping to
121 43 mitigate the urban heat island (UHI) effect. This effect occurs where built-up areas absorb more heat
122 44 energy than surrounding rural environments and together with the high density energy fluxes from
123 45 human activity lead to pronounced increases in ambient surface and air temperature (Arnfield, 2003).
124 46 UHIs contribute to human heat stress and the plethora of associated health problems: for example,
125 47 Health Protection Agency (2012) reported that heat-related mortality already accounted for 2,000
126 48 premature deaths in the UK and forecast this to increase to around 10,800 premature deaths by 2080.
127 49 Mora et al. (2017) reviewing the international literature from 1980 to 2014 found 783 cases of heat-
128 50 related excess human mortality from 164 cities in 36 countries.
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136

137 51
138 52 There is a positive correlation between locations that suffer from UHI and those that lack
139 53 evapotranspiring surfaces (Ca et al., 1998; Leuzinger et al., 2010) and the inclusion of green
140 54 infrastructure in urban environments has been identified as an effective way to mitigate UHI through
141 55 evapotranspiration (E_t) (Gill et al., 2008; Ballinasa and Barradasa, 2015; Saaroni, et al., 2018). E_t
142 56 associated with trees results in the release of water vapour from leaves into the air (Kozłowski and
143 57 Pallardy, 1997) that reduces the surrounding ambient air temperature through an evaporative cooling
144 58 process (Akbari, 2002). Trees and vegetation growing on or in close proximity to buildings also provide
145 59 multiple other benefits (Davies et al., 2017), including supporting biodiversity and reducing air pollutant
146 60 loading (Varghese et al., 2015). However, while urban forests (herein defined as “all the trees in the
147 61 urban realm” Davies et al., 2017) in temperate climates can produce a net cooling benefit by E_t , not all
148 62 trees offer the same level of cooling: canopy size and leaf amount are important determinants of species
149 63 and cultivar differences in water use (Stratópoulos et al., 2018), trees with high leaf area and
150 64 transpiration rate are the most effective in reducing air temperatures (Gillner et al., 2015; Rahman et al.,
151 65 2018) and urban forests vary in their size and species and age-class composition (UFWAC, 2016).
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159

160 66
161 67 Under a changing climate, cooling loads in buildings are expected to increase in the future (Jenkins et al.,
162 68 2008). Mechanical cooling requirements can exacerbate the UHI effect by heat ejection to the
163 69 surrounding environment, adding to cooling loads across a city (Masson et al., 2014). Energy demand for
164
165
166
167
168

169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224

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

77
78 i-Tree Eco is a tool within the i-Tree suite of peer-reviewed software tools (i-Tree, 2017). It is based on
79 the UFORE (Urban Forest Effects) methods (Nowak and Crane, 1998) and has been developed to support
80 urban forest management through the quantification of urban forest characteristics, and analysis and
81 valuation of the ES that they provide (i-Tree, 2017). Climate regulation from E_t cooling is an ES not
82 currently included in i-Tree Eco. However, the UFORE method has the capability to model leaf area at
83 the species level and total canopy surface area for a given location (Nowak and Crane, 2003). Latent
84 heat transfer across an urban forest could be calculated if appropriate E_t rates were considered. Indeed,
85 E_t cooling is likely to be substantial on a city-wide scale (Gillner *et al.*, 2015) given maximum
86 transpiration rates for individual trees can be many hundreds of litres per day (Hsieh *et al.*, 2018;
87 Stratópoulos *et al.*, 2018).

88
89 The quantification and valuation of ES is of growing international interest within a context of natural
90 capital accounting (NCA) (UN *et al.*, 2012). Indeed, the UK government is interested in developing
91 accounts for a broad range of UKNEA habitats including woodland and urban (Defra/ONS, 2017). A
92 scoping study to develop an urban NCA for the UK incorporated *inter alia* the climate regulation ES, with
93 valuation based upon both the ISO standard 7243 estimates of productivity loss at different outdoor
94 temperatures and an i-Tree Eco based estimation of building energy use avoided due to the presence of
95 urban trees (Eftec, 2017). The former determines the loss in productivity with and without air
96 temperature reduction by urban green infrastructure to value the contribution of this ES in terms of
97 maintaining productivity and notes methodological limitations of an assumed average cooling effect of
98 parks and woodland. The latter considers the impact of tree shade and shelter on summer cooling
99 energy (avoided use of air conditioning) as well as winter warming (reduced requirement for electrical
100 warming). This approach is limited however by the lack of adaptation of the i-Tree module for UK
101 building types. Both approaches excluded the saving related to the non-emission of CO₂. 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 value 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 Köppen-
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 $0.058 \pm 0.012 g/m^2/s$ (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

337
338
339 149 and total leaf area values, as reported by i-Tree Eco, were used in conjunction with Table 1 E_t R values to
340
341 150 provide a total E_t for each case study urban forest. Total E_t was determined using the species mean E_t R
342
343 151 where possible; where a species mean was not available, the genus average E_t R was adopted. Where
344
345 152 neither species nor genus data were available, the all-data mean E_t R was used (Table 1). E_t was
346
347 153 normalised across the case studies according to land surface area (E_t/km^2 ; assuming an even distribution
348
349 154 of trees).

350
351 156 The rate of water mass transfer, \dot{m} (g/m²/s), for E_t was converted into rate of thermal energy absorbed,
352
353 157 \dot{q} (kJ/m²/s), from the surrounding environment using Eq. 1:

$$\dot{q} = \dot{m} \times \lambda_{vH_2O} \quad (1)$$

354
355 159
356
357 160
358 161 Where λ_{vH_2O} is the latent heat of vapourisation of water ($\lambda_{vH_2O} = 2.456$ kJ/g at 292 K and atmospheric
359
360 162 pressure; Wagner and Pruss, 2002). Calculating energy transfer rate allowed E_t to be related to cooling
361
362 163 as a measure of power (i.e. E_t power). For modelling purposes, it was assumed that tree leaves had zero
363
364 164 heat capacity (Ca *et al.*, 1999).

365
366 166 The distribution of heat from E_t cooling can be generally characterised by the Bowen ratio (B)
367
368 167 (Santamouris, 2013). Guided by Taha (1997), the Bowen ratios of 'typical' UK urban and wooded areas
369
370 168 were used to apply an adjustment factor of $0.5 \cdot (B_{\text{tree}} + 1 / B_{\text{urban}} + 1)$ to calculated E_t energy values. This
371
372 169 generalised adjustment factor does not consider local spatial factors, but provides an estimate for the
373
374 170 amount of energy that equates to cooling, i.e. the effective E_t cooling potential.

375
376 172 A common method of assigning a monetary value to ES is to use a comparative service as an economic
377
378 173 benchmark (Defra/ONS, 2017). Following the methodology of Rahman *et al.* (2011), an economic
379
380 174 assessment of E_t cooling from trees was made through direct comparison with the cost to provide
381
382 175 equivalent cooling from operating an air conditioning (A/C) unit. An active direct evaporative cooling
383
384 176 system (DEC) was used for comparison because the cooling mechanism is the same as E_t from trees
385
386 177 (Amer *et al.*, 2015). A mid-sized evaporative cooler was selected (model ECP07, EcoCooling Ltd,
387
388 178 www.ecocooling.org). This model provides 35 kW of cooling from 1.5 kW of electricity and a flow rate
389
390 179 range 10-14.5 m³/hr. The B-adjusted E_t cooling power of the trees was divided by the rated cooling
391
392 180 capacity of the evaporative cooler (35 kW) to give the number of A/C units required to deliver an

393
394
395 181 equivalent amount of cooling as the three case study urban forests. This value was then multiplied by
396
397 182 electricity consumption of the cooler (1.5 kW) and an electricity unit price of 0.14 £/kWh (UK average
398 183 electricity variable unit 'Direct Debit' and 'Prepayment' tariffs for 2017; BEIS, 2018) to provide an
400 184 equivalent cooling value (£/hr). The comparison is made with the operational cost of A/C units and does
401 185 not include purchasing or maintenance costs.

403 186
404 187 *The potential energy impact of evapotranspiration on building cooling systems*

406 188 The direct comparison method described above is limited conceptually as A/C units are not designed for
407 189 outdoor use. However, the results provide useful comparison to previous work. A more realistic, though
408 190 novel, approach is to recognise that trees are cooling the outdoor ambient air, which in turn impacts the
410 191 cooling load placed on A/C systems. Through building energy modelling the energy dynamics and local
412 192 spatial factors of different types of building structures found in UK cities were used to assess the impact
413 193 of E_t cooling by urban trees on building energy consumption. This approach provided a practical scenario
415 194 that is transferable to building energy cost savings.

417 195
418 196 *Modelling energy impact on a single building and a street canyon*

420 197 To evaluate how trees cooling the surrounding environment impacts on a building's cooling requirement
421 198 a dynamic thermal energy model: TRaNsient SYstems Simulation package (TRNSYS) (TRNSYS, 2010) with
422 199 airflow analysis by TRNFLOW (TRNFLOW, 2009), was employed to capture both the indoor and outdoor
424 200 processes. TRNSYS is a reference software and one of the listed simulation programs in the
426 201 European/British Standard on thermal solar systems and components: BS/EN12977 (2018). TRNSYS is a
427 202 recognised simulation package within the 'Best Directory of Building Energy Software Tools' (formerly
429 203 hosted by US Dept. of Energy) and has been tested and validated by International Energy Agency (IEA;
430 204 under Task 34/43). The IEA comprehensive study demonstrated the robustness of the algorithms used in
432 205 the TRNSYS (Loutzenhiser et al., 2007; Neymark et al., 2008). In addition, the software has been
433 206 successfully used over multiple decades in a broad range of built environment research (Bradley and
435 207 Utzinger, 2007; Shahrestani et al., 2013; Shahrestani et al., 2017; Antoniadis and Martinopoulos, 2018;
437 208 Stritih et al., 2018).

438 209
439 210 While, ultimately, the cooling load of a building is determined by the many different physical attributes
441 211 of the indoor and outdoor environment (i.e. solar gains, humidity, surface temperatures, air
443 212 temperature, wind speed, heat capacity and orientation), the indoor air conditions control the level of
444 213 cooling demand and the outdoor air temperature influences the energy requirement to meet that

449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504

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 homogeneously 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

505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560


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

$$E_t = \begin{cases} (0.00022 (t - 13)^4 - 0.03 (t - 13)^2 + 1) \times E_{t_{max}} & 6 \leq t < 21 \\ 0 & t < 6 \text{ or } t \geq 21 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

252 where $E_{t_{max}}$ is the maximum E_t for the day and t is time, in 24 hr clock system.

253
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



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

561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616

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 km²,
282 but the lowest normalised leaf area (Table 3). Outer London had fewer trees/km² 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 H₂O/tree/hr (Table 3). Total
285 transpiration varied from 1,420 kg H₂O/s in Wrexham to 44,900 kg H₂O/s in Outer London (Table 3).
286 When normalised by leaf area or case study area E_t ranged 47.4-54.1 kg H₂O/s/km² (by leaf area, Table
287 3) or 30.4-37.7 kg H₂O/s/km² (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.

617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672

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).

673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728

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*

729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784

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).

785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840

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).

841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896

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**

897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952

461
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 CO₂ 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-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/annual-domestic-energy-price-statistics)
481 [energy-price-statistics](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/annual-domestic-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.

- 953
954
955 496 BS/EN12977 (2018). Thermal solar systems and components - Custom built systems. London:
956 497 British/European Standard.
- 958 498 Ca, V. T., Asaeda, T. and Abu, E. M. (1998). Reductions in air conditioning energy caused by a nearby
959 499 park. *Energy and Buildings*, 29(1), 83–92.
- 961 500 Ca, V. T., Asaeda, T. and Ashie, Y. (1999). Development of a numerical model for the evaluation of the
962 501 urban thermal environment. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, 81(1-3), 181–
963 502 196.
- 965 503 Cóstola, D., Blocken, B. and Hensen, J. L. M. (2009). Overview of pressure coefficient data in building
966 504 energy simulation and airflow network programs. *Building and Environment*, 44(10), 2027–2036.
- 968 505 Davies, H.J., Doick, K.J., Handley, P., O'Brien, L. and Wilson, J. (2017). *Delivery of Ecosystem Services by*
969 506 *Urban Forests*. Forestry Commission Research Report 26. Forestry Commission, Edinburgh, 34pp.
- 971 507 Day, A. R., Jones, P. G. and Maidment, G. G. (2009). Forecasting future cooling demand in London.
972 508 *Energy and Buildings*, 41 (9), 942–948.
- 974 509 Defra/ONS (2017). Principles of Natural Capital Accounting.
975 510 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/methodologies/principlesofnaturalcapitalac](https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/methodologies/principlesofnaturalcapitalaccounting)
976 511 [counting](https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/environmentalaccounts/methodologies/principlesofnaturalcapitalaccounting)
- 978 512 Doick, K.J., Hutchings, T.R. (2013). Air temperature regulation by urban trees and green infrastructure.
979 513 Research note 12 (FCRN012). Forestry Commission, Edinburgh, 10pp.
- 981 514 Eftec (2017). A study to scope and develop urban natural capital accounts for the UK. A report for Defra.
982 515 (June 2017). Eftec, London. 128pp. Available online from:
983 516 [http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=14143_UrbanNC_Account_FinalReportAugust201](http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=14143_UrbanNC_Account_FinalReportAugust2017.pdf)
984 517 [7.pdf](http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=14143_UrbanNC_Account_FinalReportAugust2017.pdf). Accessed: 23rd May, 2018.
- 986 518 Fini, A., Ferrini, F., Frangi, P., Amoroso, G. and Piatti, R. (2009). Withholding irrigation during the
987 519 establishment phase affected growth and physiology of Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*) and linden
988 520 (*Tilla spp.*). *Arboriculture and Urban Forestry*, 35 (5), 241–251.
- 990 521 Gerosa, G., Mereu, S., Finco, A. and Marzuoli, R. (2012). Stomatal Conductance Modeling to Estimate the
991 522 Evapotranspiration of Natural and Agricultural Ecosystems. Chapter 18. In: *Evapotranspiration - Remote*
992 523 *Sensing and Modeling*. Irmak, A. (Ed.). 403–420.
- 994 524 Gill, S. E., Handley, J. F., Ennos, A. R., Pauleit, S., Theuray, N. and Lindley, S. J. (2008). Characterising the
995 525 urban environment of UK cities and towns: A template for landscape planning. *Landscape and Urban*
996 526 *Planning*, 87(3), 210–222.
- 998 527 Gill, S. E., Rahman, M. A., Handley, J. F. and Ennos, A. R. (2013). Modelling water stress to urban amenity
999 528 grass in Manchester UK under climate change and its potential impacts in reducing urban cooling. *Urban*
1000 529 *Forestry and Urban Greening*, 12(3), 350–358.
- 1002 530 Gillner, S., Vogt, J., Tharang, A., Dettmann, S. and Roloff, A. (2015). Role of street trees in mitigating
1003 531 effects of heat and drought at highly sealed urban sites. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 143, 33–42.

1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064

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

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

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

538 Heath, J. (1998). Stomata of trees growing in CO₂-enriched air show reduced sensitivity to vapour
539 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
541 canopy manipulations on growth and water use of London plane (*Platanus x acerifolia*) trees. *Plant and*
542 *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
544 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
546 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*
548 *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
551 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
553 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
556 evapotranspiration and soil moisture: A practical approach for the Netherlands. *Journal of Hydrology*,
557 349(3-4), 257-267.

558 Leuzinger, S., Vogt, R. and Körner, C. (2010). Tree surface temperature in an urban environment.
559 *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
561 Design Summer Years for the UK. *Building Services Engineering Research and Technology*, 27(4), 311-
562 325.

563 Loridan, T. and Grimmond, C. S. B. (2012) Characterization of energy flux partitioning in urban
564 environments: links with surface seasonal properties. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*,
565 51 (2), 219-241.

1065
1066
1067 566 Loutzenhiser, P., Manz, H. and Maxwell, G. (2007). Empirical validations of shading/daylighting/load
1068 567 interactions in building energy simulation tools. Report for the International Energy Agency's SHC Task
1069 568 34.
1070
1071 569 Masson, V., Marchadier, C., Adolphe, L., Aguejedad, R., Avner, P., Bonhomme, M., Bretagne, G., Briottet,
1072 570 X., Bueno, B., de Munck, C., Doukari, O., Hallegatte, S., Hidalgo, J., Houet, T., Le Bras, J., Lemonsu, A.,
1073 571 Long, N., Moine, M. P., Morel, T., Nologues, L., Pigeon, G., Salagnac, J. L., Viguié, V. and Zibouche, K.
1074 572 (2014). Adapting cities to climate change: A systemic modelling approach. *Urban Climatology*, 10, 407-
1075 573 429.
1076
1077 574 Mora, C., Dousset, B., Caldwell, I. R., Powell, F.E., Geronimo, R.C., Bielecki, C.R., Counsell, C.W.W,
1078 575 Dietrich, B.S., Johnston, E.T., Louis, L.V., Lucas, M.P., McKenzie, M.M., Shea, A.G., Tseng, H.,
1079 576 Giambelluca, T.W., Leon, L.R., Hawkins E., Trauernicht, C. (2017). Global risk of deadly heat. *Nature*
1080 577 *Climate Change letters*, 7(July), 501-506. DOI: 10.1038/NCLIMATE3322
1081
1082 578 Neymark, J., Judkoff, R., National Renewable Energy, and International Energy, A. (2008). International
1083 579 Energy Agency Building Energy Simulation Test and Diagnostic Method (IEA BESTEST): multi-zone non-
1084 580 airflow in-depth diagnostic cases: MZ320 - MZ360. Nowak, D. and Crane, D. (1998). The urban forest
1085 581 effects (UFORE) model: quantifying urban forest structure and function. *Integrated Tools Proceedings*,
1086 582 714-720.
1087
1088 583 Peters, E.B., McFadden, J.P., Montgomery, R.A. (2010). Biological and environmental controls on tree
1089 584 transpiration in a suburban landscape. *Journal of Geophysical Research, Biogeosciences*, 115:G04006.
1090
1091 585 Rahman, M. A., Armson, D. and Ennos, A. R. (2015). A comparison of the growth and cooling
1092 586 effectiveness of five commonly planted urban tree species. *Urban Ecosystems*, 18, 371-389.
1093
1094 587 Rahman, M.A., Moser, A., Gold, A., Rötzer, T., Pauleit, S. (2018) Vertical air temperature gradients under
1095 588 the shade of two contrasting urban tree species during different types of summer days. *Science of the*
1096 589 *Total Environment*, 633, 100-111.
1097
1098 590 Rahman, M. A., Smith, J. G., Stringer, P. and Ennos, A. R. (2011). Effect of rooting conditions on the
1099 591 growth and cooling ability of *Pyrus calleryana*. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 10(3), 185-192.
1100
1101 592 Reid, W. V., Mooney, H. A., Cropper, A., Capistrano, D., Carpenter, S. R., Chopra, K., Dasgupta, P., Dietz,
1102 593 T., Duraiappah, A. K., Hassan, R., Kaspersen, R., Leemans, R., May, R. M., McMichael, T. A. J., Pingali, P.,
1103 594 Samper, C., Scholes, R., Watson, R. T., Zakri, A. H., Shidong, Z., Ash, N. J., Bennett, E., Kumar, P., Lee, M.
1104 595 J., Raudsepp-Hearne, C., Simons, H., Thonell, J. and Zurek, M. B. (2005). *Ecosystems and human well-*
1105 596 *being: Synthesis*. Sarukhán, J. and Whyte, A. (eds.). Island Press.
1106
1107 597 Rogers, K., Sacre, K., Goodenough, J. and Doick, K. (2015). *Valuing London's Urban Forest*. Treeconomics,
1108 598 London. 82pp.
1109
1110 599 Rumble, H., Rogers, K., Doick, K., Albertini, A. and Hutchings, T. (2015). *Valuing Wrexham's Urban Forest*
1111 600 *- assessing the ecosystem services of Wrexham's urban forest*. Forest Research, Farnham. 45pp.
1112
1113 601 Saaroni, H., Amorim, J.H., Hiemstra, J.A., Pearlmutter, D. (2018). Urban Green Infrastructure as a tool
1114 602 for urban heat mitigation: Survey of research methodologies and findings across different climatic
1115 603 regions. *Urban Climate*, 24, 94-110.
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120

1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176

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

605

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

607

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

609

610

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

612

613

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

615

616

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

618

619

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

621

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

623

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

625

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

627

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

629

630

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

632

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

634

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

636

637

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

639

1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232

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.

1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288

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: ¹Heath, 1998; ²Wullschleger et al., 1998; ³Breuer et al., 2003; ⁴Atkinson et al., 2004;
646 ⁵Betson and Scholefield, 2004; ⁶Fini et al., 2009; ⁷Leuzinger et al., 2010; ⁸Hipps et al., 2014; ⁹Rahman
647 et al., 2015; ¹⁰Gillner et al., 2015).

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

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	<i>Populus trichocarpa</i>	n/a	n/a	15	15	<u>0.120</u>	<u>0.120</u>	0.120	0.120
Umineko Cherry Blossom ⁹	<i>Prunus 'Umineko'</i>	n/a	n/a	6	1.37	<u>0.070</u>	<u>0.085</u>	0.077	0.063
Cherry spp. ⁴	<i>Prunus spp.</i>	wild	n/a	n/a	n/a	<u>0.048</u>	<u>0.048</u>	0.048	
Callery pear ⁹	<i>Pyrus calleryana</i>	n/a	n/a	6	1.37	<u>0.097</u>	<u>0.155</u>	0.126	0.126
Oak spp. ¹	<i>Quercus spp.</i>	In Ambient Air	2	n/a	n/a	<u>0.041</u>	<u>0.058</u>	0.049	0.049
Mountain Ash ⁹	<i>Sorbus arnoldiana</i>	n/a	n/a	6	1.37	<u>0.074</u>	<u>0.076</u>	0.075	0.075
Small leaved lime ^{6,7,10}	<i>Tilia cordata</i>	Irrigated	n/a	n/a	3.5	0.031	0.075	0.057	0.053
Broad leaved lime ^{6,7}	<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	Irrigated	n/a	n/a	3.5	0.023	0.054	0.041	
Silver lime ^{6,7}	<i>Tilia tomentosa</i>	Irrigated	n/a	n/a	3.5	0.040	0.086	0.061	
Common lime ⁶	<i>Tilia x europaea</i>	Irrigated	n/a	n/a	3.5	0.028	0.075	0.052	
Dutch Elm ¹⁰	<i>Ulmus x hollandica Mill. 'Lobel'</i>	n/a	14	12.88	23.5	<u>0.023</u>	<u>0.023</u>	0.023	0.023
E_t average (all genera):									0.054

* DBH: diameter at breast height

1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400

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	1 st	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	<i>Betula spp.</i>	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>
	2 nd	<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	<i>Tilia x vulgaris</i>	<i>Quercus robur</i>	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>
	3 rd	<i>Betula pendula</i>	<i>Magnolia spp.</i>	<i>Crataegus pedicellata</i>	<i>Betula pendula</i>
Top E _t providers	1 st	<i>Castanea sativa</i>	<i>Platanus hybrid</i>	<i>Castanea sativa</i>	<i>Platanus hybrida</i>
	2 nd	<i>Acer platanoides</i>	<i>Quercus petraea</i>	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>
	3 rd	<i>Prunus avium</i>	<i>Prunus avium</i>	<i>Populus spp</i>	<i>Castanea sativa</i>

653
654

1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456

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

1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512

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*	Cooling Value†	Average q	A/C unit*	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

1513
 1514
 1515
 1516
 1517
 1518
 1519
 1520
 1521
 1522
 1523
 1524
 1525
 1526
 1527
 1528
 1529
 1530
 1531
 1532
 1533
 1534
 1535
 1536
 1537
 1538
 1539
 1540
 1541
 1542
 1543
 1544
 1545
 1546
 1547
 1548
 1549
 1550
 1551
 1552
 1553
 1554
 1555
 1556
 1557
 1558
 1559
 1560
 1561
 1562
 1563
 1564
 1565
 1566
 1567
 1568

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 <u>MWh</u>					
	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

1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624

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