

SPRINGER BRIEFS IN APPLIED SCIENCES AND  
TECHNOLOGY · POLIMI SPRINGER BRIEFS

Salvatore Carlucci

# Thermal Comfort Assessment of Buildings



POLITECNICO  
DI MILANO



Springer

Salvatore Carlucci

# Thermal Comfort Assessment of Buildings



POLITECNICO  
DI MILANO

 Springer

Salvatore Carlucci  
Energy Department  
Politecnico di Milano  
Milan  
Italy

ISSN 2282-2577                      ISSN 2282-2585 (electronic)  
ISBN 978-88-470-5237-6            ISBN 978-88-470-5238-3 (eBook)  
DOI 10.1007/978-88-470-5238-3  
Springer Milan Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013930608

© The Author(s) 2013

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law. The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media ([www.springer.com](http://www.springer.com))

# Foreword

The wealth of research on thermal comfort has been partially taken and crystallized into international standards, where thermal comfort is defined as: “that condition of mind which expresses satisfaction with the thermal environment and is assessed by subjective evaluation”. A selection of subjective judgment scales has been described, e.g., in ISO 10551. Those scales propose a set of answers to questions as: “how do you feel at this precise moment?”, or “please state how you would prefer to be now”, so they allow collecting information about the thermal sensation and preference of a certain subject in a given place at a given time.

The data collected via these standardized surveys in the laboratory and in the field have been interpreted, and meaningful correlations between the answers and various physical variables have been derived, giving rise to what are generally called comfort models, for example, the Fanger whole-body steady-state heat balance model, the Pierce two-node model, the adaptive models and others. All these models have as input the *here-and-now* questions and make *here-and-now* predictions over the likely answers of a group of people in a certain environment.

But, when assessing comfort performances of an existing building or using a certain comfort target interval as one of the objectives of a building design process, one is generally interested in the overall performance. So one would attempt to consider some adequate average over time (e.g., a season, a year, etc.) and space (e.g., all occupied thermal zones of a building) of the *here-and-now* thermal comfort values, be them gathered via direct interviews in a building or calculated via one of the models. Disparate averaging algorithms have been proposed in the literature, and some are presented in the standards and available for use in applications.

All this at least in theory; in everyday practice budget constraints and other limitations have often led to using very simplified rules for assessment or design, even not making explicit which model and assumptions are taken as a basis. Averaging algorithms have been used often without an analysis of their implications on design choices, and very limited comparison between them has been performed.

But in the last years, under the renewed effort toward low- and zero-energy buildings, the issues of fine-tuning comfort and fully understanding its connection with energy use have become increasingly important and urgent to address, particularly so in warm climates and warm periods.

A number of European research projects (e.g., SCATs, Commoncense, ThermCo, KeepCool) have explored these issues and added new data to the comfort databases about occupied real buildings; conferences and networks such as NCEUB, Palenc, and IEA SHC Task 40/ECBCS Annex 52 have been a fruitful research cooperation and exchange opportunity for analyzing the implications on comfort design; some of the new findings have found their way to the recent update of the standards EN 15251, ISO 7730, and ASHRAE 55, and will influence their further ongoing revision.

The research work of Dr. Carlucci presented in this book represents an important contribution to these advancements and a fruit of his active engagement in some of the mentioned projects and networks, in the framework of his participation in the end-use Efficiency Research Group of Politecnico di Milano.

A careful review, comparison, and analysis of the large number of long-term indexes proposed in the literature were highly needed and are now hence available. Building on those, Carlucci proposes a new improved long-term general discomfort index which aims at better matching the specific objectives of real world assessment and design and to be applicable with the three main comfort models presented in the standards. It also explicitly defines the operational use of the index (e.g., how to define the length of the calculation period based on the actual climate of the site) in order to overcome the present ambiguities that often undermine the gnoseological and practical relevance of the results. Finally, he developed three computer codes in the EnergyPlus Reference Language for calculating the three versions of the new index and integrated them in the simulation environment EnergyPlus in order to calculate the new index and to report it as a direct output of the simulation.

Overall, a clear-cut methodology is here an essential tool to produce useful results for real world applications.

Lorenzo Pagliano  
Politecnico di Milano

# Acknowledgments

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Edward Arens and Prof. Matheos Santamouris for their valuable suggestions. I thank warmly Prof. Lorenzo Pagliano for having supported me during the execution of this work and for having reviewed it. I wish to express my gratitude also to Prof. Gabriele Masera for the inspiring discussions that helped me in developing the topic. I am also grateful to my colleagues and friends Dr. Paolo Zangheri, Eng. Marco Pietrobon, and Francesco De Rosa who helped me in times of need. Infinite thanks to my family, whose constant support helped me to complete this work. And of course, thanks to you, Natascia, for your support and your even greater patience.

Salvatore Carlucci

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>A Review of Long-Term Discomfort Indices</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background	1
1.1.1	Indices Based on the Heat Balance of the Human Body	2
1.1.2	Indices Based on Physiological Strain	3
1.1.3	Indices Based on the Measurement of Physical Parameters	3
1.2	Indices for the Long-Term Evaluation of General Thermal Discomfort	4
1.2.1	Indices Based on Comfort Models	6
1.2.2	Category-Dependent Indices	6
1.2.3	Symmetric and Asymmetric Indices	6
1.2.4	Indices Applicable Just to Summer or Extensible also to Winter	7
1.2.5	Discomfort Scales and Thresholds	7
1.3	Description of the Long-Term Discomfort Indices	7
1.3.1	Percentage Indices	9
1.3.2	Cumulative Indices	11
1.3.3	Risk Indices	15
1.3.4	Averaging Indices	16
1.4	Conclusions	17
1.5	Improvement Objectives	19
	References	19
<b>2</b>	<b>Comparison of the Ranking Capabilities of the Long-Term Discomfort Indices</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1	Introduction	21
2.2	The Adopted Methodology	23
2.2.1	The Reference Building Model	28
2.2.2	Physical Models Set in the Numerical Model	29
2.2.3	Variations of the Technical Features of the Building Envelope	33

2.2.4	Building Variants . . . . .	33
2.2.5	Comparison of the Building Variants. . . . .	33
2.3	Discussion of the Results . . . . .	34
2.3.1	Indices Unrepresentable on the Percentage Scale . . . . .	37
2.3.2	Indices Representable on the Percentage Scale . . . . .	40
2.3.3	Indices that Explicitly Make Use of Likelihood of Dissatisfied . . . . .	48
2.3.4	Inter-Comfort Model Correlation . . . . .	50
2.4	Conclusions . . . . .	51
	References . . . . .	53
<b>3</b>	<b>Gap Analysis of the Long-Term Discomfort Indices and a Harmonized Calculation Framework. . . . .</b>	<b>57</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	57
3.2	Literature Review . . . . .	58
3.2.1	Uncertainty About the Calculation Period . . . . .	58
3.2.2	Rounded Boundary Temperatures of Comfort Categories in EN 15251. . . . .	61
3.2.3	Uncertainty About the Meteorological Input Variable in ASHRAE 55. . . . .	62
3.3	Gap Analysis of a Selection of Long-Term Discomfort Indices. . . . .	62
3.3.1	Modification of the Calculation Period . . . . .	63
3.3.2	Duration of the Daily Occupation Schedule . . . . .	67
3.3.3	Weak Definitions and Simplifications in Standards. . . . .	67
3.3.4	Fanger Boundary Temperatures of Comfort Categories in EN 15251. . . . .	67
3.4	Proposal for a Calculation Framework . . . . .	72
3.4.1	Thermal Zoning . . . . .	74
3.4.2	Standard Input Parameters . . . . .	74
3.4.3	Climatic Data . . . . .	74
3.4.4	Monitoring Campaign . . . . .	74
3.5	Proposal for a Method for Identifying the Calculation Period . . . . .	75
3.6	Conclusions . . . . .	77
	References . . . . .	78
<b>4</b>	<b>The Long-Term Percentage of Dissatisfied . . . . .</b>	<b>81</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	82
4.2	A New Long-Term Discomfort Index . . . . .	82
4.2.1	The Likelihood of Thermal Discomfort at a Specified Time and Space . . . . .	83
4.2.2	Averaging Over Different Zones of a Building. . . . .	85
4.2.3	Proposal for a New Long-Term Thermal Discomfort Index . . . . .	87



- 4.3 Likelihood of Thermal Discomfort Derived from Ashrae  
Rp-884 Data . . . . . 90
- 4.4 Ranking Capability of Long-Term Percentage of Dissatisfied . . . 93
- 4.5 Integrating the Proposed Index in EnergyPlus . . . . . 96
- 4.6 Conclusions . . . . . 97
- References . . . . . 98
  
- 5 Conclusions and Future Developments . . . . . 101**
  
- Appendix A. . . . . 103**
  
- Appendix B. . . . . 107**
  
- Glossary . . . . . 127**

# Symbols and Abbreviations

## Symbols

$\alpha$	Solar absorbance of a surface (dimensionless)
B	Digit binary code: 0–1 (dimensionless)
$\gamma$	Solar factor (%)
$h$	Heat transfer coefficient ( $\text{W m}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1}$ ) or Hour (h)
$I$	Global solar irradiance on a horizontal surface ( $\text{W m}^{-2}$ )
$v_a$	Average air velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
PMV	Predicted mean vote (dimensionless)
PPD	Predicted percentage of dissatisfied (%)
$U$	Steady-state transmittance ( $\text{W m}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1}$ )
$\theta_{op}$	Operative temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\theta_{db}$	Dry-bulb temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\theta_{mr}$	Mean radiant temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\theta_{op}$	Operative temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\theta_{os}$	Sol-Air temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\theta_{res}$	Dry-resultant temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$\theta_{rm}$	Running mean of outside dry-bulb temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$wf$	Weighting factor (dimensionless)

## Subscripts

actual	Actual status
actual PMV	Referred to PMV calculated in actual status
c	Convective
C	Cold period
comf	Comfort
$\bar{d}$	Value averaged on a day
lower limit	Lower limit of comfort range
OC	Overcooling
OH	Overheating
out	Outdoor