

Wind Engineering Joint Usage/Research Center

FY2016 Research Result Report

Research Field: Wind disaster and wind resistant design Research Period: FY2016 Apr. ~ FY2017 Mar. Research Number: 162001 Research Theme: Aero-elastic behavior of high-rise buildings under downstream interference effects Representative Researcher: Yuan-Lung Lo Budget [FY2016]: 450,000Yen
--

Abstract

This paper investigates the effect of the single and multiple aerodynamic modification mechanisms on the dynamic behavior of the principal building when it is interfered by a very closely located building. During the study, aeroelastic vibration tests and high-frequency force balance tests are conducted to compare responses and wind forces in a well-simulated turbulent boundary layer flow. The principal building is manufactured with three different building configurations to represent the single and multiple aerodynamic modification treatments; the neighboring building which produces interference effects is made as a square prism model. Results show that the multiple modification treatment is efficient in reducing wind forces in all interference location series. However, it is also found that in some critical conditions, such treatment is sensitive to reduced velocity and may amplify the interference effect and result in larger displacements.

1. Introduction

Interference effects caused by neighboring buildings require an improved wind load resistant design rather than those for isolated buildings. However, due to their complex nature and huge number of disturbances, the interference effects have been considered very difficult in regulation coding for practical use. The issue with the interference effects is still one of the most difficult research topics in the field of wind engineering.

Over the past decades, researchers have adopted various methodologies to investigate the interference effects on overall or local wind loads of high-rise buildings. Factors that may affect the wind forces have been widely discussed, such as the approaching flow characteristics, wind directions, relative location of neighboring buildings, cross sectional shapes and aspect ratios, Scruton numbers, Strouhal numbers, modal frequency, and mode shapes. (Saunders and Melbourne, 1979; Surry and Mallais, 1983; Bailey and Kwok, 1985; Blessmann and Riera, 1985; Kareem, 1987; Taniike and Inaoka, 1988; Sakamoto and Haniu, 1988; Taniike, 1991, 1992; Yahyai et al., 1992; Zhang et al., 1994, 1995; Sun et al., 1995; Khanduri et al., 1998, 2000; Luo et al., 1999; Thepmongkorn et al., 2002; Tang and Kwok, 2004; Xie and Gu, 2004, 2007; Huang and Gu, 2005; Zhao and Lam, 2008; Lam et al., 2008, 2011; Hui et al., 2012, 2013; Fang et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2011, 2013, 2015; Mara et

al., 2014; Yu et al., 2015; Lo et al., 2016). Among these research works, square or rectangular prisms, as well as cylindrical prisms, chimneys, storage tanks, or cladding structures were commonly chosen for discussions (Kareem et al., 1998; Niemann and Kasperski, 1999; Wang et al., 2014; Uematsu et al., 2015). In most cases, interference effects were discussed based on the evaluation of distorted wind forces to indicate critical interference locations. However, it has been pointed out that different critical interference mechanisms could occur at certain interference locations, either at the upstream or the downstream, to generate significant responses (Bailey and Kwok, 1985; Yahyai et al., 1992; Lo et al., 2016), especially in the area very close to the principal building. In related works, the aeroelastic vibration test was considered more intuitive to observe the interfered dynamic responses rather than high-frequency force balance tests.

On the other hand, the aerodynamic modifications that can efficiently reduce the wind force acting on high-rise buildings are reported in recent works. Changing the geometrical appearance of the building shape may be the easiest treatment among the aerodynamic modifications. Two simple but efficient treatments, changing the number of sides of the cross section and changing the helical angle to twist the building, are concluded to promise lower wind forces by Kim et al. (2014, 2015, and 2016). Surprisingly, these treatments sometimes happen to meet building designers' imagination and design of what symbol the buildings stand for. In the modern skyscraper designs, the taper and twisting features are becoming more and more attractive today.

This study intends to investigate the effects of the single and the multiple aerodynamic modification treatments on the interfered responses and wind forces by comparing the experimental results from aeroelastic vibration tests and high frequency force balance tests. The modifications are attempted to be achieved by manufacturing three principal models, including a square prism model, a taper model, and a helical taper model. Closed interference locations are selected to cover those critical interference mechanisms either from the upstream or the downstream. Response trajectories, wind force spectra, force interference factors and response buffeting factors are estimated to examine how the treatments work to reduce or amplify the unfavorable dynamic behavior of the target principal building.

2. Experimental Setup

Both the aeroelastic vibration test and the high-frequency balance test are conducted in the $18 \times 1.8 \times 2.2$ m boundary layer wind tunnel of Wind Engineering Research Center at Tokyo Polytechnic University. A 1/400 scale turbulent flow over a sub-urban terrain with a power law index exponent for mean velocity profile of 0.19 is simulated with properly equipped spires, saw barriers, and roughness blocks (Photo 1). The vertical flow characteristics are shown in Fig. 1.

For the aeroelastic vibration test, three rigid base-pivoted aero-elastic models are manufactured for

the role of the principal building as shown in Fig. 2. The square prism model is 0.07 m in both width (B) and depth (D) and 0.56 m in height (H), which make the aspect ratio (H / B) 8. The tapered model is 0.04 m in width on the roof-top and 0.10 m in width on the bottom. The height is the same as the square one and the aspect ratio (height to the averaged width) is also 8. The helical tapered model has the same geometrical appearance as the tapered model but has a helical twisting angle of 180° from the bottom to the top. All the three principal models are manufactured with the same volume in order to have a basic comparison level. Both the tapered and the helical tapered models have been proven to efficiently reduce the projected wind force when they are considered in an isolated condition (Kim et al., 2014, 2015, 2016). The tapered model and the helical tapered model in this study are also referred to Model IV and X by Kim et al. (2016). The setup of the aeroelastic vibration test is illustrated in Fig. 3. The reason to choose the tapered and the helical tapered models in this study is that the buildings with tapered shape and twisting features are becoming more and more attractive in the modern skyscraper designs; however, the associated discussions have not been widely made for such two features. It is also the authors' interest to investigate the consequences with the consideration of interference effects.

Fundamental modal information of the three principal models is listed in Table 1. The fundamental frequencies in along-wind (longitudinal) and across-wind (lateral) directions are tuned to 6.5 Hz based on free vibration tests. The damping ratios are kept under or equal to 1% in both directions for three models and the generalized masses are about 0.11 kg. The corresponding mass-damping parameter is determined by

$$\delta = \frac{M\xi}{\rho B^2 H} \quad (1)$$

where ρ is the air density. M is the generalized mass. ξ is the damping ratio. For the rigid base-pivoted aeroelastic model in this study, the mass-damping parameters for three models are in the range of 0.23 to 0.33, which is slightly lower than the range of typical full scale high-rise buildings (0.4 – 0.6) and can be converted to Scruton numbers of 0.7 to 1.0 based on the linear mode shape assumption of its rigid elastic feature. Generally speaking, in this range of lower Scruton numbers, the across-wind response of an isolated square prism model will increase significantly when the reduced velocity rises to values larger than 9 or 10. Furthermore, from Table 1, the parameters in these three models are intentionally made the same or similar in order to reduce the possible differences in reducing wind forces or dynamic response not by the shape changes. In real situations, the tapered building may be stiffer than the square buildings.

The displacement signals of both directions are recorded by two laser sensors at the sampling rate of 550 Hz. The sampling length is 16,384 for one sample record and the ensemble size is 10 in order to obtain a statistical result.

For the high-frequency force balance test, the three principal models are fixed and un-flexible to the balancer for both horizontal forces measuring under the same sampling conditions. Instantaneous wind velocity is recorded at the model height for further normalizations.

The interfering building model is made of acrylic and has the identical size as the square prism model; unlike the principal building models, however, this interfering model is made rigid and un-flexible providing only the disturbed flow coming from upstream or downstream. The interference locations of interest are focused on those considered significant in the surrounding area (Fig. 4). Both the principal and interfering models are orientated with one face normal to the wind when both tests are carried out. Five location series including the upwind series, the oblique-upwind series, the side series, the oblique-downwind series and the downwind series are selected for observing different interference mechanisms.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1 Interfered response characteristics

For convenient illustration hereafter, the RMS response, the standard deviation value of displacement, at rooftop is normalized to the averaged model width (0.07 m) for each sample record. The ensemble averaged RMS responses are then calculated. Among all the measurements, the averaged variation coefficients of ensemble averaged RMS responses are lower than 10% for along-wind and across-wind directions, which are both considered quite stable for the measurement accuracy. The reduced velocity is calculated as

$$U_r = \frac{\bar{U}_H}{f_0 B} \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{U}_H$ is the mean wind velocity at the model height. In this study, 20 locations for interfering model and 11 reduced velocities ($U_r = 2.5, 3.9, 5.2, 6.8, 7.6, 8.4, 9.2, 10.0, 10.8, 11.6$, and 12.4) together provide a total of 220 cases for the interfered response characteristics for each principal building. Among these cases, some at higher reduced velocities may be indicated to contain distorted signals in few records. In such conditions, these distorted records are neglected and the rest of records are used for further analysis. The reason of such distorted signals can be explained by Fig. 5. (Lo et al. 2016). In those failed cases, the signal was distorted simply because the laser sensor misses the target of the gimbal. For instance in Fig. 5, when the across-wind response is severe, the laser may not be able to detect the along-wind response and then resulted in distorted signals. However in this study, if the number of the distorted records is larger than 8, meaning that only two or less are left for the calculation of the ensemble averages, then such case is directly neglected. Table 2 lists the neglected cases. It is important to notice that even though these cases are neglected for comparison, their tendencies are consistent with those well-performed ones.

3.1.1 Isolated model

The case of the isolated square prism model (SQ hereafter) is used to demonstrate the general vibration behavior at different reduced velocities without interference effects. SQ is also for the calibrations with those square prism models in previous works to show the measurement quality of the experiments. The across-wind (lateral) RMS response at the rooftop of the isolated model exhibits the commonly known vortex-induced vibration phenomena due to its small mass-damping parameter in Fig. 6 (Bailey and Kwok, 1985; Kawai, 1992; Gu, 2005). The vibration is increased severely by increasing reduced velocity and the tendency is consistent with previous works. On the other hand, the along-wind (longitudinal) RMS response is relatively small and can be predicted to be proportional to the square of reduced velocities. Experimental results in both directions do not exactly fit to those in previous works owing to the slight differences in approaching wind and fundamental modal information.

Fig. 7 shows the responses of three isolated models under different reduced velocities. It is clearly indicated that the treatments of aerodynamic modifications perform well to reduce the dynamic responses in both directions. For the tapered model (TA hereafter), the shrinkage of cross section from the bottom to the top has successfully lowered the along-wind responses at every reduced velocity as well as the across-wind responses at higher reduced velocities. The modification provided by the TA model is considered a single modification in this study. With the addition of the helical twisting feature in the third model (the helical tapered model, TH hereafter), the across-wind responses was largely lowered to almost the same order of the along-wind ones. A constant across-wind response value is observed around the reduced velocity of 12. This modification provided by the TH model is considered to be a multiple modification. Both modification features by the TA and the TH models have proven capable of efficient wind force reduction (Kim et al., 2015).

3.1.2 Fluctuating interfered responses of all location series

The along-wind and across-wind responses of the three principal building models under interferences are presented from Fig. 8 to 12 in terms of location series.

Upwind series

The along-wind and across-wind responses of those interfered cases at upwind locations are shown in Fig. 8. The existence of the interfering model results in larger fluctuating responses in the along-wind direction when the relative distance is larger than $2B$ for three models. The treatment of aerodynamic modification by the TA model seems no obvious benefit as long as there is an interfering model in the upstream. The treatment by the TH model generally reduce one thirds of response when there is an interfering model in the upstream and about half of response when it is isolated.

On the other hand, two opposite effects are indicated in the across-wind responses. For the SQ and

TA cases, the interfering model in the upstream efficiently lowers the responses of the principal models. The closer the distance between the principal model and the interfering model, the more the response is being reduced. However, the upstream interfering model in the TH cases slightly amplifies the response of the principal model. The amplification level increases in proportional to the distance between the principal model and the interfering model. The existence of the interfering model seems to disturb the function of the twisting feature and slightly enlarges the responses in the across-wind direction.

Oblique-upwind series

For those cases with the interfering model at oblique-upwind locations shown in Fig. 9, the along-wind figures have similar tendencies as those at upwind locations; however, the reduction in response by the TA and TH models is more obvious than Fig. 8, especially when the relative distance is larger than $2.5B$.

The across-wind figures exhibit quite interesting consequences. For the SQ and TA cases, the relative distance significantly affects the response with respect to reduced velocities. When the SQ and the TA models are isolated, the treatment of aerodynamic modification is clearly indicated when the reduced velocity is larger than 8. However, when the interfering model is located at (1.5, 1.5), the treatment provided by the TA amplifies the across-wind response slightly when the reduced velocity is larger than 8. When the interfering model moves to (2.0, 2.0), there is no reduction in the across-wind response by the TA model. As the relative distance increases, i.e. the interfering model moves to (2.5, 2.5) and (3.0, 3.0), the benefit from the treatment of the TA model shows again as the isolated cases. Comparing to the SQ and TA models, the TH model shows a generally good performance in response reduction. The across-wind response shown in the TH cases are almost in the same order of the along-wind response. Moreover, the relative distance between the principal model and the interfering model does not have an apparent effect as those in the SQ and TA cases.

A sensitive relative distance between (1.5, 1.5) to (2.0, 2.0) may be recognized for significant interference effect. Within this range, the treatment by the TA model cannot reduce the across-wind response; instead, the response may be amplified. To eliminate such significant interference effect coming from the oblique-upwind locations, the helical twisting feature can be a good suggestion. However, in the real world, the twisting feature could also result in unfavorable construction cost.

Side series

For those cases at side locations shown in Fig. 10, the two treatments of aerodynamic modifications have apparent effect on along-wind responses. However, the interference effect is seldom indicated. On the other hand, not only the aerodynamic modifications but also the existence of the interfering model significantly lowers the across-wind response. It is worth noticing that the interference effect makes quite different patterns for upwind series, oblique-upwind series, and side series in the

across-wind responses. The combination with the aerodynamic modification certainly changes how the interference mechanisms work.

Oblique-downwind series

The tendencies of the oblique-downwind series in Fig. 11 are very similar to those of the side series. Interestingly, the SQ case at (-1.5, 1.5) has a slightly larger along-wind response when the reduced velocity is near 5.2 – 6.8. This interference location has been introduced to exhibit an elliptic resonant-like vibration motion (Bailey and Kwok, 1985; Lo et al., 2016). The along-wind and across-wind responses have a high correlation to the rhythmic narrowing space caused by the principal model. However, this phenomenon is soon eliminated by either increasing the reduced velocity or adding the treatment by the TA model.

Downwind series

For the downwind series, the across-wind response is affected significantly by the downstream interfering model when the reduced velocity is at higher reduced velocities. The SQ case at (-1.5, 0.0) has a severe vibration when the reduced velocity is larger than 10.8; the same case at (-2.0, 0.0) is similar when the reduced velocity is larger than 11.6. With the treatment by the TA model, the across-wind response at (-2.0, 0.0) at every observed reduced velocity is lowered down. However, the across-wind response at (-1.5, 0.0) was failed to record when the reduced velocity is larger than 10.0.

For the TH cases, the across-wind responses have been amplified by the interference effect; however, unlike the cases in upwind locations, the increasing relative distance results in decreasing amplification in across-wind response. When the location is at (-3.0, 0.0), no interference effect is observed coming from the downstream model.

3.1.3 Response trajectories of selected critical cases

The response trajectory can show the motion behavior of the three principal building models under interference effects in a more intuitive way. It may also explain how the movement is interfered by the neighboring building model and how the aerodynamic modification works. Three isolated principal models at highest reduced velocity are compared in Fig. 13 and the critical cases are selected based on Lo et al. (2016) for drawing their trajectories in regard to certain reduced velocities shown in Fig. 14, 15 and 16.

Isolated cases

Fig. 13 shows clearly that the across-wind response motion is significantly changed by the aerodynamic modifications from a thin elliptical shape to a round one. The amplitude of response is apparently decreased in both directions.

Significant amplification caused by oblique-upwind and downwind interference effects

The reduced velocity of 10.0 for the three principal models with the existence of the interfering model near (-2.0, 0.0) is selected for an overall comparison in Fig. 14. With the existence of downstream interference effect, the aerodynamic modification provided by the TA model seems to be ineffective. However, by adding the helical twisting treatment provided by the TH model, it shows a great reduction in downstream interference effects. The across-wind response amplitude is almost the same as the TH case in Fig. 13, meaning that the reduction level by the treatment remains the same and less sensitive to reduced velocity.

Fig. 15 shows the same reduced velocity for the three principal models near the location of (2.0, 2.0). Here the aerodynamic modification provided by the TA model can lower about 30% of the across-wind response when the interfering model is at (2.0, 2.0) or (2.5, 2.5). And once again, with the addition of the helical twisting treatment, the across-wind response is greatly reduced to almost no interference level as an isolated case.

It was found by Lo et al. (2016) that the downstream interference mechanism is different from the upstream one and the vibration caused by the former could be even larger than the latter. Fig. 15 and 16 further confirm that this difference exists between these two mechanisms since the aerodynamic modification by changing the cross section size result in different levels of response reduction. Nevertheless, the helical twisting treatment in general provides good effectiveness to reduce interference effects for all cases. Compared with the conclusion by Yahyai et al. (1992), which proposed that the downstream interference effect is the most likely caused by an interfering model in a distance 2 to 3 times of the building width behind the principal model, Fig. 15 shows inconsistency that the distance is within 1.5 to 2.5 times the building width in this study.

Inclined-elliptical motion at oblique-downwind locations

Fig. 16 shows that four select critical cases are compared with the discussed case by Lo et al. (2016). From these figures, it is not hard to conclude from the figures that the inclined-elliptical and resonant-like vibration, caused by the rhythmic space channeling between the principal model and the interfering model, is sensitive to the interference location and the reduced velocity. The inclination angle of the motion may also be slightly changed by the relative location. In Bailey and Kwok (1985), the inclination angle is around 45° when the interfering model is at (-1.22, 1.5) under $U_r = 6$. In Fig. 16, it is supposed that the same motion should happen just between (-1.5, 1.5) and (-2.0, 2.0) and U_r is between 5.2 and 6.8. This phenomenon must be carefully examined to find in this limited area and limited reduced velocity range.

3.2 Interfered force characteristics

Along-wind and across-wind forces were measured by the high-frequency force balance tests and

then processed by FFT method for force spectral characteristic investigations to enhance the observation of interfered wind forces. To estimate force spectra, a taper cosine window function is adopted with no overlapping points. Fig. 17 and Fig. 18 show respectively the normalized along-wind and across-wind force spectra of three location series with respect to the isolated case for the three principal models.

3.2.1 Along-wind force spectra

Along-wind force spectra show apparently different patterns of the three principal models in upwind location series and oblique-upwind location series. In upwind location series, the along-wind spectrum area is obviously reduced by the upstream interfering model. The closer to the principal model, the more along-wind force the interfering model can reduce. As for the oblique-upwind locations series, all cases show a small but clear peak spectra value near $U_r = 0.1$, which is considered to be the shedding frequency generated from the vortex separated from the upstream interfering model. The TH cases indicate that the farther the interfering model from the principal model, the closer the peak spectral value approaches to 0.1. It is supposed that the vortex sheds from the interfering model needs enough space to form a complete vortex structure behind the separation. When the location is too close to the principal model, the peak spectrum becomes difficult to identify.

3.2.2 Across-wind force spectra

For the across-wind spectra at oblique-upwind locations, the three principal models exhibit slightly different tendencies. For the SQ cases at oblique-upwind locations, as the interfering model approaches the principal model, the vortex shedding frequency at 0.1 produced by the isolated case is gradually altered to lower frequencies. This explains that the wind force is taken controlled by the approaching flow mixed with the vortex generated from the upstream interfering model. The TA cases at oblique-upwind locations show similar tendency; however, the spectral values are generally lower than SQ cases due to the reduced projected area of the model. For the TH cases at oblique-upwind locations, the variation of spectra is different from those in the SQ and TA cases. When the relative distance increases, the peak spectral value at reduced frequency of 0.1 becomes clear.

The SQ and TA cases at oblique-downwind locations share the same tendency. The peak spectral value gradually moves to higher frequencies as the relative distance between the principal model and the interfering model decreases. The vortex shed from the isolated model is altered by the narrowing space due to the shortening space and results in a higher shedding frequency. On the other hand, in the TH cases, such effect by the narrowing space is largely disturbed by the addition of the helical twisting feature and no clear peak is observed.

As for the significant across-wind responses shown in Fig. 12, the force spectra of all interfered SQ and TA cases at downwind locations only exhibit lower turbulences, which suggests that the downstream interference effect is more a motion-induced interference mechanism, rather than a force-induced mechanism.

3.3 General comparisons of aerodynamic modifications in interference factor (IF) and buffeting factor (BF)

The efficiencies of the aerodynamic modifications provided by the TA and TH models are examined by two commonly proposed factors with little modifications. The first factor is the interference factor (Zhang and Gu, 2008) used to evaluate the interfered wind force and is modified as Eq. (3a) – (3b).

$$\Delta IF_x = \left(\frac{C_{F'_x} \text{ in TA or TH}}{C_{F'_x} \text{ in SQ}} - 1 \right) \times 100\% \quad (3a)$$

$$\Delta IF_y = \left(\frac{C_{F'_y} \text{ in TA or TH}}{C_{F'_y} \text{ in SQ}} - 1 \right) \times 100\% \quad (3b)$$

where $C_{F'_y}$ and $C_{F'_x}$ are fluctuating along-wind and across-wind force coefficients respectively.

Here the numerator and the denominator are in the same interfering condition including the isolated cases. Fig. 19 shows the percentage distribution of all cases for an overall view on the reduction efficiency. Obviously, the largest reduction in along-wind and across-wind forces at all locations could reach 20% to 30% by simply changing the prismatic square cross section to the tapered cross section. By adding the modification of helical twisting, the forces can be further reduced more than 30% in the along-wind direction and more than 60% in the across-wind direction. Such efficient reduction in wind forces either in the along-wind or across-wind direction has also been introduced by Kim et al. (2015).

The buffeting factor (Saunders and Melbourne, 1979) is the second factor to evaluate how efficient the aerodynamic modification work on reducing dynamic response and is also modified as Eq. (4a) – (4b).

$$\Delta BF_x = \left(\frac{\sigma_x \text{ in TA or TH}}{\sigma_x \text{ in SQ}} - 1 \right) \times 100\% \quad (4a)$$

$$\Delta BF_y = \left(\frac{\sigma_y \text{ in TA or TH}}{\sigma_y \text{ in SQ}} - 1 \right) \times 100\% \quad (4b)$$

where σ_x and σ_y are RMS responses in the along-wind and across-wind directions respectively.

Here again the numerator and the denominator are in the same interfering condition including the isolated cases. Fig. 20 shows the calculated results of Eq. (4a) – (4b) for all cases. Comparing to wind forces in Fig. 19, more velocity-dependent reductions in responses can be seen in Fig. 20.

ΔBF_x in the along-wind response

In general, the along-wind response has been reduced by the single and the multiple treatments of aerodynamic modifications. The combination of the helical twisting provides a much better efficiency.

The treatment by the TA model has different effect with respect to the interference location series. When the interfering model is located at upwind locations, the treatment does not always work well; moreover, the existence of the interfering model may reduce the reduction level by the treatment at certain reduced velocities. There is no obvious benefit indicated at upwind location series. However, for the other location series, the treatment by the TA model generally performs well except for few cases, such as (1.5, 1.5) and (-1.5, 0.0) at high reduced velocity or (-2.0, 2.0) at reduced velocity around 4. As mentioned in previous sections, these cases are referred to critical interference locations in many publications.

On the other hand, the treatment by the TH model exhibits fairly good efficiency in along-wind response with the existence of the interfering model.

ΔBF_y in the across-wind response

The treatment by the TA model has rather complicated consequences with the consideration of different interference location series. Generally speaking, the treatment by the TA model at upwind, side, and oblique-downwind locations amplifies the across-wind response at lower reduced velocity range, say 4 to 6 from figures and reduced the across-wind response at higher reduced velocity range. When the interfering model is at oblique-upwind locations, quite complicated tendencies are produced by the treatment by the TA model and the relative distance to the interfering model. When the relative distance to the interfering model is decreasing, the case which produces the largest amplification in across-wind response moves to higher reduced velocity. For instance, when the

interfering model is located at (3.0, 3.0), the largest amplification occurs at reduced velocity of 5.2; when the interfering model moves to (1.5, 1.5), the largest amplification is indicated at reduced velocity of 10. Such tendency is also found in the downwind location series with a clearer variation of the largest amplification case.

On the other hand, the performance of the treatment by the TH model is again, fairly good to reduce the across-wind response. It is worth pointing out that, the treatment by the TH model reduces the reduction level in both along-wind and across-wind responses when the interfering model is at upwind location series.

Comparing to Fig. 19, it is clearly conclude from Fig. 20 that the benefit from the aero-elastic test could provide abundant information on how much the reduction level in response the treatments of aerodynamic modification produce and how the interfering model affect the results at various reduced velocities.

4. Conclusions

Interference effects on high-rise buildings with three different configurations have been examined in this study. Both the single and the multiple aerodynamic modifications were performed by the tapered model and the helical tapered model. Their treatment efficiencies were evaluated in details. Several findings have been concluded as follows:

- (1) Aerodynamic modifications by changing the appearance of the building shape were confirmed through the comparisons in wind forces and responses without interference effects. However, it was found that at lower reduced velocities near 5.2 – 6.8, the aerodynamic modification provided by the tapered model may slightly amplify the across-wind response, which was unable to be discovered by the high-frequency force balance test in previous works.
- (2) The aerodynamic modification by the TA model was proven to be sensitive to the reduced velocity and the interference location. With the existence of a neighboring building, such modification cannot guarantee the reduction efficiency but may sometimes amplify the across-wind vibration severely, especially at locations which are considered having critical interference effects.
- (3) The modification provided by the TH model was proven to efficiently reduce both the wind force and the responses in general. The interference effect generated by the interfering model could amplify the response at certain location series. However, if compared to the isolated SQ model, the amplified response is still much smaller than no modification at all.

Table 1 Fundamental information of three principal models

Principal model	Square (SQ)	Tapper (TA)	Helical tapper (TH)
Height (H)	0.56	0.56	0.56
Depth (D)	0.07	0.10 (bottom) 0.04 (top)	0.10 (bottom) 0.04 (top)
Width (B)	0.07	0.10 (bottom) 0.04 (top)	0.10 (bottom) 0.04 (top)
H/B_{ave}	8	8	8
Helical angle	0°	0°	180°
$f_{n,x}$ (Hz)	6.5	6.5	6.5
$f_{n,y}$ (Hz)	6.5	6.5	6.5
ζ_x (%)	0.8	0.7	1.0
ζ_y (%)	0.9	0.8	1.0
M^* (g)	107	111	111
δ_x	0.25	0.23	0.32
δ_y	0.30	0.27	0.33

Table 2 Neglected cases with the number of distorted records larger than 8

Model	Interference location (x/B, y/B)	U_r
SQ	(-1.5, 0.0)	11.6, 12.4
	(-2.0, 0.0)	12.4
	(1.5, 1.5)	11.6, 12.4
	(2.0, 2.0)	10.8, 11.6, 12.4
TA	(-1.5, 0.0)	10.8, 11.6, 12.4
	(1.5, 1.5)	12.4




Photo 1 Wind tunnel at WERC, TPU




Fig. 1 Characteristic profiles of simulated turbulent boundary layer flow




Fig. 2 Configurations of three principal models




Fig. 3 Diagram of vibration test




Fig. 4 Diagram of interference location series




Fig. 5 Illustration of distorted signal due to laser sensor missing




Fig. 6 RMS response of isolated SQ model at different reduced velocities and calibrations with previous works





Fig. 7 RMS response of three isolated models at different reduced velocities







Fig. 8 Along-wind and across-wind responses for upwind location series







Fig. 9 Along-wind and across-wind responses for oblique-upwind location series







Fig. 10 Along-wind and across-wind responses for side location series







Fig. 11 Along-wind and across-wind responses for oblique-downwind location series






Fig. 12 Along-wind and across-wind responses for downwind location series







Fig. 13 Response trajectories of three isolated principal models at $U_r = 12.4$



(a) SQ from (-1.5, 0.0) to (-2.5, 0.0)




(b) TA from $(-1.5, 0.0)$ to $(-2.5, 0.0)$




(c) TH from $(-1.5, 0.0)$ to $(-2.5, 0.0)$


Fig. 14 Response trajectories of three principal models at downwind locations under $U_r = 10.0$



(a) SQ from $(1.5, 1.5)$ to $(2.5, 2.5)$




(b) TA from $(1.5, 1.5)$ to $(2.5, 2.5)$




(c) TH from (1.5, 1.5) to (2.5, 2.5)

Fig. 15 Response trajectories of three principal models at oblique-upwind locations under $U_r = 10.0$




(a) $U_r = 5.2$

(b) $U_r = 6.2$ (Lo et al., 2016)




(c) $U_r = 6.8$

Fig. 16 Inclined-elliptical motion caused by resonant-like rhythmic vibration in SQ
model




(a) Upwind series




(b) Oblique-upwind series


Fig. 17 Along-wind force spectra of three principal models



(a) Oblique-upwind series




(b) Oblique-downwind series



(c) Downwind series

Fig. 18 Across-wind force spectra of three principal models



(a) ΔIF_x





Fig. 19 Percentage distribution for wind force reduction efficiency by aerodynamic modification






Fig. 20 Percentage distribution for response reduction efficiency against reduced velocity by aerodynamic modification

5. References

- Bailey, P.A., Kwok, K.C.S., 1985. Interference excitation of twin tall buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 21, 323-338.
- Blessmann, J., Riera, J.D., 1985. Wind excitation of neighboring tall buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 18, 91-103.
- Bouris, D., Bergeles, G., 1999. 2D LES of vortex shedding from a square cylinder. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 80, 31-46.

- Chatterjee, D., Biswas, G., 2015. Dynamic behavior of flow around rows of square cylinders kept in staggered arrangement. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 136, 1-11.
- English, E.C., 1990. Shielding factors from wind-tunnel studies of prismatic structures. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 36, 611-619.
- English, E.C., Fricke, F.R., 1999. The interference index and its prediction using a neural network analysis of wind-tunnel data. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 83, 567-575.
- Fang, F.M., Chung, C.Y., Li, Y.C., Liu, W.C., Lei, P.K., 2013. The acrosswind response of the downwind prism in a twin-prism system with a staggered arrangement. *Wind & Struct.* 17(3), 245-262.
- Huang, P., Gu, M., 2005. Experimental study on wind-induced dynamic interference effects between two tall buildings. *Wind & Struct.* 8(3), 147-161.
- Hui, Y., Tamura, Y., Yoshida, A., 2012. Mutual interference effects between two high-rise building models with different shapes on local peak pressure coefficients. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 104-106, 98-108.
- Hui, Y., Tamura, Y., Yoshida, A., Kikuchi, H., 2013a. Pressure and flow field investigation of interference effects on external pressures between high-rise buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 115, 150-161.
- Hui, Y., Yoshida, A., Tamura, Y., 2013. Interference effects between two rectangular-section high-rise buildings on local peak pressure coefficients. *J. Fluids Struct.* 37, 120-133.
- Kareem, A., 1987. The effect of aerodynamic interference on the dynamic response of prismatic structures. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 25, 365-372.
- Kareem, A., Kijewski, T., Lu, P.C., 1998. Investigation of interference effects for a group of finite cylinders. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 77-78, 503-520.
- Kawai, H., 1992. Vortex induced vibration of tall buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 41-44, 117-128.
- Khanduri, A.C., Bedard, C., Stathopoulos, T., 1997. Modelling wind-induced interference effects using backpropagation neural networks. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 72, 71-79.
- Khanduri, A.C., Stathopoulos, T., Bedard, C., 1998. Wind-induced interference effects on buildings – a review of the state-of-the-art. *Eng. Struct.* 20(7), 617-630.
- Khanduri, A.C., Stathopoulos, T., Bedard, C., 2000. Generalization of wind-induced interference effects for two buildings. *Wind & Struct.* 3(4), 255-266.
- Kim, W.S., Tamura, Y., Yoshida, A., 2011. Interference effects on local peak pressures between two buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 99, 584-600.
- Kim, W.S., Tamura, Y., Yoshida, A., 2013. Simultaneous measurement of wind pressures and flow patterns for buildings with interference effect. *Advances Struct. Eng.* 16(2), 287-305.
- Kim, W.S., Tamura, Y., Yoshida, A., 2015. Interference effects on aerodynamic wind forces between two buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 147, 186-201.
- Kim, Y.C., Tamura, Y., Tanaka, H., Ohtake, K., Bandi, E.K., Yoshida, A., 2014. Wind-induced

- responses of super-tall buildings with various atypical building shapes. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 133, 191-199.
- Kim, Y.C., Bandi, E.K., Yoshida, A., Tamura, Y., 2015. Response characteristics of super-tall Buildings – effect of number of sides and helical angle. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 145, 252-262.
- Kim, Y. C., Tamura, Y., Kim, S., 2016. Wind load combinations of atypical supertall buildings. *J. Struct. Eng.* 142(1), 04015103-1 - 04015103-8.
- Lam, K.M., Leung, M.Y.H., Zhao, J.G., 2008. Interference effects on wind loading of a row of closely spaced tall buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 96, 562-583.
- Lam, K.M., Zhao, J.G., Leung, M.Y.H., 2011. Wind-induced loading and dynamic responses of a row of tall buildings under strong interference. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 99, 573-583.
- Lilly, D.K., 1992. A proposed modification of the Germano subgrid-scale closure model. *Physics of Fluids* 4, 633–635.
- Lo, Y.L., Kim, Y.C., Li, Y.C., 2016. Downstream interference effect of high-rise buildings under turbulent boundary layer flow. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 159, 19-35.
- Luo, S.C., Li, L.L., Shah, D. A., 1999. Aerodynamic stability of the downstream of two tandem square-section cylinders. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 79, 79-103.
- Mara, T.G., Terry, B.K., Ho, T.C.E., Isyumov, N., 2014. Aerodynamic and peak response interference factors for an upstream square building of identical height. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 133, 200-210.
- Murakami, S., Iizuka, S., Mochida, A., Tomigana, Y., 1997. LES analysis on turbulent flow past 2D square cylinder using various dynamic SGS models. *Seisen-kenkyu.* 49, 39-45. (In Japanese)
- Murakami, S., Mochida, A., 1995. On turbulent vortex shedding flow past 2D square cylinder predicted by CFD. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 54-55, 191-211.
- Niemann, H.J., Kasperski, M., 1999. Interference effects for a group of two reinforced concrete chimneys. *J. Fluids Struct.* 13, 987-997.
- Noda, H., Nakayama, A., 2003. Reproducibility of flow past two-dimensional rectangular cylinders in a homogeneous turbulent flow by LES. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 91, 265-278.
- Sakamoto, H., Haniu, H., 1988. Aerodynamic forces acting on two square prisms placed vertically in a turbulent boundary layer. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 31, 41-66.
- Saunders, J.W., Melbourne, W.H., 1979. Buffeting effects of upstream buildings. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Wind Engineering*, Fort Collins, Colorado. Pergamon Press, Oxford, 593-608.
- Sun, T.F., Gu, Z.F., 1995. Interference between wind loading on group of structures. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 54-55, 213-225.
- Surry, D., Mallais, W., 1983. Adverse local wind loads induced by adjacent building. *J. Struct. Eng.* ASCE 108, 816-821.
- Tang, U.F., Kwok, K.C.S., 2004. Interference excitation mechanisms on a 3DOF aeroelastic

- CAARC building model. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 92, 1299-1314.
- Taniike, Y., 1991. Turbulence effect on mutual interference of tall buildings. *J. Eng. Mech.* 117(3), 443-456.
- Taniike, Y., 1992. Interference mechanism for enhanced wind forces on neighboring tall buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 41-44, 1073-1083.
- Taniike, Y., Inaoka, H., 1988. Aeroelastic behavior of tall buildings in wakes. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 28, 317-327.
- Thepmongkorn, S., Wood, G.S., Kwok, K.C.S., 2002. Interference effects on wind-induced coupled motion of a tall building. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 90, 1807-1815.
- Uematsu, Y., Yasunaga, J., Koo, C., 2015. Design wind loads for open-topped storage tanks in various arrangements. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 138, 77-86.
- Vikram C. K., Y. T. Krishne Gowda, H.V. Ravindra, C. J. Gangadara Gowda, Manu, 2011. Numerical simulation of two dimensional unsteady flow past two square cylinders. *International Journal of Technology and Engineering System.* 2(3), 355-360.
- Wang, F., Tamura, Y., Yoshida, A., 2014. Interference effects of a neighboring building on wind loads on scaffolding. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 125, 1-12.
- Xie, Z.N., Gu, M., 2004. Mean interference effects among tall buildings. *Eng. Struct.* 26, 1173-1183.
- Xie, Z.N., Gu, M., 2007. Simplified formulas for evaluation of wind-induced interference effects among three tall buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 95, 31-52.
- Yahyai, M., Kumar, K., Krisha, P., Pande, P. K., 1992. Aerodynamic interference in tall rectangular buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 41-44, 859-866.
- Yu, X.F., Xie, Z.N., Zhu, J.B., Gu, M., 2015. Interference effects on wind pressure distribution between two high-rise buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 142, 188-197.
- Zhang, A., Gao, C., Zhang, L., 2005. Numerical simulation of the wind field around different building arrangements. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 93, 891-904.
- Zhang, A., Gu, M., 2008. Wind tunnel test and numerical simulations of wind pressures on buildings in staggered arrangement. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 96, 2067-2079.
- Zhang, A., Zhang, L., 2004. RBF neural networks for the prediction of building interference effects. *Computers and Structures* 82, 2333-2339.
- Zhang, W.J., Kwok, K.C.S., Xu, Y.L., 1994. Aeroelastic torsional behavior of tall buildings in wakes. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 51, 229-248.
- Zhang, W.J., Xu, Y.L., Kwok, K.C.S., 1995. Interference effects on aeroelastic torsional response of structurally asymmetric tall buildings. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 57, 41-61.
- Zhao, J.G., Lam, K.M., 2008. Interference effect in a group of tall buildings closely arranged in an L- or T-shaped pattern. *Wind & Struct.* 11(1), 1-18.

6. Published Paper etc.

Lo, Y.L., Kim, Y.C., Yoshida, A., Effects of Aerodynamic Modification Mechanisms on Interference from Neighboring Buildings. European African Conference on Wind Engineering 2017, Liege, Belgium. (Oral presentation accepted)

Lo, Y.L., Kim, Y.C., Yoshida, A., Effects of Aerodynamic Modification Mechanisms on Interference from Neighboring Buildings. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn. (Under-reviewing)

7. Research Organization

1. Representative Researcher

Yuan-Lung Lo/ Assistant Professor, Dept. Civil Eng., Tamkang Univ., Taiwan (ROC)

2. Collaborate Researchers

Yong Chul Kim/ Associate Professor, Dept. Architecture, Tokyo Polytechnic Univ., Japan