



HAL
open science

Integration of moisture transfer through walls into an urban climate model and application to the medieval city centre of Cahors (France)

Margot Ruiz, Valéry Masson, Marion Bonhomme, Marina Malagoni de Almeida,
Stéphane Ginestet

► To cite this version:

Margot Ruiz, Valéry Masson, Marion Bonhomme, Marina Malagoni de Almeida, Stéphane Ginestet. Integration of moisture transfer through walls into an urban climate model and application to the medieval city centre of Cahors (France). *Urban Climate*, 2024, 56, pp.102036. <10.1016/j.uclim.2024.102036>. <hal-04656243>

HAL Id: hal-04656243

<https://insa-toulouse.hal.science/hal-04656243v1>

Submitted on 8 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

Integration of moisture transfer through walls into an urban climate model and application to the medieval city centre of Cahors (France)

Margot Ruiz^{a,b,*}, Valéry Masson^b, Marion Bonhomme^a, Marina Malagoli^{a,c}, Stéphane Ginestet^a

^a LMDC, Université de Toulouse, INSA, UPS, Toulouse, France

^b CNRM, Université de Toulouse, Météo-France, CNRS, Toulouse, France

^c Instituto Federal de Goiás, Goiás, Brasil

* Corresponding author: 135 Avenue de Ranguel, 31400 Toulouse, France.

E-mail address: mruiz@insa-toulouse.fr (M. Ruiz)

1 **Integration of moisture transfer through walls into an urban climate model** 2 **and application to the medieval city centre of Cahors (France)**

3 **Margot Ruiz^{a,b,*}, Valéry Masson^b, Marion Bonhomme^a, Marina Malagoli^{a,c}, Stéphane Ginestet^a**

4 ^a LMDC, Université de Toulouse, INSA, UPS, Toulouse, France

5 ^b CNRM, Université de Toulouse, Météo-France, CNRS, Toulouse, France

6 ^c Instituto Federal de Goiás, Goiás, Brasil

7 * Corresponding author: 135 Avenue de Ranguel, 31400 Toulouse, France.

8 E-mail address: mruiz@insa-toulouse.fr (M. Ruiz)

9 **Abstract**

10 Moisture transfer is a key phenomenon for simulating the energy balance of the walls of historical
11 buildings as it has an impact on indoor and outdoor comfort, energy consumption and the durability of
12 the walls. It is therefore essential to consider moisture transfer through walls when simulating old city
13 centres. However, urban climate models neglect this phenomenon. The objective of this paper is to
14 integrate the coupled mass and heat transfers into the urban climate model Town Energy Balance (TEB).
15 A specially designed numerical method for solving hygrothermal transfers at the urban scale is updated
16 and the hygrothermal transfer through walls is integrated into TEB. The reliability of this modified
17 version of TEB for representing a historical district is verified by comparing the simulated results with
18 in-situ measurements in a building of the medieval city centre of Cahors (France). The comparison is
19 carried out for several points in the wall and for indoor conditions. The integration of the moisture
20 transfers through the walls greatly improves the moisture estimation inside the building. This new
21 version of the model gives a good representation of the hygrothermal behaviour of a historical building
22 and could therefore be used to compare several renovation scenarios.

23 **Keywords:**

24 Hygrothermal behaviour, urban climate model, historical city centre, in-situ measurement
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Given the climate emergency, enhancing building energy efficiency is a priority. This is particularly
3 true in historical city centres, which are composed of poorly insulated buildings. In addition, their
4 complex urban forms make them particularly vulnerable to Urban Heat Island (UHI) phenomena (Rosso
5 et al., 2018), expressed by the observation of higher temperatures in cities than in the surrounding urban
6 areas (Oke, 1988). Research projects have shown that building retrofit is a major lever for limiting the
7 UHI effect (Masson et al., 2014, 2013). Historical city centres are often subject to constraints related to
8 heritage preservation. For example, a retrofit of historical walls by applying external insulation is not
9 possible (Hansen et al., 2018). According to Cassar (2009), two major challenges to be confronted in
10 the 21st century are the urgency of energy renovation and the conservation of historical heritage.

11 Building energy simulation is an effective method for evaluating the retrofitting of historical city
12 centres. It allows easy comparison of different strategies and predictions of building and wall behaviour
13 in different configurations, over long timescales and in various climates (current or future) (Akkurt et
14 al., 2020; Webb, 2017). However, existing tools for energy simulation at the building or city scale are
15 designed to represent modern buildings. The thermal properties of historical buildings are very different
16 from those of more recent buildings (Camuffo, 2019; Cantin et al., 2010). Webb (2017) highlights two
17 main limitations of BES (Building Energy Simulation) models for representing old buildings. The first
18 is that the standard assumptions made about the input data are not appropriate. The second limitation is
19 that these tools do not adequately model certain physical phenomena, such as moisture exchange at the
20 wall level. This phenomenon is particularly important in the case of historical centres. It has a strong
21 impact on the durability of old walls (Hansen et al., 2018; Harrestrup and Svendsen, 2016; Straube and
22 Schumacher, 2007). In addition, the rain and moisture buffering capacity of materials can have a
23 considerable effect on energy consumption, and indoor and outdoor comfort in certain configurations
24 (Abuku et al., 2009; Maalouf et al., 2014; Osanyintola and Simonson, 2006; Saneinejad et al., 2014,
25 2012; Zhang et al., 2017, p. 2; Zhou et al., 2020).

26 Some BES tools perform whole-building hygrothermal simulations (Carmeliet et al., 2011; Rode and
27 Grau, 2003; Woloszyn and Rode, 2008); they use various approaches with different levels of accuracy
28 and computational costs (Janssens et al., 2008). However, to the best of our knowledge, no simulation
29 tool on an urban scale is currently able to model the coupled heat and mass transfer through walls, under
30 realistic weather conditions and on large spatio-temporal scales. A method has been developed
31 specifically to facilitate their integration into an urban scale model but it has not yet been implemented
32 into an urban climate tool (Ruiz et al., 2023).

33 This study employs the Town Energy Balance (TEB) model designed to parametrise energy, radiative,
34 water and turbulent exchanges between built surfaces and the atmosphere (Masson, 2000). This tool is
35 also used to assess the microclimate in the street and to simulate the energy balance of buildings (Bueno

1 et al., 2012). A neighbourhood is represented with simplified geometry, which means that buildings are
2 not modelled individually. Thus, urban climate models, such as TEB, can simulate large spatial scales
3 (from the neighbourhood to the agglomeration), over long time periods. The use of an urban climate
4 model for building energy simulation allows the following two key phenomena to be taken into account:
5 (1) the strong influence of the urban microclimate on boundary conditions of façades (Dorer et al.,
6 2013) and (2) the impact of waste heat from HVAC equipment and buildings on the urban microclimate
7 (Yang et al., 2017).

8 In this paper, an application is made on the medieval city centre of Cahors (France), which is subject to
9 heritage conservation regulations. In the framework of the ENERPAT project, a living-lab approach
10 was set up, with the aim of promoting an appropriate and suitable renovation of the old walls, as well
11 as revitalising the old centre and bringing back the population (Claude et al., 2017). Several buildings
12 have been retrofitted using hemp-lime insulation and long-term monitoring has been set up (Claude,
13 2018; Claude et al., 2019, 2017; Malagoni de Almeida, 2022).

14 The objective of this paper is to integrate the moisture transfer through walls in the urban climate model
15 TEB. The urban model thus modified will allow to consider the two main characteristics of old city
16 centres: their very dense urban form and the hygrothermal performance of the walls (Claude et al.,
17 2019). Section 2 presents a model of coupled mass and heat transfer through walls and a numerical
18 solution method specially adapted to the urban scale. In section 3, this numerical method is used to
19 integrate the moisture transfer through walls in the urban climate model TEB. Section 4 presents the
20 medieval city centre of Cahors and its modelling using the TEB tool. This section also discusses the
21 reliability of the model and the impact of moisture transfer, based on a comparison of in-situ
22 measurements and results simulated by TEB before and after integration.

23

24 **2. Numerical method for solving hygrothermal transfer at the urban scale**

25 Currently, the urban climate model TEB only takes account of heat transfer by thermal conduction
26 through the walls and neglects the influence of water in liquid and vapour form on the wall behaviour.
27 The objective of this work is to integrate the moisture transfers through walls. However, the most
28 common methods of numerical solution of coupled transfers are not suitable for the urban climate
29 model. Adaptations have to be made on the space-time discretization scales and on the numerical
30 resolution scheme. Explicit discretization schemes are difficult to integrate in TEB, while implicit
31 schemes require the use of complex, iterative solving methods. Implicit methods are generally based on
32 a variable timestep depending on convergence, which makes them complicated to integrate into a fixed
33 timestep urban model. For these reasons, a numerical method has been specially developed by Ruiz et
34 al. (2023) to work at the urban scale. This method will be used as a basis for the present work. Some
35 modifications have been introduced to make the method even more easily integrable in TEB and more

1 robust for numerical stability in the case of dynamic boundary condition calculations. The changes
2 made are detailed in this section.

3 2.1. Coupled heat and mass transfer model

4 The model to be integrated into TEB describes the hygrothermal transfers through a multilayer wall, in
5 1D. It considers the main phenomena of moisture and heat transfer. It models thermal conduction, water
6 vapour transfer through Fick's diffusion, and liquid water transport by applying Darcy's law. It is based
7 on the same assumptions as the work of Ruiz et al. (2023), i.e. it neglects: the Soret effect, the effect of
8 gravity in the pores, the influence of temperature on moisture storage, the contribution of the gas phase
9 to heat storage, the transfer of air through the wall, ice formation, pore weathering processes, chemical
10 reactions and the effect of hysteresis. In addition to these simplifications, two new assumptions are
11 made, neglecting: the dependence of heat storage on the variation of moisture storage, and the effect of
12 liquid water transfers on the heat equation (Mendes et al., 2003).

13 Applying these assumptions and using temperature and capillary pressure as the driving potentials, the
14 energy and mass conservation balances are written as follows:

$$15 \quad (c_{mat} \rho_{mat} + c_l w) \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} =$$

$$16 \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\left(\lambda + L_v K_v \left[\frac{\partial p_{v,sat}}{\partial T} \varphi + \frac{p_c \rho_v}{T \rho_l} \right] \right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + \left[c_l (T - T_{ref}) K_l + L_v K_v \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_l} \right] \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial x} \right) \quad (1)$$

$$17 \quad \frac{\partial w \partial p_c}{\partial p_c \partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(K_v \left[\frac{\partial p_{v,sat}}{\partial T} \varphi + \frac{p_c \rho_v}{T \rho_l} \right] \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + \left[K_l + K_v \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_l} \right] \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial x} \right) \quad (2)$$

18 with c_{mat} the heat capacity of the material, ρ_{mat} the density of the material, c_l the heat capacity of liquid
19 water (J/K), w the liquid water content ($kg.m^{-3}$), h_l the liquid water enthalpy (J), h_v the vapour enthalpy
20 (J), K_l the liquid conductivity (s), p_c the capillary pressure (Pa), p_v the vapour pressure (Pa), K_v the
21 vapour permeability of the material ($kg.m^{-1}.s^{-1}.Pa^{-1}$), c_v the heat capacity of water vapour (J/K), T_{ref}
22 the reference temperature (K), φ the relative humidity, and L_v the heat of vaporization ($2500 J.kg^{-1}$).

23 The boundary conditions represent the thermal (q_{s*} in $W.m^{-2}$) and mass (j_{s*} in $kg.m^{-2}.s^{-1}$) fluxes
24 exchanged between the wall surface and its environment. Transfers at the external surface include
25 thermal convection, mass convection, rain, diffuse and direct solar radiation, and long-wave radiation
26 from the atmosphere and other surfaces of the urban environment. Boundary conditions at the interior
27 surface are restricted to long-wave radiation, thermal and mass convection.

$$28 \quad q_{sext} = h_{conv,th} (T_{ext} - T_{sext}) + \alpha q_{SW,inc} + q_{LW}$$

$$29 \quad + L_v h_{conv,m} \left[p_{v,ext} - p_{sat}(T_{sext}) \exp\left(\frac{p_{c,sext}}{\rho_l R_v T_{sext}}\right) \right] + c_l (T_{ext} - T_{ref}) j_{rain} \quad (3)$$

$$1 \quad j_{s_{ext}} = h_{conv,m} [p_{v,ext} - p_{sat}(T_{s_{ext}}) \exp\left(\frac{p_{c,s_{ext}}}{\rho_l R_v T_{s_{ext}}}\right)] + j_{rain} \quad (4)$$

$$2 \quad q_{s_{int}} = h_{conv,th}(T_{int} - T_{s_{int}}) + L_v h_{conv,m} [p_{v,int} - p_{sat}(T_{s_{int}}) \exp\left(\frac{p_{c,s_{int}}}{\rho_l R_v T_{s_{int}}}\right)] + q_{LW} \quad (5)$$

$$3 \quad j_{s_{int}} = h_{conv,m} [p_{v,int} - p_{sat}(T_{s_{int}}) \exp\left(\frac{p_{c,s_{int}}}{\rho_l R_v T_{s_{int}}}\right)] \quad (6)$$

4 with $h_{conv,th}$ the convective heat coefficient ($W.m^{-2}.K^{-1}$), $h_{conv,m}$ the convective mass coefficient ($kg.$
5 $m^{-2}.s^{-1}.Pa^{-1}$), α the absorption coefficient, $q_{SW,inc}$ the incident short-wave radiative flux ($W.m^{-2}$),
6 q_{LW} the long-wave radiative flux ($W.m^{-2}$), and j_{rain} the wind-driven rain flow incident on the façade (
7 $kg.m^{-2}.s^{-1}$).

8 **2.2. Numerical method**


9 The numerical solution method was specifically adapted to be easy to integrate into the TEB numerical
10 scheme and to work at large spatio-temporal scales. The proposed method results from a compromise
11 between the numerical methods generally used to solve coupled transfers and the simpler methods used
12 to solve heat transfer through a wall in an urban climate model such as TEB, while taking account of
13 the level of accuracy expected in an urban scale model (Ruiz et al., 2023). Indeed, TEB is already based
14 on many assumptions such as that a neighbourhood is represented by a typical street and that only one
15 wall composition is simulated per district.

16 The proposed method is based on an IMPLICIT/EXPLICIT discretization scheme (IMEX) (Gasparin et al.,
17 2019). It has the advantage of being numerically stable and consistent, without using an iterative method
18 for solving (Gasparin, 2019).

19 The time discretization implemented is five minutes (the typical timestep in TEB). This is reduced to
20 ten seconds – only for the wall mass and thermal equations, not for all the TEB model – in the moments
21 that are critical for convergence, thus ensuring the numerical stability of the model. To determine the
22 critical moments for convergence, five tests are performed. They check for:

- 23 1. A large amount of rain absorbed by the wall,
- 24 2. Oscillations in temperatures or capillary pressures simulated on the interior and exterior
25 surfaces,
- 26 3. A large variation rate for the temperature or the capillary pressure on the interior and exterior
27 surfaces,
- 28 4. A large variation rate for the integrated water content,
- 29 5. The fact that capillary pressure does not become positive.

1 The procedure of the five tests is detailed in Ruiz et al. (2023). Only the test concerning oscillations has
 2 been modified. The new test not only observes the evolution of the sign of the variation rate, but also
 3 studies the evolution of the last two variation rates compared to the trend. This new procedure is detailed
 4 in **Fig. 1**, for capillary pressure at the outer surface. The same test procedure is applied to the capillary
 5 pressure at the inner surface, and to the simulated temperature at the inner and outer surfaces of the
 6 wall.



7
 8 **Fig. 1.** Algorithm of Test 2 for capillary pressure at the exterior surface.

9 These tests are all governed by the threshold values summarised in **Table 1**, which were defined to
 10 represent acceptable thresholds and provide satisfactory results while limiting the number of timestep
 11 reductions. The definition of threshold values has been simplified in this new method: contrary to what
 12 takes place in Ruiz et al. (2023), a single set of threshold values allows numerical stability to be obtained
 13 for all the meshes.

1 One difference from previous work is that, if one of the tests provides unsatisfactory results, the
 2 timestep is decreased for both equations (mass and heat), in all cases.

3 **Table 1**

4 Threshold values for the five tests (modified from Ruiz et al. (2023).)

Test number	Variable	Units	Threshold values
Test 1	Absorbed rain rate	$kg.m^{-2}.s^{-1}$	0.00002
Test 2	Variation rate for		
	- Capillary pressure	$Pa.s^{-1}$	666.67
	- Temperature	$^{\circ}C.s^{-1}$	0.000167
Test 3	Variation rate for		
	- Capillary pressure	$Pa.s^{-1}$	6666.67
	- Temperature	$^{\circ}C.s^{-1}$	0.000667
Test 4	Variation rate for integrated water content	$kg.m^{-3}.s^{-1}$	0.000167
Test 5	Capillary pressure limit	Pa	0
	Replacement value for capillary pressure	Pa	-1e5

5 Concerning the spatial discretization, a constant, relatively coarse mesh has been chosen, in accordance
 6 with the result of the sensitivity analysis of Ruiz et al. (2023). The meshing technique used is based on
 7 a stretch factor of 1.5, a first mesh size of 0.001 m and a maximum mesh size of 0.1 m. There is no
 8 refinement of the mesh at the interface between two layers of different materials, as we are mostly
 9 interested in results on the external and internal surfaces of walls.

10 Finally, the numerical solution method used is the Lower-Upper (LU) decomposition method. This is
 11 also the method used in TEB for solving conductive heat transfer alone. It is possible to use this method
 12 because an IMEX discretisation scheme is implemented. It would not have been possible with a fully
 13 implicit scheme.

14 The numerical solution approach applied is a decoupled method, i.e. the mass equation and the heat
 15 equation are solved separately (by two separate matrix systems). Thus, the heat equation has only one
 16 unknown: the temperature, and the same is true for the mass equation, which determines the capillary
 17 pressure. The method presented in this paper solves the mass equation and then the heat equation. The
 18 first equation is used to calculate the capillary pressure at timestep $j+1$. Then, this value of the capillary
 19 pressure is used in the heat equation at timestep $j+1$ (Fig. 2). This new approach makes it possible to
 20 solve both equations using the same amount of water at the same timestep. The results are therefore
 21 more consistent when the closure of the energy and mass balances are studied at the end of the timestep.




Fig. 2. Decoupled solution approach solving the mass equation and then the heat equation.

The following discretised mass and heat equations are used for solving at timestep $j+1$ and at node i .

$$0 = (C_{PP})_i^j \frac{p_{c,i}^{j+1} - p_{c,i}^j}{\Delta t} + \left[\frac{(K_{PT})_{i-1/2}^j (T_i^j - T_{i-1}^j)}{\Delta x_i} - \frac{(K_{PT})_{i+1/2}^j (T_{i+1}^j - T_i^j)}{\Delta x_i} \right] + \left[\frac{(K_{PP})_{i-1/2}^j (p_{c,i}^{j+1} - p_{c,i-1}^{j+1})}{\Delta x_i} - \frac{(K_{PP})_{i+1/2}^j (p_{c,i+1}^{j+1} - p_{c,i}^{j+1})}{\Delta x_i} \right] \quad (7)$$

$$0 = (C_{TT})_i^j \frac{T_i^{j+1} - T_i^j}{\Delta t} + \left[\frac{(K_{TT})_{i-1/2}^j (T_i^{j+1} - T_{i-1}^{j+1})}{\Delta x_i} - \frac{(K_{TT})_{i+1/2}^j (T_{i+1}^{j+1} - T_i^{j+1})}{\Delta x_i} \right] + \left[\frac{(K_{TP})_{i-1/2}^j (p_{c,i}^{j+1} - p_{c,i-1}^{j+1})}{\Delta x_i} - \frac{(K_{TP})_{i+1/2}^j (p_{c,i+1}^{j+1} - p_{c,i}^{j+1})}{\Delta x_i} \right] \quad (8)$$

The coefficients of the matrices are written as follows:

$$C_{TT} = c_{mat} \rho_{mat} + c_l W; C_{PP} = \frac{dw}{dp_c}; K_{TT} = \lambda + L_v K_{PT}; K_{TP} = L_v K_{vR_v T \rho_l}; K_{PP} = K_l + K_{vR_v T \rho_l} \text{ and } K_{PT} = K_{vR_v T^2} \left(L_v - \frac{p_c}{\rho_l} \right).$$

The coefficients C_{**} and K_{**} also depend on the temperature and capillary pressure. The values of these two variables are unknown at the beginning of timestep $j+1$. Their calculation is therefore based on the values obtained at timestep j , which is a specificity of the IMEX scheme.

Spatial discretisation implies calculating the value of some quantities between two points of the mesh.

For this purpose, the mesh thicknesses are averaged and the coefficients K_{**} are calculated from a

$$\text{weighted average: } \Delta x_{i-1/2} = (\Delta x_i + \Delta x_{i-1})/2; \Delta x_{i+1/2} = (\Delta x_i + \Delta x_{i+1})/2;$$

$$K_{**i-1/2} = (K_{**i} * \Delta x_i + K_{**i-1} * \Delta x_{i-1}) / (\Delta x_i + \Delta x_{i-1}) \text{ and } K_{**i+1/2} = (K_{**i} * \Delta x_i + K_{**i+1} * \Delta x_{i+1}) / (\Delta x_i + \Delta x_{i+1}).$$

1 The same discretisation method and the same driving potentials are used to define the boundary
 2 conditions and the following equations are obtained:

$$3 \quad j_{sext}^{j+1} = h_{conv,m} \left(p_{v,ext}^{j+1} - p_{v,sext}^j \left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho_l R_v T_{sext}^j} (p_{c,sext}^{j+1} - p_{c,sext}^j) \right) \right) + j_{rain,abs} \quad (9)$$

$$4 \quad j_{sint}^{j+1} = h_{conv,m} \left(p_{v,int}^{j+1} - p_{v,sint}^j \left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho_l R_v T_{sint}^j} (p_{c,sint}^{j+1} - p_{c,sint}^j) \right) \right) \quad (10)$$

$$5 \quad q_{sext}^{j+1} = h_{conv,th} (T_{ext}^{j+1} - T_{sext}^{j+1}) + L_v h_{conv,m} \left(p_{v,ext}^{j+1} - p_{v,sext}^j \left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho_l R_v T_{sext}^j} (p_{c,sext}^{j+1} - p_{c,sext}^j) \right) \right) +$$

$$6 \quad j_{rain,abs} c_l (T_{ext}^{j+1} - T_{ref}) + \alpha q_{SW,inc} + q_{LW} \quad (11)$$

7

$$8 \quad q_{sint}^{j+1} = h_{conv,th} (T_{int}^{j+1} - T_{sint}^{j+1}) +$$

$$9 \quad L_v h_{conv,m} \left(p_{v,int}^{j+1} - p_{v,sint}^j \left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho_l R_v T_{sint}^j} (p_{c,sint}^{j+1} - p_{c,sint}^j) \right) \right) + q_{LW} \quad (12)$$

10 The variables at the surfaces are approximated by their value at the nearest node.

11 **2.3. Validation by inter-model comparison**

12 The objective of this part is to check that the updated method provides satisfactory results. This
 13 validation is performed by comparison with a reference tool, Delphin 6.1.2 (Fechner et al., 2020), which
 14 has been widely used and validated (Sontag et al., 2013). Delphin is a simulation programme developed
 15 for calculating the coupled transfers of heat, humidity, air, pollutants and salt in 1D, 2D or 3D. In our
 16 study, it was only used to describe the moisture and heat transfer through a multi-layer wall in 1D. The
 17 validation methodology is explained in detail in Ruiz et al. (2023) and only a brief description is given
 18 here. It consists of assessing the gap between results simulated with our method and those obtained
 19 using Delphin. Six variables are studied: temperature and vapour pressure at the interior surface,
 20 temperature and vapour pressure at the exterior surface, average temperature in the wall, and water
 21 content integrated over the whole wall. For each variable, threshold values for the error between our
 22 method and Delphin were set to: an absolute error of 1°C for temperature, and a relative error of 5% for
 23 vapour pressure and of 10% for water content. The times when these thresholds were exceeded were
 24 calculated. If the duration when the threshold value was exceeded was less than ten percent of the
 25 simulation time, the results were assumed to be satisfactory. Many cases were tested, including fifteen
 26 wall compositions (Appendix A – Table A1) and three climates (the temperate climate of Cahors in
 27 France, the hot and dry climate of Aswan in Egypt, and the hot and humid climate of Manaus in Brazil).
 28 All these study cases were simulated over a period of one year. The boundary conditions were always
 29 calculated considering the urban form of Cahors.

1 Results obtained with this modified version were always satisfactory for all the cases studied (Appendix
2 A – Fig. A1) with the mesh version presented in Section 2.2. This means that the new assumptions and
3 modifications made are appropriate.

5 **3. Integration of moisture transfer through walls into TEB**

6 The numerical method for solving hydrothermal transfer at the urban scale has been presented and
7 validated in the previous section. The steps involved in integrating this method into TEB are detailed
8 in this section, including the necessary adaptations regarding material properties, meshes, boundary
9 conditions and the solving of the transfers in the walls.

10 **3.1. TEB brief description**

11 TEB is an urban climate model, which has been developed to simulate thermal, radiative, hydric and
12 turbulent exchanges between the city and the atmosphere (Masson, 2000). The simulations can be
13 performed from the neighbourhood scale to the city scale. An urban zone is represented by a grid with
14 many points, representing each neighbourhood. The 3D geometry of the city in each grid mesh is
15 simplified by an average 2D urban canyon, which means that buildings are not simulated individually.
16 The TEB model incorporates the BEM (Building Energy Model) module, which simulates the energy
17 behaviour of buildings (Bueno et al., 2012). Buildings are represented by a single thermal zone and the
18 thermal inertia of the interior materials is modelled by a generic thermal mass (**Fig. 3**). This module can
19 simulate building occupancy, internal gains, HVAC (Heating, Ventilation and Air-Conditioning)
20 equipment, infiltration through the building envelope, windows and associated shading devices. TEB
21 thus assesses the building energy consumption and quantifies the interactions between the buildings
22 and the canyon microclimate.

23 The conditions in the urban canyon are calculated by considering many phenomena, such as the
24 interaction with buildings, the releases from traffic or industry, the effect of gardens and different types
25 of vegetation, the exchanges with the ground and the atmosphere, and radiative trapping and shadows.
26 The comfort of pedestrians in the urban canyon is assessed using the UTCI (Universal Thermal Climate
27 Index) (Bröde et al., 2010; Jendritzky et al., 2008). The calculation of this outdoor comfort index is
28 integrated in TEB. It uses the main climatic variables affecting comfort (temperature, humidity,
29 radiation and wind) and a physiological model.




Fig. 3. Description of BEM (taken from Bueno et al. (2012).)

Concerning the consideration of moisture, TEB performs a mass balance to calculate the specific humidity in the urban canyon by considering anthropogenic moisture emissions (due to buildings and traffic), and moisture exchanges with the atmosphere, vegetation, road and soil. The BEM module can calculate the specific humidity of the indoor air, from a mass balance taking internal moisture gains, and vapour transfers due to window opening, air infiltration or HVAC equipment, into account. The TEB model thus already allows for complete indoor and outdoor mass balances, since it considers the main moisture phenomena at the urban scale. However, it currently neglects moisture transfers through the walls. Similarly, rainfall interception, evaporation and runoff are currently taken into account at roof and ground level, but not yet at wall level.

3.2. Simulation of wall hygrothermal behaviour

The current version of TEB solves heat transfer in 1D through walls (Fig. 4). It considers only heat transfer by conduction in a material assumed to be dry; all other hygrothermal phenomena are neglected. The heat equation used to describe walls is the following:


$$C_{mat} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right) \quad (13)$$

where C_{mat} is the volumetric heat capacity of the material ($J.m^{-3}.K^{-1}$)

TEB considers spatial variations of thermal properties according to material layers but it neglects the temporal evolution of thermal properties according to the amount of moisture in each layer.

1 The integration of coupled mass and heat transfer involves implementing a second equation to solve the
 2 mass balance and also completing the heat equation by adding the hydric processes. This corresponds
 3 to equations (2) and (1), respectively, as the heat storage in the liquid phase, the evolution of the thermal
 4 conductivity as a function of the water content, and the heat transfer with the vapour phase must be
 5 added. These phenomena are integrated by applying the method presented in Section 2.

6 The addition of moisture transfers makes it possible to consider latent exchanges between the wall and
 7 the indoor and outdoor environments, as well as the effects of rain (**Fig. 4**). This new version of TEB
 8 can be used to quantify the impact of new phenomena, such as the evaporative cooling potential at the
 9 wall surface, the moisture buffering capacity of the materials and the effect of water contained in the
 10 pores on the thermal conduction of the walls.



11
 12 **Fig. 4.** Wall simulation in TEB (a) before and (b) after integration of hydric transfer.

13 However, the addition of moisture transfers is not limited to the modification of the equations describing
 14 the wall. It is also necessary to adapt the input data concerning the characteristics of the materials and
 15 the definition of the boundary conditions.

16 3.3. New input data

17 The walls simulated in TEB are multi-layer walls, i.e. they are composed of several materials. So far,
 18 the input data for defining the materials has been restricted to the thickness of the material layer, the
 19 dry thermal conductivity and the volumetric heat capacity.

20 The new version of TEB considers the evolution of thermal conductivity according to water content.
 21 The following equation is used to calculate the wet thermal conductivity (Nicolai, 2007):

$$\lambda = \lambda_{dry} + \lambda_w \cdot w \quad (14)$$

22 with λ_{dry} the dry thermal conductivity of the material ($Wm^{-1}K^{-1}$) and λ_w the thermal conductivity of
 23 liquid water ($Wm^{-1}K^{-1}$).

24 To describe the hydric behaviour of materials, it is essential to add parameters that provide the model
 25 with information on the moisture storage capacity, the liquid water conductivity and the water vapour
 26 diffusion. These three characteristics change with the humidity in the wall. Their evolution according

1 to moisture in the layer can be described in three different ways: fixed as a constant, defined by a list
 2 of points, or using a model. The method is chosen depending on data availability and material
 3 characteristics.

4 The model integrated in TEB to describe the moisture retention curve is based on the work of Durner
 5 (1994). Thus, the water content is computed from capillary pressure using a multimodal expression:

$$w(p_c) = w_{sat} \sum_{i=1}^N l_i [1 + \alpha_i |p_c|^{n_i}]^{-m_i} \quad (15)$$

6 with $\sum l_i = 1$ and $m_i = 1 - \frac{1}{n_i}$

7 The liquid conductivity is calculated using the Mualem model, which was originally designed to
 8 calculate the hydraulic conductivity of soil (Mualem, 1976; Priesack and Durner, 2006) :

$$K_l = K_{l,sat} s^r \left[\frac{\sum_i l_i \alpha_i \left(1 - \left(1 - s_i^{1/m_i}\right)^{m_i}\right)}{\sum_i l_i \alpha_i} \right]^2 \quad (16)$$

9 with $K_{l,sat}$ the liquid conductivity at saturation (s), $s = \frac{w}{w_{sat}}$ and $s_i = \frac{w_i}{w_{sat}} = l_i [1 + (\alpha_i |p_c|)^{n_i}]^{-m_i}$

10 Note that the TEB user has the choice of providing the coefficients necessary to calculate these two
 11 models or of directly providing a list of points linking the variable to be calculated and the capillary
 12 pressure or the water content. In the second case, the values of the quantities are then calculated by
 13 interpolation.

14 Then, the vapour transfer through walls is calculated using the water vapour permeability. The
 15 following expression links this coefficient with the water vapour resistance factor:

$$K_v = \frac{D_{v,air}}{\mu R_v T} \quad (17)$$

16 with μ the water vapour resistance factor (-) and $D_{v,air}$ the diffusion coefficient of water vapour in air
 17 ($m^2 \cdot s^{-1}$).

18 So, the water vapour permeability coefficient can be defined by entering a function or a list of points,
 19 but there is a third option. In fact, Künzle (1995) suggests considering the vapour transfer coefficient to
 20 be constant, as it is almost constant in the sorption region and vapour transfers mainly take place in this
 21 region.

22 3.4. Dynamic calculation of boundary conditions

1 The boundary conditions are calculated dynamically during the run time, taking the impact of the wall
2 on its environment into account. The TEB model calculates the hygrothermal conditions in the urban
3 canyon and inside the buildings at each timestep and these data are then used to calculate the boundary
4 conditions of the wall at the next timestep.

5 In the TEB model, only one thermal building zone is simulated, which means that the walls are not
6 discretised according to floors. Average boundary conditions are therefore determined for the entire
7 façade, using the mean temperature, the mean wind speed and the mean specific humidity in the urban
8 canyon.

9 **3.4.1. Thermal and radiative boundary conditions**

10 The version of TEB before the integration of moisture transfers considers the thermal and radiative
11 boundary conditions in a very comprehensive way. At the inner surface, the following exchanges are
12 taken into account:

- 13 - Long-wave radiation exchanges between the wall surface studied and other interior surfaces
14 (mass, floor, other walls and windows),
- 15 - Internal radiative gains,
- 16 - Load from solar heat gain,
- 17 - Thermal convection between the wall surface and the indoor air.

18 At the exterior wall surface, the boundary conditions are calculated from:

- 19 - Thermal convection between the façade and the outside air,
- 20 - Solar radiation,
- 21 - Long-wave radiation exchange between the façade under study and the other façades, the
22 ground, snow, the atmosphere, and also with the windows of other buildings.

24 **3.4.2. Hydric boundary conditions**

25 The integration of the moisture transfers through the walls implies adding boundary conditions
26 reflecting the moisture exchanges between the wall and its environment. The two phenomena to be
27 added are mass convection and driving rain.

28

29

30 **3.4.2.1. Mass convection**

1 Mass convection takes place at both the inner and outer surfaces of the wall. It reflects the exchange of
 2 moisture between the wall and its environment. It involves both a mass boundary condition and a
 3 thermal boundary condition, which is due to the latent heat of water vapour:

$$j_{conv,m} = h_{conv,m} \left[p_{v,env} - p_{v,sat}(T_{surf}) \exp\left(\frac{p_{c,surf}}{\rho_l R_v T_{surf}}\right) \right] \quad (18)$$

$$q_{conv,m} = L_v \cdot h_{conv,m} \left[p_{v,env} - p_{v,sat}(T_{surf}) \exp\left(\frac{p_{c,surf}}{\rho_l R_v T_{surf}}\right) \right] \quad (19)$$

4
 5 The TEB model calculates the thermal convection coefficients at the inner surface by applying the
 6 DOE-2 model (Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory (LBL), 1994) and, at the outer surface, using the model
 7 of Rowley et al. (1930, 1932). Then, the mass convection coefficient is easily calculated by applying
 8 the Lewis relation (Janssen et al., 2007):

$$h_{conv,m} = 7.7 * 10^{-9} h_{conv,th} \quad (20)$$

9 Mass convection also involves the vapour pressure difference between the surface and the ambient air.
 10 The vapour pressure of the ambient air is derived from the specific humidity calculated from the indoor
 11 or outdoor mass balance.

12 3.4.2.2. Wind-Driven Rain

13 The other boundary condition to be integrated is the rain absorbed by the wall. The TEB tool allows the
 14 local wind speed to be estimated inside the canyon. TEB simulates a one-dimensional wind profile
 15 within the urban canyon by using a drag force approach and considering the effect of vegetation and
 16 urban canopies (Hamdi and Masson, 2008; Masson and Seity, 2009). The local wind speed is an
 17 important criterion for estimating the Wind-Driven Rain (WDR). The method chosen to integrate this
 18 phenomenon is based on the work of Straube and Burnett (2000), as their formula integrates the local
 19 wind speed. The following formula is used to calculate the driving rain incident on the façade:

$$j_{rain,inc} = \frac{1}{V_t} \cdot RAF \cdot u(z) \cdot j_{rain} \cdot \cos(\theta) \quad (21)$$

20 with V_t the raindrop terminal velocity of fall, RAF the Rain Admittance Factor, $u(z)$ the local wind
 21 speed at the height of the studied point z , j_{rain} the amount of precipitation ($kg \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$), and θ the
 22 angle between the wind direction and the line normal to the wall.

23 For the calculation of the falling velocity of a raindrop as a function of its diameter, the equation of
 24 Dingle and Lee (1972) is used:

$$V_t(d) = -0.166033 + 4.91844 d - 0.888016 d^2 + 0.054888 d^3 \quad (22)$$

1 with d the raindrop diameter.

2 The terminal velocity of an average raindrop is estimated from the mean raindrop diameter. Blocken
3 and Carmeliet (2010) suggest the following formula to calculate the mean raindrop diameter, according
4 to the work of Best (1950):

$$\bar{d} = 1.105r^{0.232} \quad (23)$$

5 The incident rain flux used by TEB represents an average flux incident on the wall. The wind speed
6 used in the equation is therefore not the wind speed at a specific height, but the mean wind speed
7 simulated within the canyon. Concerning the local wind direction, TEB does not allow a wind direction
8 to be simulated inside the urban canyon, so it is assumed to be equal to the direction above the canyon.
9 However, the local wind speed generally used in Straube and Burnett's equation (Straube and Burnett,
10 2000), corresponds to the wind speed in a free wind region and thus outside the region disturbed by the
11 buildings.

12 The RAF coefficient allows calculations to pass from the WDR intensity in free field to the rain
13 deposition on the façade of the building (Straube, 2010). This coefficient depends not only on local
14 aerodynamics but also on raindrop diameter, building shape and wind angle of attack. In our case, the
15 local wind speed already took the local aerodynamics into account, but the other factors still needed to
16 be considered by a coefficient. The choice of the value for the RAF coefficient is complex and Straube
17 and Burnett (2000) suggest values for this coefficient for only a few configurations.

18 The use of a semi-empirical method for the prediction of WDR implies a high level of uncertainty (Zhou
19 et al., 2023). Nevertheless, the prediction of WDR in an urban climate model like TEB cannot be
20 achieved by CFD methods for each neighbourhood geometry studied. It was therefore necessary to
21 update these semi-empirical relations and to suggest suitable coefficients to work with the local wind
22 speed in the urban canyon.

23 However, not all the incident flux can be systematically absorbed by the wall. The maximal absorbed
24 rain flux is calculated according to the moisture conditions in the wall, from the following equation:

$$j_{rain,max} = - (K_l(w_{sat}), K_l(w^{elem})) \cdot \frac{p_c^{elem}}{x^{elem}} \quad (24)$$

25 with $j_{wdr,max}$ the maximum water flow into the boundary element ($kg.m^{-2}.s^{-1}$), w_{sat} the saturation
26 water content of the material ($kg.m^{-3}$), w^{elem} the current water content in the boundary element ($kg.$

1 m^{-3}), p_c^{elem} the capillary pressure in the boundary element (Pa) and x^{elem} the thickness of boundary
2 element (m).

3 The absorbed rain flux corresponds to the minimum value between the incident rain flux at the façade
4 and the maximum flux:

$$j_{rain,abs} = \min(j_{rain,inc}, j_{rain,max}) \quad (25)$$

5 Moreover, heat flux is associated with the mass flux of absorbed rain:

$$q_{rain} = c_l(T_{can} - T_{surf}) \cdot j_{rain,abs} \quad (26)$$

6 This equation expresses the transition of rainwater temperature from the canyon temperature to the wall
7 surface temperature.

8 In addition, the interception of rain by the wall has an impact on the distribution of the rainfall on the
9 scale of the urban canyon (see Appendix B).

10 **3.4.3. Management of timestep reduction**

11 As explained in section 2.2, the method developed for solving coupled transfers generally works with
12 a timestep of five minutes, but involves adding sub-timesteps of ten seconds, at moments critical for
13 numerical stability. The urban model TEB generally uses a fixed timestep of five minutes. Its numerical
14 stability does not require a reduction of the timestep. Therefore, this adjustment mechanism was only
15 applied to the transfers in the walls (as necessary for stability), but not to the whole TEB model. Thus,
16 when a critical moment was identified, the timestep for hygrothermal transfers through walls was
17 reduced while the timestep for the other physical processes involved in the urban climate model
18 remained fixed at five minutes. This method enabled a reasonable calculation time to be kept for the
19 whole model. Concerning the calculation of the boundary conditions of the walls, indoor and outdoor
20 conditions are calculated every five minutes, including in the case of a decrease of the timestep. Thus,
21 when the timestep is decreased, we consider that the elements needed for computation of boundary
22 conditions (temperature and humidity of the environment, radiative fluxes and driving rain) remain the
23 same for all the sub-timesteps of ten seconds and those until the end of the five minute timestep.

24

25 **4. Hygrothermal simulation of the historical district of Cahors**


26 In this section, the new version of TEB is tested in a case study of the medieval centre of Cahors. The
27 model had to be configured to be representative of this neighbourhood. The hygrothermal conditions
28 inside the simulated building are compared to those recorded in a building of Cahors and the results

1 obtained before and after the integration of moisture transfers are also compared. The impact of hydric
2 transfers through the walls is thus discussed.

3 4.1. Description of the case studied

4 This study focused on the medieval city centre of Cahors (Fig. 5), a small town in the South of France
5 ($44^{\circ}26'54''\text{N } 1^{\circ}26'29''\text{E}$). It is characterized by a dense, complex urban form with very narrow streets
6 having two main orientations: North-South and East-West (Claude, 2018).

7 Buildings date mainly from the 13th century (Malagoni de Almeida, 2022). Since that time, they have
8 undergone successive renovations, resulting in a high degree of heterogeneity of the walls. Two main
9 typologies of walls can be found in the medieval district of Cahors: walls made of massive brick and
10 wood-frame walls filled with bricks (Claude, 2018; Claude et al., 2019). The historical walls of this
11 district are subject to heritage preservation constraints. Therefore, when they are retrofitted, their
12 outside appearance must be preserved. In the scope of the ENERPAT project, the retrofitting of these
13 walls using bio-based materials was studied, considering the heritage conservation constraint and also
14 the durability of the wall (in particular the growth of mould) (Claude et al., 2019). As part of this work,
15 walls were renovated using a hemp-lime interior insulation and instrumented (Claude et al., 2017). A
16 weather station was also set up on a roof in the medieval centre, close to the instrumented building, in
17 order to record local weather data (**Fig. 5**).



18 **Fig. 5.** Medieval district of Cahors (taken from Charrier (2013)) and location of the instrumented area.
19

20 Data measured in a monitored building were used to validate the modified version of TEB, including
21 moisture transfer through walls. The building studied had massive walls (40 cm thickness of bricks).

22 Not all walls of the building had been retrofitted with the same techniques. Most of them had been
23 insulated from the inside with polystyrene, while the first-floor façade facing west had been retrofitted
24 with 15 cm of hemp and lime insulation. This wall was the only instrumented wall in the building and
25 was therefore used for model validation (

26 **Fig. 6**). The hypothesis made for the TEB configuration was therefore that the wall composed of 40 cm
27 thickness of bricks and insulated with 15 cm of hemp-lime, was representative of the district. It is


1 important to underline that, in reality, this wall was not totally representative of the medieval centre.
2 However, the objective of this work was to validate the model and not to study the behaviour of the
3 medieval centre of Cahors.



4
5 **Fig. 6.** View of the west facade of the building studied.

6 **4.2. In-situ instrumentation**

7 The instruments installed in the building recorded not only measurements of indoor conditions but also
8 those in the wall (**Fig. 7**). Thus, temperature and relative humidity were recorded with a
9 thermohygrometer (KIMO KH50) in the room adjacent to the wall under study. The surface temperature
10 was measured on the indoor surface of the wall, using type K thermocouples. Sensors (Honeywell HIH
11 4602-C) detected the hygrothermal conditions in the middle of the insulation and at the interface
12 between the insulation and the brick.



13
14 **Fig. 7.** Description of the instrumented wall.

15 A weather station (Vantage Pro 2 Plus) was also installed to measure local outdoor conditions. It was
16 positioned on a roof in the medieval centre of Cahors (**Fig. 8**) to provide data on temperature, relative
17 humidity, amount of precipitation, solar radiation, and wind speed and direction.



Fig. 8. Weather station located on a roof in the medieval centre of Cahors.

4.3. Configuration of the simulation

The objective of this part was to provide input parameters to TEB, which described the study case. The urban form of the district is very dense and contiguous; the indicators provided by Claude (2018) were used. The RAF coefficient, used for the calculation of the WDR, was set to 0.2 to match the in-situ measurement of relative humidity inside the studied wall. As TEB allows the simulation of various street orientations, the two main street orientations were simulated (**Fig. 9**). The instrumented wall is the wall B.




Fig. 9. Description of the two street configurations simulated (view from above.)

The buildings were assumed to have undergone a first renovation with modern materials, i.e. roof insulation with mineral wool, installation of double glazing in the windows, insulation of the walls with hemp-lime and reduction of the air permeability. The medieval town centre is facing a loss of inhabitants to more modern dwellings, mainly due to the lack of comfort and to fuel poverty. The buildings were therefore considered unoccupied, no ventilation or air conditioning equipment was running, internal

1 loads were set to zero and wood shutters were always closed. The heating worked only during cold
 2 periods, with a set point of 19 °C. **Table 2** summarises the input data used to describe the medieval
 3 town centre of Cahors.

4 **Table 2**
 5 Properties of the average street simulated in TEB.

Property	Value	Unit
Vertical-to-horizontal building area ratio	1.8	
Building height	12	m
Building density	0.589	
Roughness length	1.5	m
Internal gains	0	W/m ²
Glazing-to-wall ratio	0.1	
Window construction	Double-glazing	
U-value window	2	W/(m ² /K)
Shading devices	Permanent	
Solar transmittance of shade	0	
Infiltration	4	Vol/h at 50 Pa
Mechanical ventilation	None	
Heating system	Variable (Fig. 10)	
Air conditioning system	None	

6 **Table 3** summarises the thermal and radiative properties of construction materials, used in roofs, walls,
 7 floors and masses for thermal inertia.

8 **Table 3**
 9 Characteristics of the materials constituting the building.

Property	Material	Thicknes s (m)	Volumetric heat capacity ($J.m^{-3}.K^{-1}$)	Thermal conductivity ($W.m^{-1}.K^{-1}$)	Albedo	Emissivit y
Roof						
Layer 1 (out)	Tile	0.02	1422900	1	0.25	0.8
Layer 2	Mineral wool	0.2	42500	0.04		
Layer 3 (in)	Plasterboard	0.02	765000	0.21		
Wall						
Layer 1	Brick	0.4	1292800	0.49	0.3	0.9
Layer 2	Hemp-lime	0.15	440000	0.107		
Floor						
Layer 1	Wood	0.2	800000	0.29		
Mass						
Layer 1	Wood	0.15	800000	0.29		

10 As explained in Section 3.3, further properties were needed to describe the hygrothermal behaviour of
 11 the walls in the modified version of TEB. The hygrothermal properties of the materials constituting the

1 walls were defined from the results of Claude's work (Claude, 2018), which includes a characterisation
2 of the insulation based on hemp-lime and of 16th century bricks taken from the old centre of Cahors.
3 The values used for thermal conductivity and volumetric specific heat are given in **Table 3**.

4 For hemp-lime, lists of points were used to describe the moisture retention curve and the evolution of
5 the liquid conductivity as a function of the water content. For brick, both curves were described by
6 applying the models associated with equations (15) and (17). For both materials, the vapour diffusivity
7 coefficient was assumed to be constant. All the parameters used to describe the hydric behaviour of
8 brick and hemp-lime are presented in detail in Appendix C.

9 **4.4. Forcing data**

10 The simulation time was divided into two phases: the initialisation phase and the comparison phase.
11 The initialisation step lasted for one year, from 17th June 2020 to 17th June 2021. The purpose of this
12 stage was to obtain suitable initial conditions in the wall at the beginning of the comparison phase. The
13 comparison ran from 17th June 2021 to 1st January 2022 (more than six months) (**Fig. 10**).

14 The urban simulation of the TEB tool needs to be forced by a file of weather above the canyon. During
15 the initialisation phase, data from the urban weather station were not available. Therefore, the weather
16 forcing was computed using weather data from a station at a nearby aerodrome: the forcing data for
17 temperature, specific humidity, horizontal rainfall, solar radiation, pressure, wind speed and direction
18 were calculated using the measurements of Le Montat weather station, located about 10 km from the
19 centre of Cahors. The only missing data was longwave radiation from the atmosphere, which was
20 calculated from the formulas of Martin and Berdahl (1984) and Walton (1980). These equations
21 required knowledge of the air temperature and the dew point temperature, which were obtained from
22 the measurements at the station, and also of the cloud cover, which was not measured at this station.
23 For the cloud cover, the value recorded by a weather station located at Gourdon (about 40 km from
24 Cahors) was used.

25 During the comparison phase, the data from the weather station located on a roof in Cahors were
26 available and could be used directly. This station provided almost all the variables necessary for the
27 forcing (temperature, specific humidity, horizontal rainfall, solar radiation, pressure, wind speed and
28 direction). However, the variables measured at this urban station did not allow the computation of long
29 wave radiation from the atmosphere. The same method as in the initialisation phase was therefore
30 applied.

31 The heating in TEB was programmed so as to be switched on during the same periods in the simulation
32 as in the real building. It was thus activated from 17th June 2020 to 17th May 2021 and from 17th
33 November 2021 to 1st January 2022. The fact that the heater was switched on did not mean that it ran
34 continuously. It only heated when the indoor temperature was below the target temperature (19 °C).




Fig. 11. Temperature (a), relative humidity (b), solar radiation (c) and precipitation (d) used for the forcing file of data above the urban canyon.

4.5. Assessment method

Calibration and validation of numerical models are key issues in order to obtain robust results when simulating historical buildings (Costa-Carrapiço et al., 2022a; Huerto-Cardenas et al., 2020; Panico et al., 2023). Several works have used in-situ data measured in old buildings to calibrate and/or validate their wall or building models (Andreotti et al., 2022; Hansen et al., 2018; Panico et al., 2023; Roberti et al., 2015; Şahin et al., 2015; Saïd et al., 1999). However, there is currently no consensus on the method to be used for comparing measured and simulated data (Costa-Carrapiço et al., 2022b). Huerto-Cardenas et al. (2020) suggest a reflection on this topic and provide guidelines for the parameters to be compared (in particular the importance of integrating a criterion on humidity) and the threshold values to be used for the validation. It is unrealistic to expect perfect agreement between simulated and measured data (Hens, 2015; Panico et al., 2023) as it is difficult for models to reflect real conditions. The tools are based on more or less complete hypotheses concerning physical phenomena, geometry, wall composition, hygrothermal properties of materials, occupancy, and meteorological data. Uncertainties also exist on the representativeness of in-situ measurements (Akkurt et al., 2020; Costa-Carrapiço et al., 2022b).

To check the relevance of the model and of the assumptions made, the conditions simulated by TEB are compared with the measurements made in the instrumented building in Cahors (Fig. 7). The ability

1 of TEB to provide reliable simulations the study case was checked at four points: at the interface
 2 between brick and insulation, in the middle of the insulation, at the inner surface of the wall, and inside
 3 the building. Both temperature and relative humidity were verified at all these points, except at the
 4 surface, where only the temperature was recorded.

5 The gap between measured and simulated data was evaluated through two indicators: MAE (Mean
 6 Absolute Error) and Pearson coefficient, which measures the linear correlation between two sets of data.

$$MAE = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |m_i - s_i|}{n} \quad (27)$$

$$r = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (m_i - \bar{m}) \times (s_i - \bar{s})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (m_i - \bar{m})^2} \times \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (s_i - \bar{s})^2}} \quad (28)$$

7 with m_i the measured value at time i , s_i the simulated value at time i , and n the number of timesteps.

8 Following Huerto-Cardenas et al. (2020), a first level of validation was considered when the MAE was
 9 lower than 1 °C or 5% RH. Another, less accurate, level of validation was defined by considering a
 10 threshold for MAE at 2 °C or 10% RH, which corresponded to the threshold for the second level of
 11 Huerto-Cardenas et al. (2020). At both validation levels, we estimated that the Pearson coefficient had
 12 to be greater than 0.7, to reflect a good correlation between measured and simulated values (**Table 4**).
 13 In cases where the values were outside these validation criteria, the simulation results were considered
 14 unsatisfactory. This method of validation was applied for the two variables and the four comparison
 15 points.

16 **Table 4**
 17 Threshold values for the two validation levels.

	Level 1	Level 2
MAE (Mean Absolute Error)	≤ 1°C	≤ 2°C
	≤ 5%RH	≤ 10%RH
r (Pearson coefficient)	> 0.7	> 0.7

18

19 **4.6. Results**

20 This section shows the results of the comparison between the measurements and the simulations using
 21 TEB. This will allow us to verify that the results simulated with TEB are satisfactory and thus to confirm
 22 the quality of the model and the relevance of the assumptions made concerning the definition of the
 23 neighbourhood, the building, and the materials.

24 Both versions of TEB (with and without moisture transfer through walls) are compared with in-situ
 25 measurements. The interest of integrated hygrothermal transfer is evaluated. The comparison of the two
 26 versions makes it possible to quantify the impact of the moisture transfers on the different points

1 studied: at the brick/insulation interface, in the middle of the insulation, on the inner surface of the wall,
2 inside the building and also in the urban canyon.

3 **4.6.1. Hygrothermal conditions in the wall**

4 The first point of study corresponds to the interface between the brick and the insulation. Regarding
5 temperature, the simulated data are close to the measurements made at the same point. Moreover, a
6 similar trend is observed for both curves (**Fig. 12**). The MAE for temperature is approximately equal
7 for both versions of TEB (**Table 5**). Thus, moisture transfer does not seem to have a great impact on
8 the temperature at this point. The MAE for the modified version of TEB is 1.18°C. As the MAE is
9 above 1°C, the validation is only level 2. Nevertheless, the results remain satisfactory, with a high
10 Pearson coefficient of 0.992.

11 The relative humidity is validated at level 1 (the most accurate level). The model tends to overestimate
12 the relative humidity in summer and underestimate it in winter. Nevertheless, the results remain
13 satisfactory. The amount of moisture at the interface is strongly affected by WDR. The model and the
14 coefficient used are therefore suitable to describe the driving rain incident on the first floor of this
15 façade. On the other hand, it is not possible to compare the relative humidity between the two versions
16 of TEB, since the version before integration does not calculate the humidity evolution inside the wall.

17 It should be remembered that TEB does not differentiate the floors in the calculation of the boundary
18 conditions, which means that the entire wall, regardless of the floors, receives the same amount of rain
19 and the same radiative flux. In addition, the mesh applied does not include any refinement at the
20 interface between two layers of material. Taking these strong simplification assumptions into account,
21 the results obtained are very satisfactory.

22 In the present study, the interface was the point that was most influenced by the definition of the exterior
23 boundary conditions. The definition of the urban boundary conditions therefore seems relevant. In order
24 to better verify the relevance of the urban boundary conditions, it would have been useful to position a
25 sensor to measure the conditions inside the brick, closer to the external surface. However, the brick wall
26 was too fragile to be drilled (drilling could have affected the stability of the wall).




Fig. 12. Temporal evolution of simulated and measured temperature (a) and relative humidity (b) at the interface between brick and insulation from 17th June 2021 to 1st January 2022.

At the middle of the hemp and lime insulation, very good agreement is observed between measurements and simulated data for both temperature and relative humidity. Using the version of TEB that includes moisture transfer through walls, the validation is level 1, the most accurate level. In contrast, the results simulated by the unmodified version of TEB lead to a validation of level 2 as the MAE of temperature is slightly lower when moisture transfer is considered (Table 5). The hygrothermal properties used to describe the hemp-lime insulation are therefore appropriate.

At the level of the inner surface, only the temperature was measured and, so, studied. The simulation results are very close to the measurements: the calculated MAE is around 0.5°C and the Pearson coefficient of 0.99 shows a strong correlation (Table 5). This point of the wall is very strongly influenced by the indoor boundary conditions. The definition of the building therefore allows good simulation of the indoor conditions.

Table 5

1 Indicators on the error between the measured and simulated data at three points of the wall from 17th
 2 June 2021 to 1st January 2022 (*na* = *not applicable*).

			Temperature	Relative humidity
INTERFACE	MAE	TEB before modification	1.24 °C	na
		TEB after modification	1.18 °C	2.92 %
	Pearson coefficient (r)	TEB before modification	0.992	na
		TEB after modification	0.992	0.823
	Validation level	TEB before modification	2	na
		TEB after modification	2	1
INSULATION	MAE	TEB before modification	1.07 °C	na
		TEB after modification	0.82 °C	1.22 %
	Pearson coefficient (r)	TEB before modification	0.989	na
		TEB after modification	0.987	0.923
	Validation level	TEB before modification	2	na
		TEB after modification	1	1
SURFACE	MAE	TEB before modification	0.41 °C	na
		TEB after modification	0.53 °C	na
	Pearson coefficient (r)	TEB before modification	0.992	na
		TEB after modification	0.989	na
	Validation level	TEB before modification	1	na
		TEB after modification	1	na

3

4 **4.6.2.Indoor conditions**

5 Regarding indoor temperature, good agreement is observed between simulated and measured data (**Fig.**
 6 **13**). The MAE values are very satisfactory in both versions (**Table 6**). The difference between the
 7 simulated results from the two versions of TEB is very small, which shows that the moisture transfers
 8 have little impact on the indoor temperature in the configuration studied, i.e. an unoccupied building.

9 Previous works have shown a significant impact of the moisture buffer capacity on the indoor thermal
 10 conditions (Maalouf et al., 2014; Zhou et al., 2020). It would therefore be interesting to carry out a new
 11 study assuming that the building is occupied, to assess the impact of this situation in the context of the
 12 medieval centre of Cahors. Furthermore, considering the building as occupied would allow the comfort
 13 of the occupants and also the energy consumption to be evaluated.

1 In addition, a slightly larger discrepancy between the simulated and measured data was observed when
2 the heating was switched on. This is because TEB simulates perfect control whereas, in real conditions,
3 the indoor temperature fluctuates around the set temperature.

4 Concerning the relative humidity, a larger difference can be observed between the results of the two
5 TEB versions (**Fig. 13**). The calculation of the indicators (MAE and Pearson coefficient) leads to a
6 validation of level 1 for the version considering the moisture transfers through the walls and of level 2
7 for the version neglecting them. Moreover, not taking the moisture transfers through the walls into
8 account leads to inconsistent values, with an indoor relative humidity exceeding 100%. Condensation
9 should therefore occur, but TEB does not model condensation inside the building. Consideration of
10 moisture transfer through the walls provides results that are closer to the values measured on site: the
11 variations are smaller, and the peaks of relative humidity are reduced, which corresponds to the moisture
12 buffering behaviour of hemp and lime insulation, a highly hygroscopic material.

13 In the simulation of this unoccupied building, the moisture balance inside the building is only impacted
14 by the air infiltration through the building envelope and the exchanges through the walls. In reality,
15 other phenomena are involved, such as moisture exchanges with other internal materials (internal walls,
16 floor, etc.), and also transfer at the level of the roof and the ground, or capillary rise from the ground to
17 the walls. However, these phenomena are currently neglected in TEB. Therefore, if the accuracy of the
18 indoor relative humidity prediction is to be increased, these phenomena should be integrated into TEB.
19 For this study, the level of accuracy obtained is considered satisfactory.

20 It is also relevant to note that the measurements were made in a given room, on the first floor and
21 adjacent to the west-facing façade, whereas TEB does not simulate the conditions room by room but
22 considers the building as a single thermal zone. Finally, the new version of TEB gives satisfactory
23 results and thus correctly represents the hygrothermal behaviour of the old building. It will therefore be
24 a good tool for the simulation of the old town centre of Cahors on an urban scale and can thus be used
25 to evaluate different retrofit scenarios.

26

27

28





Fig. 13. Temporal evolution of simulated and measured temperature (a) and relative humidity (b) in the room studied from 17th June 2021 to 1st January 2022.

Table 6

Indicators of the error between the measured and simulated data in the room studied from 17th June 2021 to 1st January 2022.

		Temperature	Relative humidity
<i>MAE</i>	TEB before modification	0.54 °C	6.74 %
	TEB after modification	0.73 °C	4.43 %
<i>Pearson coefficient (r)</i>	TEB before modification	0.992	0.878
	TEB after modification	0.990	0.967
<i>Validation level</i>	TEB before modification	1	2
	TEB after modification	1	1

4.6.3. Impact on urban canyon conditions

The objective of this section is to quantify the impact on the urban canyon conditions of considering moisture transfer through walls. Saneinejad et al. (2014, 2012) have shown that drying the façade after a rainy event can lead to a reduction of canyon temperature and UTCI by evaporative cooling and thus improve pedestrian comfort. However, this experiment was performed in simplified weather conditions, since the windward wall suddenly became capillary saturated.

1 This section investigates the potential of evaporative cooling, using the second street configuration and
2 the south-facing wall C (**Fig. 9**) from 23rd to 26th June 2021. This case was chosen because it corresponds
3 to one of the highest absorbed rain fluxes during the summer of 2021. This study allowed the
4 phenomenon to be evaluated in real conditions when the wall surface did not reach water saturation and
5 in the specific context of a very narrow street.

6 The rain event took place during the night of 23rd to 24th June 2021. Thus, wall C absorbed rainfall and
7 the water content at the surface increased (**Fig. 14 a and b**). The relative humidity was almost 100%
8 until 9:30 a.m. and then decreased, matching the drying of the façade (**Fig. 14 c**).

9 The comparison of the two versions of TEB evaluates the impact of the moisture exchanges on the
10 conditions in the canyon. A decrease in the surface temperature of wall C of up to about 2 °C is observed
11 during the wetting and drying phases (**Fig. 14 d**). Thus, the version of TEB that considers moisture
12 transfer through the walls simulates lower heat and radiative fluxes from the façade to the canyon. **Fig.**
13 **14 (e and f)** shows a decrease of up to 24 W/m² for the sensible flux and up to 7.5 W/m² for the long-
14 wave radiative flux.

15 Nevertheless, the decrease in the surface temperature of wall C and in the fluxes from the wall to the
16 canyon is not sufficient to significantly impact the temperature and, more generally, the comfort in the
17 canyon. The difference between the two TEB versions does not exceed 0.05 °C for the canyon
18 temperature and 0.1 °C for the UTCI.

19 Finally, the potential for cooling by evaporation seems low in the context of the medieval town centre
20 of Cahors. However, these results are specific to the urban morphology and climate studied. It would
21 therefore be interesting to carry out a similar study in other cities.




Fig. 14. Behaviour of wall C during the wetting and drying phases: absorbed rainfall (a), surface water content (b), surface relative humidity (c), surface temperature (d), sensible flux (e), and long-wave radiative flux from the surface to the canyon (f).

5. Conclusion

The objective of this paper was to integrate moisture transfer through walls into the urban climate model TEB. For this purpose, a numerical method specially developed to simulate hydric transfer at the urban scale was updated, to improve its numerical stability and to make it easier to integrate into the TEB model. It is based on a decoupled numerical solution approach and an IMEX discretisation scheme. The spatio-temporal discretisation scales are relatively large, to adapt to the urban scale.

The coupled heat and mass transfers have been integrated into the urban climate model TEB by applying the numerical method presented. It was also necessary to add the boundary conditions related to the mass flow, which are dynamically calculated according to the data simulated by TEB in the buildings

1 and in the urban canyon. New input data have also been introduced to describe the hygrothermal
2 behaviour of materials. This improved version of TEB takes the effect of WDR and the moisture
3 buffering capacity into account. It can thus evaluate the impact of moisture transfers through walls, at
4 the urban scale and under real climatic conditions, over long periods.

5 This work is based on a case study of the medieval town centre of Cahors. The TEB tool has been
6 configured to simulate this historical district. In this old centre, a building was instrumented, and a
7 weather station installed on a roof. This long-term in situ monitoring was used for the weather forcing
8 of TEB, but also for validation. The results simulated using the TEB model before and after integration
9 of the moisture transfers have been compared to the hygrothermal conditions measured inside a wall
10 and in a building of the medieval neighbourhood. The results simulated with the updated version of
11 TEB are satisfactory at all four points studied (brick/insulation interface, middle of the insulation, inner
12 surface, and indoor conditions). The numerical model and method used to solve the hygrothermal
13 transfers are therefore validated. This also means that the assumptions made to describe the
14 neighbourhood, the walls and the materials of the historical neighbourhood are appropriate.

15 Both versions of TEB give very satisfactory results for the prediction of indoor and wall temperature.
16 The version after integration of moisture transfers also gives satisfactory results for relative humidity,
17 while the unmodified version of TEB overestimates the amplitude of humidity peaks in the room. The
18 integration of moisture transfer through the walls has therefore greatly improved the prediction of the
19 relative humidity inside the building. On the other hand, moisture transfer through walls and WDR on
20 the façade seem to have little impact on the temperature inside the building, in the wall or in the canyon
21 street.

22 However, it must not be forgotten that this study was carried out in a particular context of unoccupied
23 buildings. Future work should study these buildings under occupied conditions, with the aim of
24 quantifying the impact of moisture transfer through the walls on occupant comfort and energy
25 consumption. The new version of TEB will also be a powerful tool to evaluate different retrofit
26 scenarios in deserted old centres, such as that of Cahors, taking energy and microclimatic criteria into
27 account. In addition, the new version of the TEB model now simulates the evolution of the hygrothermal
28 conditions in the wall, which will enable the risk of mould growth to be assessed and thus consider a
29 criterion on the wall durability.

30 This updated version of TEB can also be used to complete the literature on the impact of moisture
31 transfer through walls with different compositions in various climates and urban forms.

1 Acknowledgements

2 This work was funded by the University of Toulouse and the Occitanie region of France. The authors
3 would like to thank the town of Cahors for its support and for making the building available to us for
4 testing.

5


6 Appendix A: Intermodel validation of the updated method

7 A numerical validation was performed by comparing the results simulated by the method presented in
8 Section 2 and by the Delphin tool. The methodology applied for the validation was identical to that
9 described in Ruiz et al. (2023). **Table A.1** presents the fifteen wall compositions studied and **Fig. A.1**
10 the results of the validation, which are satisfactory for all cases studied.

11 Table A.1

12 Details of the composition of the walls studied (Ruiz et al., 2023).

N°	Composition of the walls from the outside to the inside
1	Brick (0.4 m) – Hemp and lime insulation (0.1 m)
2	Hemp and lime insulation (0.1 m) – Brick (0.4 m)
3	Brick (0.4 m)
4	Hemp and lime insulation (0.1 m)
5	Brick (0.4 m) – Calcium silicate (0.1 m)
6	Brick (0.4 m) – Mineral wool (0.1 m) – Vapour retarder (0.001 m) – Gypsum board (0.01 m)
7	Lime plaster (0.001 m) – Mineral wool (0.1 m) – Brick (0.4 m)
8	Raw earth (0.2 m)
9	Concrete (0.2 m)
10	Mineral fine plaster (0.015 m) – Expanded polystyrene (0.1 m) – Concrete (0.2 m)
11	Concrete (0.2 m) – Mineral wool (0.1 m) – Vapour retarder (0.001 m) – Gypsum board (0.01 m)
12	Old brick (0.215 m)
13	Old brick (0.215 m) – Perforated composite foil (0.001 m) – Phenolic foam (0.05 m) – Composite foil (0.001 m) – Plasterboard (0.0125 m)
14	Old brick (0.215 m) – Glue mortar (0.0065 m) – Calcium silicate (0.14 m) – Lime plaster (0.004 m)
15	Old brick (0.215 m) – Mineral fine plaster (0.008 m) – Wood fibre board (0.1 m) – Gypsum board (0.012 m)



1
2 **Fig. A.1.** Time during which the threshold value was exceeded in a year for each simulation.

3
4 **Appendix B: Rainfall distribution in the urban canyon**

5 Before moisture transfer through walls was integrated, the TEB tool assumed that rain entering the
6 urban canyon was entirely received by the ground. It was distributed horizontally and uniformly
7 between roads and gardens, regardless of the shape of the urban canyon or wind direction.

8 Integrating moisture transfer through walls into TEB means adding moisture-related boundary
9 conditions. Each wall can now absorb part of the wind-driven rain. Section 3.4.2.2 details the method
10 for calculating incident rain according to wall orientation, wind speed and direction. Part of the incident
11 rain is absorbed, depending on the current state of the wall, and the remaining incident rain runs off
12 along the wall until it reaches the ground. Note that the absorbed rain is uniformly distributed vertically,
13 as the wall is not discretized.


$$j_{runoff} = j_{rain,inc,wall} - j_{rain,abs,wall} \quad (B.1)$$

14 with j_{runoff} runoff along the wall ($kg.m^{-2}.s^{-1}$).

15 Finally, after the integration of moisture transfer through the walls, the rain received by the ground
16 corresponds to the difference between the rain entering the canyon and the rain absorbed by the building
17 walls (**Fig. B.1**). Rain is still distributed uniformly over the ground, regardless of wind direction.

$$j_{rain,ground} = j_{rain} - 0.5(j_{rain,abs,wallA} + j_{rain,abs,wallB}) * r_{wall/ground} \quad (B.2)$$

- 1 with $j_{rain,ground}$ rain flux received by the ground (including roads and gardens) ($kg.m^{-2}.s^{-1}$) and
 2 $r_{wall/blt}$ wall-to-ground area ratio.



3
 4 **Fig. B.1.** Schematic representation of the distribution of driving rain entering the urban canyon.

5
 6 **Appendix C: Hygrothermal properties of wall materials**

7 This appendix presents a detailed version of the hygrothermal characteristics of 16th century brick and
 8 hemp-lime that were used to parametrise TEB. These properties are extracted from the characterisation
 9 performed by Claude (2018) (**Table C.1**).

10 **Table C.1**

11 Hygrothermal properties of materials.

	Density ρ ($kg.m^{-3}$)	Thermal capacity C_p ($J.kg^{-1}.K^{-1}$)	Dry thermal conductivity λ ($W.m^{-1}.K^{-1}$)	Vapour resistance coefficient μ (-)	Water absorption coefficient A_w ($kg.m^{-2}.s^{-0.5}$)	Water content at saturatio n W_{sat} ($kg.m^{-3}$)
16 th century brick	1616	800	0.49	9	0.28	388
Hemp and lime insulation	440	1000	0.107	6.5	0.2	789

1 The moisture retention curve of the brick was described by applying the Durner model. The coefficients
 2 used are described in **Table C.2** and the model is unimodal.

3 **Table C.2**

4 Coefficients of Durner model for the brick.

α	m	n	W_{sat} ($kg.m^{-3}$)
2.4553e-5	0.469704	1.88574	386.236

5 **Table C.3** shows the parameters used to describe the evolution of the conductivity of liquid water as a
 6 function of water content. The applied model is also unimodal.

7 **Table C.3**

8 Coefficients of Mualem model for the brick.

τ	α	m	n	$K_{l,sat}$ (s)
1	1.22646e-5	0.6915294	3.2418	3.312836e-9

9 Finally, the water vapour diffusivity of the brick was set to the following value:

10 $K_v = 1.619e-11 kg.m^{-1}.s^{-1}.Pa^{-1}$

11 For the hemp-lime insulation, the moisture retention curve is described by four points relating capillary
 12 pressure to water content (**Table C.4**).

13 **Table C.4**

14 Description of the moisture retention curve for hemp and lime insulation.

P_{cap} (log(Pa))	θ ($m^3.m^{-3}$)
0	0.789
6.13	0.0324533
8.79	0.00167187
12	0

15 Similarly, **Table C.5** shows the values used to describe the evolution of liquid conductivity according
 16 to water content.

17 **Table C.5**

18 Description of the evolution of liquid conductivity for hemp and lime insulation

θ ($m^3.m^{-3}$)	K_l (log(s))
0	-25
0.02812959	-14.2068454
0.788	-10.9586953

19 The vapour diffusion coefficient of hemp-lime was assumed to be constant at the following value:

20 $K_v = 3.564e-11 kg.m^{-1}.s^{-1}.Pa^{-1}$

1 **References**

- 2 Abuku, M., Blocken, B., Nore, K., Thue, J.V., Carmeliet, J., Roels, S., 2009. On the validity of
3 numerical wind-driven rain simulation on a rectangular low-rise building under various oblique
4 winds. *Build. Environ.* 44, 621–632. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2008.05.003>
- 5 Akkurt, G.G., Aste, N., Borderon, J., Buda, A., Calzolari, M., Chung, D., Costanzo, V., Del Pero, C.,
6 Evola, G., Huerto-Cardenas, H.E., Leonforte, F., Lo Faro, A., Lucchi, E., Marletta, L., Nocera, F.,
7 Pracchi, V., Turhan, C., 2020. Dynamic thermal and hygrometric simulation of historical buildings:
8 Critical factors and possible solutions. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 118, 109509.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.109509>
- 10 Andreotti, M., Calzolari, M., Davoli, P., Dias Pereira, L., 2022. Hygrothermal performance of an
11 internally insulated masonry wall: Experimentations without a vapour barrier in a historic Italian
12 Palazzo. *Energy Build.* 260, 111896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2022.111896>
- 13 Best, A.C., 1950. The size distribution of raindrops. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.* 76, 16–36.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49707632704>
- 15 Blocken, B., Carmeliet, J., 2010. Overview of three state-of-the-art wind-driven rain assessment
16 models and comparison based on model theory. *Build. Environ.* 45, 691–703.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2009.08.007>
- 18 Bröde, P., Jendritzky, G., Fiala, D., Havenith, G., 2010. The Universal Thermal Climate Index UTCI
19 in operational use. Presented at the Proceedings of Conference: Adapting to Change: New Thinking
20 on Comfort Cumberland Lodge, Windsor, UK.
- 21 Bueno, B., Pigeon, G., Norford, L.K., Zibouche, K., Marchadier, C., 2012. Development and
22 evaluation of a building energy model integrated in the TEB scheme. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 5, 433–448.
23 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-433-2012>
- 24 Camuffo, D., 2019. *Microclimate for Cultural Heritage: Measurement, Risk Assessment,*
25 *Conservation, Restoration, and Maintenance of Indoor and Outdoor Monuments.* Elsevier.
- 26 Cantin, R., Burgholzer, J., Guarracino, G., Moujalled, B., Tamelikecht, S., Royet, B.G., 2010. Field
27 assessment of thermal behaviour of historical dwellings in France. *Build. Environ.*, 1st International
28 Symposium on Sustainable Healthy Buildings 45, 473–484.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2009.07.010>
- 30 Carmeliet, J., Blocken, B., Defraeye, T., Derome, D., 2011. Moisture phenomena in whole building
31 performance prediction, in: *Building Performance Simulation for Design and Operation.* Routledge.
- 32 Cassar, M., 2009. *Sustainable heritage: challenges and strategies for the twenty-first century.* J.
33 *Preserv. Technol.*
- 34 Charrier, A., 2013. *Cahors, les chantiers.*
- 35 Claude, S., 2018. *Étude expérimentale et numérique de solutions basées sur les éco-matériaux pour la*
36 *rénovation thermique du patrimoine bâti urbain (PhD Thesis).* INSA de Toulouse.
- 37 Claude, S., Ginestet, S., Bonhomme, M., Escadeillas, G., Taylor, J., Marincioni, V., Korolija, I.,
38 Altamirano, H., 2019. Evaluating retrofit options in a historical city center: Relevance of bio-based
39 insulation and the need to consider complex urban form in decision-making. *Energy Build.* 182, 196–
40 204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.10.026>
- 41 Claude, S., Ginestet, S., Bonhomme, M., Moulène, N., Escadeillas, G., 2017. The Living Lab
42 methodology for complex environments: Insights from the thermal refurbishment of a historical

- 1 district in the city of Cahors, France. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, *Energy Consumption in Buildings*: 32,
2 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.01.018>
- 3 Costa-Carrapiço, I., Croxford, B., Raslan, R., Neila González, J., 2022a. Hygrothermal calibration and
4 validation of vernacular dwellings: A genetic algorithm-based optimisation methodology. *J. Build.*
5 *Eng.* 55, 104717. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobbe.2022.104717>
- 6 Costa-Carrapiço, I., González, J.N., Raslan, R., Sánchez-Guevara, C., 2022b. Understanding the
7 challenges of determining thermal comfort in vernacular dwellings: A meta-analysis. *J. Cult. Herit.*
8 58, 57–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2022.09.019>
- 9 Dingle, A.N., Lee, Y., 1972. Terminal Fallspeeds of Raindrops. *J. Appl. Meteorol.* 1962-1982 11,
10 877–879.
- 11 Dorer, V., Allegrini, J., Orehounig, K., Moonen, P., Upadhyay, G., Kämpf, J., Carmeliet, J., 2013.
12 Modelling the urban microclimate and its impact on the energy demand of buildings and building
13 clusters. *Proc. BS 2013 13th Conf. Int. Build. Perform. Simul. Assoc.* 3483–3489.
- 14 Durner, W., 1994. Hydraulic conductivity estimation for soils with heterogeneous pore structure.
15 *Water Resour. Res.* 30, 211–223. <https://doi.org/10.1029/93WR02676>
- 16 Fechner, H., Ruisinger, U., Nicolai, A., Grunewald, J., 2020. DELPHIN.
- 17 Gasparin, S., 2019. Numerical methods for predicting heat and moisture transfer through porous
18 building materials.
- 19 Gasparin, S., Berger, J., Dutykh, D., Mendes, N., 2019. An innovative method to determine optimum
20 insulation thickness based on non-uniform adaptive moving grid. *J. Braz. Soc. Mech. Sci. Eng.* 41,
21 173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40430-019-1670-6>
- 22 Hamdi, R., Masson, V., 2008. Inclusion of a Drag Approach in the Town Energy Balance (TEB)
23 Scheme: Offline 1D Evaluation in a Street Canyon. *J. Appl. Meteorol. Climatol.* 47, 2627–2644.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JAMC1865.1>
- 25 Hansen, T.K., Bjarløv, S.P., Peuhkuri, R.H., Harrestrup, M., 2018. Long term in situ measurements of
26 hygrothermal conditions at critical points in four cases of internally insulated historic solid masonry
27 walls. *Energy Build.* 172, 235–248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.05.001>
- 28 Harrestrup, M., Svendsen, S., 2016. Internal insulation applied in heritage multi-storey buildings with
29 wooden beams embedded in solid masonry brick façades. *Build. Environ.* 99, 59–72.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.01.019>
- 31 Hens, H.L.S.C., 2015. Combined heat, air, moisture modelling: A look back, how, of help? *Build.*
32 *Environ.*, Fifty Year Anniversary for Building and Environment 91, 138–151.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.03.009>
- 34 Huerto-Cardenas, H.E., Leonforte, F., Aste, N., Del Pero, C., Evola, G., Costanzo, V., Lucchi, E.,
35 2020. Validation of dynamic hygrothermal simulation models for historical buildings: State of the art,
36 research challenges and recommendations. *Build. Environ.* 180, 107081.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.107081>
- 38 Janssen, H., Blocken, B., Carmeliet, J., 2007. Conservative modelling of the moisture and heat
39 transfer in building components under atmospheric excitation. *Int. J. Heat Mass Transf.* 50, 1128–
40 1140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2006.06.048>
- 41 Janssens, A., Woloszyn, M., Rode, C., Sasic-Kalagasidis, A., De Paepe, M., 2008. From EMPD to
42 CFD – overview of different approaches for Heat Air and Moisture modeling in IEA Annex 41: IEA

- 1 ECBCS Annex 41. Proc. IEA ECBCS Annex 41 Closing Semin. 9–20.
- 2 Jendritzky, G., Weihs, P., Batchvarova, E., Havenith, G., de Dear, R., 2008. The Universal Thermal
3 Climate Index UTCI Goal and state of COST Action 730 and ISB Commission 6. Presented at the Air
4 Conditioning and the Low Carbon Cooling Challenge, London.
- 5 Künzle, H.M., 1995. Simultaneous heat and moisture transport in building components: one- and two-
6 dimensional calculation using simple parameters. IRB Verlag, Stuttgart.
- 7 Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory (LBL), 1994. DOE2.1E-053 Source Code.
- 8 Maalouf, C., Le, A.D.T., Umurigirwa, S.B., Lachi, M., Douzane, O., 2014. Study of hygrothermal
9 behaviour of a hemp concrete building envelope under summer conditions in France. *Energy Build.*
10 77, 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.03.040>
- 11 Malagoni de Almeida, M., 2022. Etude de la rénovation hygrothermique de parois anciennes utilisant
12 des matériaux biosourcés (PHD Thesis). INSA de Toulouse.
- 13 Martin, M., Berdahl, P., 1984. Characteristics of infrared sky radiation in the United States. *Sol.*
14 *Energy* 33, 321–336. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-092X\(84\)90162-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-092X(84)90162-2)
- 15 Masson, V., 2000. A Physically-Based Scheme For The Urban Energy Budget In Atmospheric
16 Models. *Bound.-Layer Meteorol.* 94, 357–397. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1002463829265>
- 17 Masson, V., Marchadier, C., Bretagne, G., Moine, M.-P., Houet, T., Bonhomme, M., Morel, T.,
18 Viguie, V., Avner, P., Aguejdad, R., Briottet, X., Doukari, O., 2013. Projet ACCLIMAT - Adaptation
19 au Changement CLIMatique de l'Agglomération Toulousaine (Research Report).
- 20 Masson, V., Pigeon, G., Lemonsu, A., Marchadier, C., Hidalgo, J., Bueno, B., De Munck, C., Daniel,
21 M., Viguie, V., Genovese, E., Salagnac, J.-L., ZIBOUCHE, K., Long, N., Levellier, T., Bonhomme,
22 M., AIT HADDOU, H., Adolphe, L., Nologues, L., 2014. Projet MUSCADE, Modélisation Urbaine
23 et Stratégies d'adaptation au Changement Climatique pour Anticiper la Demande et la production
24 Énergétique (Research Report). ANR.
- 25 Masson, V., Seity, Y., 2009. Including Atmospheric Layers in Vegetation and Urban Offline Surface
26 Schemes. *J. Appl. Meteorol. Climatol.* 48, 1377–1397. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JAMC1866.1>
- 27 Mendes, N., Winkelmann, F.C., Lamberts, R., Philippi, P.C., 2003. Moisture effects on conduction
28 loads. *Energy Build.* 35, 631–644. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788\(02\)00171-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788(02)00171-8)
- 29 Mualem, Y., 1976. A new model for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated porous
30 media. *Water Resour. Res.* 12, 513–522. <https://doi.org/10.1029/WR012i003p00513>
- 31 Nicolai, A., 2007. Modeling and numerical simulation of salt transport and phase transitions in
32 unsaturated porous building materials. *Mech. Aerosp. Eng. Theses Diss.*
33 <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.2016.2088>
- 34 Oke, T.R., 1988. Street design and urban canopy layer climate. *Energy Build.* 11, 103–113.
35 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-7788\(88\)90026-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-7788(88)90026-6)
- 36 Osanyintola, O.F., Simonson, C.J., 2006. Moisture buffering capacity of hygroscopic building
37 materials: Experimental facilities and energy impact. *Energy Build.* 38, 1270–1282.
38 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2006.03.026>
- 39 Panico, S., Larcher, M., Marincioni, V., Troi, A., Baglivo, C., Congedo, P.M., 2023. Identifying key
40 parameters through a sensitivity analysis for realistic hygrothermal simulations at wall level supported
41 by monitored data. *Build. Environ.* 229, 109969. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2022.109969>

- 1 Priesack, E., Durner, W., 2006. Closed-Form Expression for the Multi-Modal Unsaturated
2 Conductivity Function. *Vadose Zone J.* 5, 121–124. <https://doi.org/10.2136/vzj2005.0066>
- 3 Roberti, F., Oberegger, U.F., Gasparella, A., 2015. Calibrating historic building energy models to
4 hourly indoor air and surface temperatures: Methodology and case study. *Energy Build.* 108, 236–
5 243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.09.010>
- 6 Rode, C., Grau, K., 2003. Whole Building Hygrothermal Simulation Model. *ASHRAE Trans.* 109.
- 7 Rosso, F., Golasi, I., Castaldo, V.L., Piselli, C., Pisello, A.L., Salata, F., Ferrero, M., Cotana, F., de
8 Lieto Vollaro, A., 2018. On the impact of innovative materials on outdoor thermal comfort of
9 pedestrians in historical urban canyons. *Renew. Energy* 118, 825–839.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2017.11.074>
- 11 Rowley, F.B., Algren, A.B., Blackshaw, J.L., 1930. Surface conductances as affected by air velocity,
12 temperature and character of surface. *ASHRAE Trans* 36, 429–446.
- 13 Rowley, F.B., Eckley, W.A., 1932. Surface coefficients as affected by wind direction. *ASHRAE*
14 *Trans* 38, 33–46.
- 15 Ruiz, M., Masson, V., Bonhomme, M., Ginestet, S., 2023. Numerical method for solving coupled heat
16 and mass transfer through walls for future integration into an urban climate model. *Build. Environ.*
17 231, 110028. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2023.110028>
- 18 Şahin, C.D., Arsan, Z.D., Tunçoku, S.S., Broström, T., Akkurt, G.G., 2015. A transdisciplinary
19 approach on the energy efficient retrofitting of a historic building in the Aegean Region of Turkey.
20 *Energy Build.* 96, 128–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.03.018>
- 21 Saïd, M.N.A., Brown, W.C., Shirliff, C.J., Maurenbrecher, A.H.P., 1999. Monitoring of the building
22 envelope of a heritage house: a case study. *Energy Build.* 30, 211–219. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788\(98\)00031-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788(98)00031-0)
- 24 Saneinejad, S., Moonen, P., Carmeliet, J., 2014. Coupled CFD, radiation and porous media model for
25 evaluating the micro-climate in an urban environment. *J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 128, 1–11.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2014.02.005>
- 27 Saneinejad, S., Moonen, P., Defraeye, T., Derome, D., Carmeliet, J., 2012. Coupled CFD, radiation
28 and porous media transport model for evaluating evaporative cooling in an urban environment. *J.*
29 *Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn.* 104–106, 455–463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2012.02.006>
- 30 Sontag, L., Nicolai, A., Vogelsang, S., 2013. Validierung der Solverimplementierung des
31 hygrothermischen Simulationsprogramms Delphin (Technical report).
- 32 Straube, J., 2010. Simplified prediction of driving rain on buildings: ASHRAE 160P and WUFI 4.0.
33 *Build. Sci. Press* 148, 1–16.
- 34 Straube, J., Burnett, E., 2000. Simplified prediction of driving rain deposition.
- 35 Straube, J., Schumacher, C., 2007. Interior Insulation Retrofits of Load-Bearing Masonry Walls in
36 Cold Climates. *J. Green Build.* 2, 42–50. <https://doi.org/10.3992/jgb.2.2.42>
- 37 Walton, G.N., 1980. A new algorithm for radiant interchange in room loads calculations. *ASHRAE.*
- 38 Webb, A.L., 2017. Energy retrofits in historic and traditional buildings: A review of problems and
39 methods. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 77, 748–759. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.145>
- 40 Woloszyn, M., Rode, C., 2008. Tools for Performance Simulation of Heat, Air and Moisture
41 Conditions of Whole Buildings. *Build. Simul.* 1, 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12273-008-8106-z>

- 1 Yang, J., Tham, K.W., Lee, S.E., Santamouris, M., Sekhar, C., Cheong, D.K.W., 2017.
2 Anthropogenic heat reduction through retrofitting strategies of campus buildings. *Energy Build.* 152,
3 813–822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.11.051>
- 4 Zhang, M., Qin, M., Rode, C., Chen, Z., 2017. Moisture buffering phenomenon and its impact on
5 building energy consumption. *Appl. Therm. Eng.* 124, 337–345.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2017.05.173>
- 7 Zhou, X., Carmeliet, J., Sulzer, M., Derome, D., 2020. Energy-efficient mitigation measures for
8 improving indoor thermal comfort during heat waves. *Appl. Energy* 278, 115620.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115620>
- 10 Zhou, X., Kubilay, A., Derome, D., Carmeliet, J., 2023. Comparison of wind-driven rain load on
11 building facades in the urban environment and open field: A case study on two buildings in Zurich,
12 Switzerland. *Build. Environ.* 233, 110038. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2023.110038>
- 13