Standards for the structural design of dual-skin facade (DSF) curtain wall systems to resist wind load do not account for the geometric orientation of ventilation orifices with respect to the prevailing wind. Two numerical simulations of unsteady fluid dynamics are performed implementing the Shear Stress Transport (SST) turbulence model to predict the pressure exerted on the exterior barrier of a dual-skin facade under the condition of a transient wind for two different geometric configurations. It is determined that the orientation of the ventilation orifices produces a significant impact on the load carried by the outer wall. When designs create an air-flow path between the wind impingement surface and low pressure zones, such as the roof of the building, the load carried by the outer wall is much greater than the case where ventilation orifices are only placed at the impingement surface.
A crucial requirement for the design of a curtain wall system is sufficient integrity to resist structural failure resulting from aerodynamic load. The long development history of standards implemented to prevent failure under predictable wind conditions bears an inalienable connection to the traditional single-wall construction of the building envelope.

In recent history designs have been proposed and implemented that utilize a multi-layered approach in order to harness benefits of increased energy efficiency, acoustic isolation and access to natural ventilation. The continued innovation of these technologies presents a need for revised structural standards that account for the fluid-dynamical interactions of winds with the multiple layers of the wall.

The primary emphasis of recent research is on the thermal performance [1-4] and energy modeling [5-8] of double-skin facades. Investigation into the structural performance and pressure distributions of double-skin systems requires further exploration. Past research conducted in the area of pressure equalized rain screen (PER) design [9-13] and pressurized equalized cavities [14-16] provides a precept for analysis of Multi-Layered Systems (MLS); however, the geometric scale and modes of ventilation associated with MLS configurations are more expansive and affect the load sharing between the internal and external skins. Recent research on the ballooning of flexible membranes [17] also has potential application to double-skin cavities with an exterior skin subject to large deformations, such as a cable-net facade. The structural flexibility of the interior and exterior skins affects the load sharing distribution of a double-skin.

The most pertinent research of pressure distributions of double-skin facades is void of consideration for multi-skin facades. [20], however determination of the load sharing between internal skins, 4) permeability of the skins results of these investigations demonstrate a lack of standard guidelines addressing how to design and structurally analyze double-skin facades. Several attempts to document primary design considerations exist [20-21], however determination of wind loading and load sharing of double-skinned systems is addressed in brevity. Oesterle et al. acknowledge that the outer facade is primarily affected by short-term wind forces while the inner skin is subject to the steady components of wind [20], but variance in cavity geometry, opening configurations and airflow mode are not specified.

ASCE 7-05 Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures Section 6.0 is void of consideration for multi-skin facades [22]. It is unclear how the definitions of partially enclosed building enclosure and air permeable cladding relate to the determination of internal pressure coefficients for a double-skin which includes natural ventilation by operable units on the inner skin. The configuration of airflow openings is not addressed.

Eurocode EN-1991-1-1:2005 begins to address guidelines in Section 7.2.10 Pressure on walls or roofs with more than one skin [23]. This section specifies that the wind force on each skin is to be calculated separately. Section 7.2.10 describes how the wind force on each skin is dependent on 1) the relative rigidity of the skins, 2) external and internal pressures, 3) distance between skins, 4) permeability of the skins and 5) the openings [24]. A series of rules are then presented for determining the pressure on each skin, but is restricted to a distance between skins less than 100 mm and where the “extremities of the layer between skins is closed”. The present rules are not applicable to configurations which put air into communication with other faces, excluding double-skin facades and airflow configurations. Researchers have concluded that the wind load guidelines established in Eurocode EN-1991-1-1:2005 require revision [18-19].

In the present work the pressure distribution and load sharing of multi-story DSF systems normal to prevailing winds is evaluated for multiple ventilation orifice configurations.

### 2 MULTI-STORY MODEL

Two geometric representations of a dual-facade system were investigated by the method of CFD. Both cases represent the wind-facing wall of a low-rise building where the curtain wall is greater in its length dimension than its height dimension. In this case the flow can be regarded as two-dimensional, which greatly simplifies the solution domain and allows for liberal allocation of finite volumes to the solved space. The barriers of the DSF were modeled as rigid boundaries. This assumption is accurate when the outer wall implements traditional rigid framed units, but may not be applicable to the case where cable systems are used to suspend the outer wall. Both the three dimensional situation and the case where wall deflections are substantial provide opportunities for further research.

The solution domains observed in each case were similar and are depicted in Figure 1. The dimensions for each case are expressed in terms of the cross-sectional width of the orifices, which was specified to be 1 foot. The DSF configuration denoted as Design A features two orifices, both of which communicate to the air-impingement surface. A second case, that is labeled Design B, implements an alternate configuration where only one of the orifices is located normal to the prevailing wind. In this case, the second orifice is located at the roof of the building.

In both cases the wind is modeled as a transient with peak magnitude of 85 mph. The time-variant gust profile is provided as Equation 1. The profile of the gust is a power-law representation of the atmospheric boundary layer based on the limitations of the turbulent viscosity field. Equation 3 dictates the conservation of turbulence production and Equation 4 provides for conservation of turbulence dissipation. Equation 5 is the well known continuity equation.

The governing equations of fluid mechanics implemented in the simulation are listed as Equations 2 through 5. Equation 2 represents the conservation of momentum in the form of the Incompressible Unsteady Reynolds Averaged Navier Stokes (U-RANS) equations for a tensor of order two, where \( \tau \) represents the dimension normal to the wall surface and \( \tau \) represents the dimensional parallel to the wall surface. This corresponds to use in all of the cited equations. Equations 3 and 4, the Shear Stress Transport (SST) equations of Menter [24], press the Reynolds Stress by solution of the turbulent viscosity field. CFX commercial software was implemented to obtain the approximated numerical solution by finite volume method. A flux limited second order upwinding scheme was implemented for Equations 2 and 5 while a first order unwinding was implemented for Equations 3 and 4. Grid cell allocation was controlled to maintain a fine grid at wall boundaries.

Time marching was performed via the 2nd order backward Euler method and multiple linearizations were performed at each time level to maintain a convergence value of 10e-5 for the rms average of the residuals at each cell corresponding to each conservation equation. Numerical accuracy was also assessed by utilizing multiple grid levels. Models were investigated at both 260,000 and 385,000 cells. There was no appreciable change in the result.
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Figure 2. Pressure distribution for Design A (left) and Design B (right) at various times.

Figure 2 (continued). Pressure distribution for Design A (left) and Design B (right) at various times.
4 BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

The vertices of the solution domain are labeled A through D and the surfaces of the curtain wall fall within the zone annotated by E in Figure 1. At the solution boundary, AB velocity is specified by Equation 1 and the resulting pressure distribution is variable. The locations BC and CD are specified pressure and entrainment conditions where a pressure of zero gauge to the initial domain pressure is specified to be invariable with time and the second derivative of velocity is constrained to zero. At the boundaries extending into the zone of location E and all surfaces within that zone are walls and the no-slip condition is enforced.

5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to produce standards that prescribe appropriate pressure correlations to the free stream air velocity it is necessary to predict how the ventilation of the DSF affects its fluid-dynamic scenario of operation and the resulting pressure variations over its surfaces.

Figure 2 shows the pressure distribution of the solution domain at discrete points in time. It can be observed that the pressure response of the internal cavity that is formed between the walls of the DSF to the simulated wind condition is different for the two cases studied. An implication of this fact is that structural design requirements would not be the same for both systems.

In the case of Design A the variation in pressure over the outer impinged surface of the wall is small with respect to the difference between the mean pressure over the surface and the ambient pressure. Since both of the ventilation orifices in the external wall connect to this zone, the cavity pressure is relatively uniform and equal to that of the impingement zone. Since a small change in pressure does occur due to boundary layer development along the surface a mild airflow does take place in the cavity.

The situation of Design B strongly contrasts the alternate configuration investigated. It is well established that the leading corner of the building will result in the development of a free shear layer which may exhibit instability in the form of vortex shedding or other aerodynamic phenomena. Air entrained by this layer may gather sufficient rotational velocity to generate a low pressure zone at the roof of the building. The ventilation mode implemented in this situation provides communication between this low pressure region and the other orifice surfaces. The results obtained in this study bear obvious implications for the design of DSF systems; namely, that the ventilation geometry can have a substantial impact on the structural design requirements for the exterior layer. Analysis of the transient condition indicated that for the specific case in question, that the loading of the outer wall bared a relationship similar to that of the ASCE 7-05 method.
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