

**DISTRIBUTION OF PRESSURE COEFFICIENT
ALONG THE EXTERNAL PROFILE OF RURAL
HOUSE EXPOSED TO WINDSTORM IN
MALAYSIA USING COMPUTATIONAL FLUID
DYNAMICS (CFD)**

SITI NORATIKAH BINTI CHE DERAMAN

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2019

**DISTRIBUTION OF PRESSURE COEFFICIENT ALONG THE EXTERNAL
PROFILE OF RURAL HOUSE EXPOSED TO WINDSTORM IN MALAYSIA
USING COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DYNAMICS (CFD)**

by

SITI NORATIKAH BINTI CHE DERAMAN

**Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

February 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful. Alhamdulillah, all praises to Allah, the Almighty for providing me this opportunity and granting me the capability to complete this study successfully. I would like to express my utmost gratitude and appreciation to my primary supervisor, Prof. Dr. Taksiah A Majid and my second supervisor, Dr. Shaharudin Shah Zaini for their invaluable guidance, supervision, professional expertise, patience, commitment and encouragement throughout these years.

A heartfelt appreciation is also dedicated to Dr. Mohd Azmi Ismail, Khairi and Hafiz, who patiently taught me about ANSYS Fluent and Gambit 2.4.6 as well as solving the problems occurred in both software. Their knowledge, experience and expertise have made a significant contribution in all aspects of my research, and I am tremendously grateful for that.

I would not have been able to concentrate and accomplish my goals had it not been for the love and support from my lovely parents, Che Deraman Che Wil and Sobariah Ab Rahman and also my siblings, Hazwani, Azizul, Farhanah, Shahidan, Syahmi and Syahrul for their endless love, prayers, understanding, patience, financial support and encouragement. Allah bless all of you for the bits and pieces you have helped me with. I love you!

I would like to extend my thanks to the members of Wind Group for sharing their academic knowledge, friendship and cooperation during my study. I am indebted to them for their assistance during my journey. I would also want to express my special

thanks to my close friends from team Syabiha, Farah, Aziemah, Hasyimah, Ain, Rafidah, Fatihah, Aina, Hilmah, Azrin, Khairiyah, '*Geng Surau*', '*Kawan Sekolah*', '*The Legendary*' and '*Gadis Murai*' Group for their advice and support throughout the ups and downs. The same appreciation also goes to the Hydraulic Group, staffs from School of Civil Engineering, staffs from School of Mechanical Engineering, academic staff from School of Material and Mineral Resources, academic staffs from Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, all postgraduate student in School of Civil Engineering, members of Doctorate Support Group who directly or indirectly help me throughout these years, thank you.

Finally, I would like to thank the Ministry of Education Malaysia for sponsoring my PhD studies under MyBrain15 program. I am also grateful for the financial support from the Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS) provided by the Ministry of Higher Education (203.PAWAM.6071317) and the APEX Delivering Excellence Grant DE2012 from Universiti Sains Malaysia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xviii
ABSTRAK	xx
ABSTRACT	xxii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Overview of windstorm induced damage	1
1.2 Damage to low-rise building	3
1.3 Problem statement	5
1.4 Objectives	6
1.5 Scope of study	6
1.6 Novelty	7
1.7 Thesis organization	7
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Rural house in Malaysia	9
2.2 Factors affecting airflow around the building	10
2.3 Flow behavior of the airflow around the building	14
2.4 Atmospheric boundary layer flow	18
2.4.1 Roughness length	20
2.4.2 Turbulent region close to a smooth wall (log-law layer)	21

2.5	Computational wind engineering	25
2.5.1	Turbulence model	25
2.5.2	Fundamental mathematical models of RANS equations	26
2.5.3	Reynolds number effects	29
2.5.4	Grid discretization	31
2.6	Past research works	33
2.7	Summary of literature review	48
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY		
3.1	Introduction	49
3.2	Post windstorm site-survey	51
3.3	Flowchart for numerical simulation procedures	56
3.4	Numerical procedures for validation	58
3.4.1	Pre-processing for validation	58
3.4.1 (a)	Development of the geometry model of the validation model	59
3.4.1 (b)	Computational domain and boundary conditions of validation model	61
3.4.1 (c)	Development of grid generation for validation model	66
3.4.2	Solving of validation model	67
3.4.3	Post-processing for validation model	68
3.4.3 (a)	Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test	69
3.4.3 (b)	Error measures	71
3.5	Numerical methods for the house model	73
3.5.1	Pre-processing for the house model	73
3.5.1 (a)	Development of geometric model for house model	74
3.5.1 (b)	Computational domain and boundary conditions for house model	77

3.5.1 (c)	Development of grid scheme	83
3.5.2	Solving the house model using CFD	85
3.5.2 (a)	The RNG $k - \varepsilon$ turbulence model	85
3.5.2 (b)	Wall function and near wall treatment	87
3.5.2 (c)	Numerical technique	90
3.5.2 (d)	Iterative convergence	91
3.5.3	Post-processing for the house model	92
3.6	Summary of methodology	95
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS		
4.1	Introduction	96
4.2	Post windstorm survey results	96
4.3	Critical aspects that contributed on damages to rural houses	100
4.3.1	Effect of gap heights	100
4.3.2	Effect of overhangs	101
4.3.3	Effect of roof geometries	103
4.3.4	Effect of roof pitches	106
4.3.5	Effect of roof claddings	107
4.3.6	Terrain categories	109
4.4	Validation results between the previous and current study	111
4.4.1	Comparison of pressure coefficient	111
4.4.2	Quantitative test	113
4.5	Numerical simulation of rural house using CFD	115
4.5.1	Grid sensitivity analysis	116
4.5.2	Rural house with and without kitchen house	120
4.5.3	Overall effect around a rural house model	125
4.5.3 (a)	General trend of the pressure coefficient distribution	125

4.5.3 (b)	Effects of position of kitchen house on air flow properties around rural house	133
4.5.3 (c)	Effects of gap height on the distribution of pressure coefficient	148
4.5.3 (d)	Effects of roof pitch on the pressure distribution around the house	172
4.5.3 (e)	Effects of overhang on pressure coefficient profile	195
4.5.3 (f)	Design of experiment (DOE)	217
4.6	Summary of results	220
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		
5.1	Conclusion of research work	223
5.2	Future recommendations	224
REFERENCES		226
APPENDICES		
Appendix A: Survey Form		
Appendix B: Data Collections		
Appendix C: Beaufort Scale (MET)		
Appendix D: User Define Function (UDF)		
Appendix E: General Factorial Design		
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS		

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1: Typical surface roughness length, z_0 (Liu, 1991)	21
Table 2.2: Effects of Reynolds number (Fluent, 2010)	30
Table 2.3: Factors affecting wind flow around buildings	37
Table 3.1: Summary of the inspection at the site	55
Table 3.2: Summary of boundary conditions	64
Table 3.3: Input parameters by Tominaga et al., (2015) and the current study	68
Table 3.4: Summary of rural house development	74
Table 3.5: Values of wall function at the ground	81
Table 3.6: Properties of air	86
Table 3.7: Summary table of grid generation	89
Table 3.8: Solver setting in Fluent 14.0 for the house model	91
Table 4.1: Percentage difference of pressure coefficient for the current study and CFD Tominaga	113
Table 4.2: Multiple comparison of the group	114
Table 4.3: Summary of the error measures	115
Table 4.4: Meshing details for grid sensitivity analysis	117
Table 4.5: Maximum suction for the kitchen house located at the center	133
Table 4.6: Maximum suction for the kitchen house located at the edge	134
Table 4.7: Percentage difference of pressure coefficient for different positions of kitchen house	143
Table 4.8: Maximum pressure coefficient at gap height for the kitchen house located at the center	149
Table 4.9: Maximum pressure coefficient at gap height for the kitchen house located at the edge	149

Table 4.10:	Percentage difference of pressure coefficient for different gap heights when the kitchen house located at the center	160
Table 4.11:	Percentage difference of pressure coefficient for different gap heights when the kitchen house located at edge	165
Table 4.12:	Maximum suction on the roof ridge for the kitchen house located at the center	172
Table 4.13:	Maximum suction on the roof ridge for the kitchen house located at the edge	173
Table 4.14:	Percentage difference of pressure coefficient for different roof pitch when the kitchen house located at center	185
Table 4.15:	Percentage difference of pressure coefficient for different roof pitch when the kitchen house located at edge	190
Table 4.16:	Maximum suction at the overhang for the kitchen house located at the center	196
Table 4.17:	Maximum suction at the overhang for the kitchen house located at the edge	196
Table 4.18:	Percentage difference of pressure coefficient for different overhang length	206
Table 4.19:	Maximum net suction on overhang at windward side for the kitchen house located at the center	215
Table 4.20:	Maximum net suction on overhang at windward side for the kitchen house located at the edge	216
Table 4.21:	ANOVA test for the variables	218

LIST OF FIGURES

	Pages
Figure 1.1: Damage in Mourilyan from tropical cyclone Larry (Henderson and Ginger, 2008)	1
Figure 1.2: Examples of roof uplift of rural house in Kepala Batas, Penang	2
Figure 1.3: Benchmark hurricane vulnerability curves for commercial building classes (Khanduri and Morrow, 2003)	4
Figure 2.1: Worst peak negative pressure coefficients (Meecham et al., 1991)	12
Figure 2.2: Main streams as the flow approaches the building (a) side view; (b) plan view (Abohela et al., 2011)	14
Figure 2.3: Typical flow pattern of (a) gable roof (Liu, 1991); (b) flat roof (Cook, 1990)	15
Figure 2.4: Location of (a) stagnation point; (b) stagnation area on the windward wall (Liu, 1991)	16
Figure 2.5: The separation point and reattachment point developed on the elongated building (Liu, 1991)	17
Figure 2.6: Wind flow pattern around flat and gable roofs (Liu, 1991)	17
Figure 2.7: Subdivision of the atmospheric boundary layer (Ashrafi et al., 2015)	19
Figure 2.8: Boundary layer at a flat plate at zero incidence (Schlichting and Gersten, 2017)	19
Figure 2.9: Wind velocity profile according to the terrain (Oke, 1992)	20
Figure 2.10: The universal law of the wall for smooth and sand-grain roughened surface (Blocken et al., 2007a)	22
Figure 2.11: Mesh refinement around the cube (Abohela et al., 2016)	31
Figure 2.12: Mesh arrangement around the scaled cubical SEB (Irtaza et al., 2013)	32

Figure 2.13:	Structured quadratic mesh type (a) Tominaga et al., (2015); (b) Ozmen et al., (2016)	33
Figure 2.14:	Distributions of static pressure for different roof pitches (Tominaga et al., 2015)	34
Figure 2.15:	Streamlines for different roof pitches (Tominaga et al., 2015)	34
Figure 2.16:	Flow patterns around building models obtained with smoke-wire technique, Realizable $k - \varepsilon$ turbulence model and Standard $k - \omega$ turbulence model (a, d, g) roof pitch of 15° ; (b, e, h) roof pitch of 30° ; (c, f, i) roof pitch of 45° (Ozmen et al., 2016)	35
Figure 2.17:	Variation of mean pressure coefficients along the mid-axis of building model for $\theta = 90^\circ$ (a) $\alpha = 15^\circ$; (b) $\alpha = 30^\circ$; (c) $\alpha = 45^\circ$ (Ozmen et al., 2016)	36
Figure 3.1:	Flow chart of the methodology	50
Figure 3.2:	Site visualization showing the (a) roof uplift; (b) roof blown-off; (c) surrounding condition	52
Figure 3.3:	Measuring tools (a) measuring tape; (b) handheld digital laser distance measure	52
Figure 3.4:	Inspection on (a) timber roof truss using measuring tape; (b) house dimension of the damaged house using handheld digital laser distance measure	53
Figure 3.5:	Interview session with the house owner	54
Figure 3.6:	Cross-section showing the roof pitch, roof overhang and gap height	55
Figure 3.7:	Flowchart of CFD simulation	57
Figure 3.8:	Schematic diagram of the validation model (Tominaga et al., 2015)	59
Figure 3.9:	Developed validation model	60
Figure 3.10:	Computational domain size and boundary conditions of the validation model	61
Figure 3.11:	Computational domain for validation model from <i>GAMBIT GUI</i>	62

Figure 3.12:	Boundary conditions of validation model from <i>GAMBIT GUI</i>	63
Figure 3.13:	Grid generation of validation model using <i>GAMBIT GUI</i>	67
Figure 3.14:	Schematic diagram of 3-dimensional rural house showing the location of kitchen house at the (a) edge; (b) center of core house	76
Figure 3.15:	Outline of the rural house model (scale 1:1)	77
Figure 3.16:	Computational domain for house model from <i>GAMBIT GUI</i>	78
Figure 3.17:	Schematic diagram of computational domain and boundary conditions	82
Figure 3.18:	Boundary conditions of house model from <i>GAMBIT GUI</i>	83
Figure 3.19:	Developed mesh edge of house model from <i>GAMBIT GUI</i>	84
Figure 3.20:	Developed grid scheme of house model from <i>GAMBIT GUI</i>	84
Figure 3.21:	Schematic of the wall adjacent cell in the centre point p (Hargreaves and Wright, 2007)	88
Figure 3.22:	Schematic diagram showing the sections to generate grid at the bottom of computational domain for each section	88
Figure 3.23:	Mesh edge showing the cell height ratios at each section	89
Figure 3.24:	The residual graph showing the solution become stable	91
Figure 3.25:	The selected cutting line for kitchen house at (a) edge; (b) center	92
Figure 3.26:	The location of the cut section for overhang (a) 0.5 m; (b) 0.75 m; and (c) 1.0 m	93
Figure 3.27:	Net pressure on overhang roof	93
Figure 4.1:	Example of types of damage (a) roof of core house; (b) roof of kitchen house; (c) roof of core and kitchen	97

	house; (d) roof and wall of core house; (e) severe damaged	
Figure 4.2:	Number of damaged house according to the types of damages	98
Figure 4.3:	Number of damaged house according to the types of house	99
Figure 4.4:	Severe damage to the roof of (a) single-storey; (b) double-storey; (c) elevated rural houses	99
Figure 4.5:	Number of damaged house according to the range of gap height	101
Figure 4.6:	Number of damaged house associated to the overhang length of (a) core house; (b) kitchen house	103
Figure 4.7:	Examples of roof geometry (a) gable; (b) dutch-gable; (c) lean-to; (d) shed roof	104
Figure 4.8:	Number of damages caused by roof geometry for core house	105
Figure 4.9:	Number of damaged house caused by roof geometry for kitchen house	105
Figure 4.10:	Number of damages with respect to the range of the roof pitch for (a) core house; (b) kitchen house	107
Figure 4.11:	Examples of cladding profile (a) corrugated; (b) asbestos; (c) trapezoidal; (d) tile profile	108
Figure 4.12:	Number of damages according to the types of roof cladding for (a) core house; (b) kitchen house	109
Figure 4.13:	Number of damages based on the terrain categories	110
Figure 4.14:	Pressure coefficient between the current study, CFD Tominaga and WTT Tominaga	113
Figure 4.15:	Enlarged view of grids for grid sensitivity analysis (a) coarse mesh; (b) medium mesh; (c) fine mesh	118
Figure 4.16:	Pressure coefficient distribution of the coarse, medium and fine mesh	119
Figure 4.17:	The pressure coefficient contour along a rural house with and without kitchen house having (a) 12°; (b) 17°; (c) 22°; (d) 27°	121

Figure 4.18:	The streamlines along a rural house with and without kitchen house model having (a) 12°; (b) 17°; (c) 22°; (d) 27°	125
Figure 4.19:	Pressure distribution profile over a house model with the position of kitchen house at the edge	127
Figure 4.20:	Pressure distribution profile over a house model with the position of kitchen house at the center	130
Figure 4.21:	Pressure contour along the transverse profile of the house model for different kitchen house position	136
Figure 4.22:	Plan view showing the pressure coefficient of the house model for different kitchen house location	138
Figure 4.23:	Pressure distribution profile of a house for two different positions of kitchen house	142
Figure 4.24:	Streamlines along the transverse profile of the model for the kitchen house located at (a) center; (b) edge	145
Figure 4.25:	Plan view showing the streamlines of the house model for different location of the kitchen house	148
Figure 4.26:	Pressure coefficient contour along the transverse profile of the different gap heights for the kitchen house located at center	152
Figure 4.27:	Pressure coefficient contour along the transverse profile of the different gap heights for the kitchen house located at edge	155
Figure 4.28:	Pressure coefficient distribution along the transverse profile of different gap heights for the kitchen house at center	159
Figure 4.29:	Pressure coefficient distribution along transverse profile of different gap heights for the kitchen house located at edge	164
Figure 4.30:	Streamlines along the central vertical axis of kitchen house for the different gap height models when the kitchen house located at center	168
Figure 4.31:	Streamlines along the central vertical axis of kitchen house for the different gap height models when the kitchen house located the edge	171

Figure 4.32:	Pressure contour along the central vertical axis of kitchen house for the different roof pitch when the kitchen house located at center	177
Figure 4.33:	Pressure contour along the central vertical axis of kitchen house for the different roof pitch when the kitchen house located at edge	180
Figure 4.34:	Pressure coefficient profile showing effect of roof pitch for different overhang when the kitchen house located at center	184
Figure 4.35:	Pressure coefficient profile showing effect of roof pitch for different overhang length when the kitchen house at the edge	189
Figure 4.36:	The streamlines over a rural house for different roof pitches when the kitchen house located at center	193
Figure 4.37:	The streamlines over a rural house for different roof pitches when the kitchen house located at edge	195
Figure 4.38:	Pressure coefficient contour along the central vertical axis of kitchen house for the different overhang when the kitchen house located at center	199
Figure 4.39:	Pressure coefficient contour along the central vertical axis of kitchen house for the different overhang when the kitchen house located at edge	201
Figure 4.40:	Pressure distribution over a house profile for three different overhang when the kitchen house located at (a) center; (b) edge	205
Figure 4.41:	The streamlines over a rural house for different roof overhang when the kitchen house located at center	209
Figure 4.42:	The streamlines over rural house for different overhangs when the kitchen house located at edge	212
Figure 4.43:	Interaction and main effect plot for pressure coefficient	220

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

3D	Three-dimensional
ABL	Atmospheric Boundary Layer
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics
CD	Computational Domain
CWE	Computational Wind Engineering
DOE	Design of experiment
FVM	Finite Volume Method
FFD	Full Factorial Design
GH	Gap height
GSA	Grid Sensitivity Analysis
LES	Large Eddy-Simulation
MAE	Mean Absolute Error
MET	Malaysian Meteorological Department
NAE	Normalized Absolute Error
OV	Overhang
PBL	Planetary boundary layer
RANS	Reynolds Averaged-Navier Stoke
RKE	Realizable $k - \varepsilon$
RMSE	Root Mean Square Error
RNG	Renormalization Group
RP	Roof pitch
SEB	Silsoe Experimental Building
SIMPLE	Semi-Implicit Method for Pressure-Linked Equation

SKE	Standard $k - \varepsilon$
TKE	Turbulence Kinetic Energy
TDR	Turbulence Dissipation Rate
UDF	User Define Function
WTT	Wind Tunnel Test

LIST OF SYMBOLS

B	Constant
C_S	Roughness constant
C_P	Pressure coefficient
C_{Pmin}	Maximum negative peak pressure
C_{Pmean}	Mean suction
C_{Prms}	Root Mean Square value of pressure coefficient
C_μ	Kolmogorov constant
E	Empirical constant
H	Target building
H_C	Height of core house
H_e	Height of the eaves
H_K	Height of kitchen house
H_S	Height of surrounding building
h_g	Height of ABL
K_S	Roughness height
L_z	Length of the line
N	Interval count
R_e	Reynolds Number
T	Reference temperature
u	Wind velocity
u_*	Friction velocity
u^+	Dimensionless velocity
U_∞	Constant velocity distribution

V	Upstream velocity at the height of the building
V_z	Wind velocity at height z
V_1	Wind velocity at reference height z_1
y^+	Dimensionless distance from the wall
z_0	Roughness length
z	Height above ground
z_0	Roughness length
z_P	Center of first cell
ε	Turbulence dissipation rate
κ	Von Karman constant
k	Turbulence kinetic energy
ρ	Air density
μ	Dynamic viscosity of air
α	Power-law exponent
δ	Boundary layer thickness
μ	Kinematic viscosity
$\bar{\rho}$	Mean density
\bar{p}	Mean pressure
τ_ω	Shear stress at the wall

**TABURAN PEKALI TEKANAN DI SEPANJANG PROFIL LUAR RUMAH
LUAR BANDAR YANG TERDEDAH KEPADA RIBUT DI MALAYSIA
MENGUNAKAN PERKOMPUTERAN DINAMIK BENDALIR (CFD)**

ABSTRAK

Kajian terhadap kesan aliran angin di sekeliling rumah luar bandar menjadi fokus di dalam kajian ini. Kajian lapangan selepas angin ribut menunjukkan banyak kerosakan bumbung pada rumah dapur dan bukan hanya pada rumah ibu. Walaubagaimanapun, kajian-kajian lepas terhad kepada bangunan tinggi dan rendah tanpa ruang tambahan (rumah dapur) berbanding rumah luar bandar di bahagian Utara di Semenanjung Malaysia. Kajian berangka menggunakan simulasi Perkomputeran Dinamik Bendalir dijalankan untuk mensimulasikan aliran angin terhadap rumah luar bandar, seterusnya menghasilkan taburan tekanan di sekeliling rumah dan disahkan dengan keputusan ujian terowong angin. Oleh itu, kajian ini dijalankan untuk mengkaji kesan juntaian, sudut bumbung, ketinggian jurang dan kedudukan rumah dapur ke atas aliran angin di sekeliling rumah luar bandar menggunakan Perkomputeran Dinamik Bendalir. Persamaan RANS menggunakan model bergelora RNG $k - \varepsilon$ diperkenalkan untuk menyelesaikan masalah aliran dalam kajian ini. Sedutan tertinggi di batas bumbung ($C_p = -2.28$) telah direkod untuk model rumah dapur berada di tengah. Pekali tekanan yang tertinggi di tinggi sela telah direkod menjadi 0.97 untuk model dengan 0.25 m sela. Sementara itu, model yang bersudut bumbung 17° telah membangunkan sedutan tertinggi di batas bumbung dengan nilai pekali tekanan -2.28. Kesan sedutan tertinggi berlaku di juntaian bumbung dengan nilai pekali tekanan bersih dikira menjadi -2.35 dan tidak berlaku di batas bumbung. Akhir sekali, keputusan dari rekabentuk eksperimen menunjukkan juntaian bumbung dan sudut bumbung memberi kesan kuat

kepada nilai C_P sedangkan juntaian bumbung, sudut bumbung dan kedudukan rumah dapur menyumbangkan kesan interaksi yang kuat.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESSURE COEFFICIENT ALONG THE EXTERNAL PROFILE OF RURAL HOUSE EXPOSED TO WINDSTORM IN MALAYSIA USING COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DYNAMICS (CFD)

ABSTRACT

The study of effects of wind flow surrounding the rural house become the focus of the present study. Post windstorm site-survey shows that most damages part of the roof is over the kitchen house and not only core house. However, the previous studies are limited to the high-rise building and low-rise building without extended room (kitchen house) rather than the rural house in the Northern region of Peninsula Malaysia. The numerical study using CFD simulation was performed to simulate the wind flow toward rural house, resulting a pressure distribution surrounding the house and validated with the wind tunnel test. Therefore, the study is conducted to investigate the effect of house features namely overhang, roof pitch, gap height and position of kitchen house on the wind flow surrounding the rural house using CFD. The steady-RANS equation using RNG $k - \varepsilon$ turbulence models were introduced to solve the flow problems for this study. The highest suction at the roof ridge ($C_P = -2.28$) was recorded for the model with kitchen house located at the center. The highest pressure coefficient at the gap height was recorded to be 0.97 for model with 0.25 m gap. Meanwhile, the model with 17° roof pitch developed the highest suction at the roof ridge with the value of $C_P -2.28$. The highest suction effect occurred on the roof overhang with the values of net C_P calculated to be -2.35 and not at the roof ridge. Finally, the results using Design of Experiment show that overhang roof and roof pitch cause the most significant influence to the C_P values whereas the roof overhang, roof pitch and kitchen house position contributed to the strong interaction effect.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview of windstorm induced damage

Most high winds are produced by severe storms such as hurricanes, tornadoes, thunderstorm, downburst (Liu, 1991), tropical cyclone, monsoon and gale (Henderson and Ginger, 2008). The same types of severe storms such as hurricanes, typhoons and cyclones are termed differently based on the geographical region and in Asia is known as cyclones (Liu, 1991). Cyclones generally impacted the coastal regions in the tropics, and can extend hundreds of kilometers in land. Therefore, this type of storm has the potential to cause the most damage such as roof blown off, uprooted trees, building collapse, injuries and deaths of human or animals. Figure 1.1 shows the damage caused by a strong wind event in Mourilyan, Australia.



Figure 1.1: Damage in Mourilyan from tropical cyclone Larry (Henderson and Ginger, 2008)