

Erzurum 2016



INTERNATIONAL WINTER CITIES SYMPOSIUM

PROCEEDINGS

ERZURUM

10-12 February 2016

ISBN No: 978-975-442-811-7



IWCS International
Winter Cities
Symposium



Call For Paper

International Winter Cities Symposium, hosted by the Ataturk University, Faculty of Architecture and Design, will be held in Turkey's favourite winter city, Erzurum, in February 10-12, 2016. The symposium, which includes presentations of the invited speakers, will seek answers to the question of "How should a liveable winter city be?". The symposium addresses issues in a wide range from urban scale to inner and outer space design and tries to discuss both problems and solutions. Moreover, it is especially aimed to adapt growing importance of sustainable planning, energy efficiency and ecological development for winter cities.

Theme

In order to promote symposium's main theme including the discussion of urban, open space, buildings and interior space design issues, sub-themes are defined as follows:

- Cold climate sensitive planning and urban design
- Transportation planning and pedestrian spaces in winter cities
- Local economic development and urban economy in winter cities
- Urban administration and climate policies in winter cities
- Open space design and uses
- Use of urban squares
- Artificial lightning
- Planting
- Aesthetic
- Thermal comfort
- Architectural design for cold climate conditions
- Building systems and construction technics
- Material uses
- Thermal comfort of buildings
- Interior design for winter cities
- Sustainable Energy Use and Energy Enerji Efficiency
- Legal Arrangements and Standards
- Other / Multi-Discipliner Studies

Honorary President

Prof. Dr. Hikmet Koçak (Ataturk University Rector)

Head of Symposium

Prof. Dr. Hasan YILMAZ (Dean of Faculty of Architecture and Design)



Title
International Winter Cities Symposium Proceeding Book
(Electronic Book)

Author
Prof. Dr. Hasan YILMAZ

Secreteriat
Assist. Prof. Dođan DURSUN
Assist. Prof. Fatma Zehra AKICI

Organising Commitee
Prof. Dr. Sevgi YILMAZ
Assoc. Prof. Serkan ZER
Assoc. Prof. Mehmet Akif IRMAK
Assoc. Prof. Metin DEMİR
Assist. Prof. Nalan DEMİRCİOđLU YILDIZ
Assist. Prof. Neslihan DEMİRCAN
Res.Assist.Ahmet KO
Res.Assist.Merve YAVAŞ
Res.Assist.Başak AYTATLI
Res.Assist.Emral MUTLU
Res.Assist.Ali Can KUZULUGİL

UNIVERSITY PUBLICATION NUMBER

ATATÜRK UNIVERSITY PUBLICATION	NUMBER:1155
Faculty of Architecture and Design Publications	NUMBER: 2
Research Series	NUMBER 2

ISBN NUMBERS

978-975-442-811-7

Rectorate of the Atatürk University, 2016

This book is published on the web and ethical and legal responsibilities of the articles belong to the authors

“Promotional Copy/ Not for Sale”

Scientific Committee

Prof. Dr. David ARDITI (Illinois Institute of Technology)
Prof. Dr. Nihal ARIÖĐLU (Istanbul Technical University)
Prof. Dr. Sadık ARTUNÇ (Mississippi State University)
Prof. Dr. Adnan BARLAS (Middle East Technical University)
Prof. Dr. Süha BERBEROĐLU (Cukurova University)
Prof. Dr. Figen BEYHAN (Gazi University)
Prof. Dr. Cana BİLSEL (Middle East Technical University)
Prof. Dr. Yahya BULUT (Ataturk University)
Prof. Dr. Öner DEMİREL (Karadeniz Technical University)
Prof. Dr. Kathryn GLEASON (Cornell University)
Prof. Dr. Atila GÜL (Suleyman Demirel University)
Prof. Dr. C.Y.JIM (The University of Hong Kong)
Prof. Dr. Faris KARAHAN (Ataturk University)
Prof. Dr. Abdullah KELKİT (Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University)
Prof. Dr. Hülya KOÇ (Dokuz Eylul University)
Prof. Dr. İlkey ÖZDEMİR (Karadeniz Technical University)

Scientific Committee (Continue)

Prof. Dr. Haluk PAMİR (Atılım University)
Prof. Dr. Güven Arif SARGIN (Middle East Technical University)
Prof. Dr. Metin ŞENBİL (Gazi University)
Prof. Dr. Janos UNGER (University of Szeged)
Prof. Dr. Rengin ÜNVER (Yıldız Technical University)
Assoc. Prof. Burak BEYHAN (Mersin University)
Assoc. Prof. İlknur T. DOĐRUSOY (Dokuz Eylul University)
Assoc. Prof. Seda KUNDAK (Istanbul Technical University)
Assoc. Prof. Deni RUGGERI (NMBU Norwegian University of Life Sciences)
Assoc. Prof. Cenap SANCAR (Karadeniz Technical University)
Assoc. Prof. Filiz TAVŞAN (Karadeniz Technical University)
Assoc. Prof. Süleyman TOY (Ataturk University)
Assoc. Prof. Ömer İskender TULUK (Karadeniz Technical University)
Assist. Prof. Işık SEZEN (Ataturk University)
Dr. Noemi KANTOR (University of Szeged)
Patrick J. COLEMAN (Head of Winter Cities Institute)
Nola KILMARTIN (Kennedy Architecture)
Allison JAMES (MIT)





Contact

Atatürk University, Faculty of Architecture and Design, 25240 Erzurum

Telefon: +90 442 231 53 21

Faks: +90 442 231 58 81

e-mail : wintercities2016@atauni.edu.tr

web: <http://wintercities2016.atauni.edu.tr/>

İçindekiler

Mevcut Bina Çatılarında Kar Ve Buz Eritici Isıtıcı Kabloların Kullanımı	1
Sıcaklığın İç Mekandaki Algısı.....	9
Preventing Roof Ice Dam According Iranian Traditional Bathhouses.....	29
Kış Kentlerinde Kar Ve Buz Mücadelesinde Yeni Yöntemlerin Araştırılması.....	42
Kış Kentleri İçin Yaya Bölgesi Planlama Yaklaşımları Ve Erzurum Kent Ölçeğinde Fırsatlar.....	53
Açık Alanlardaki Yapıların Çatı Özellikleri İle Alternatif Kullanımları.....	70
İklimsel Tasarım Parametreleri Açısından Geleneksel Kayseri Sokağının Değerlendirilmesi.....	77
Kış Kentlerinde Sokak Sağıklaştırma; Erzurum Örneği.....	88
Atatürk Üniversitesi Öğrencilerinin Küresel Isınmaya Yönelik Bilgi Ve Farkındalık Düzeylerinin Araştırılması.....	100
Norveç'te Mimari Ve Kentsel Koruma.....	118
Kış Kenti Kimliği Taşıyan Erzurum'da Kış Ayları İklim Elemanlarının Uzun Yıllar Değerlendirilmesi.....	130
Evaluation Of Human Thermal Comfort Ranges In The Respect Of Urban Climate Of Winter Cities On The Example Of Erzurum City.....	143
Sinemanın Kar-Kentleri.....	156
İklim Duyarlı Kentsel Tasarım Parametrelerinin Soğuk İklim Koşulları Açısından İrdelenmesi.....	166
Erzurum Kentinde Çevre Dostu Ulaşımı Aracı Olarak Bisikletli Yaşam Fırsatları.....	184
Kış Kentlerinde Kullanıcıların Tasarım Algısı.....	202
Soğuk İklim Bölgelerinde Mevsimlik Bitkilerin Yeterlilikleri.....	213

Soğuk İklim Koşullarında Kent Peyzajında Kullanılabilecek Bitki Türleri Ve Bitkisel	
Tasarım Yaklaşımları.....	228
Kent Peyzajının Geliştirilmesinde İklim Faktörü.....	243
Kış Aylarında Seyhan Havzasındaki İklimsel Konfor Durumunun Ortaya	
Konması.....	255
Kış Kentlerinde Açık Ortak Kullanım Alanlarının Tasarımını	
Yönlendirmek.....	270
Soğuk İklim Bölgelerinde İklimle Dengeli Tasarım Ve Yerel	
Mimarlık.....	281
Unıversıade 2011 Erzurum (Türkiye) Kayakla Atlama Tesisinin Kent İmgesi ve	
Peyzajı Üzerine Etkilerinin Değerlendirilmesi.....	298
Kış Kentlerinde Açık Alan Kullanımı ve Tasarımı: Türkiye'den ve Dünya'dan	
Örnekler.....	321
Türkiye Kış Kentlerinde Dış Mekân Tasarımında Yaya Konforuna Yönelik	
Öneriler.....	333
Bartın İli Kırsal Alanlarında Kış Dönemi Rekreasyon Olanaklarının	
Değerlendirilmesi.....	350
Geleneksel Yeşil Çatılar ve Erzurum Örneği.....	367
Turizmin Çeşitlendirilmesi Stratejisi Bağlamında Artvin'de Kış Turizmi Odaklı Rekreasyon	
Faaliyetlerinin Değerlendirilmesi.....	381
Tarihi Kimliğiyle Kars Kenti Kentsel Tasarım Projesi.....	389
Modern Kış Kentlerinde Değişen Algı.....	408
Her Mevsim Kamusal Mekanları: Park ve Meydanlar.....	425
Kış Kentlerinde Yaya Hareketliliğinin Yeşil Altyapı Planı Temelinde ve Kentsel Tasarım	
Rehberlerindeki Önemi: Erzurum Kenti Cumhuriyet Caddesi	
Örneği.....	443

Türkiye’de Yayla Turizminin İhmal Edilmiş Bir Yönü; Kış Mevsimi.....	460
Alan Kullanım Önceliklerinin Belirlenmesinde Topsis Yöntemi Ve Erzurum Örneği.....	473
Bitkilendirme Tasarımında Kış Mevsiminde Estetik Amaçlı Kullanılabilecek Bazı Bitkiler	495
Kış Kentlerinde Rekreasyon; Ankara Örneği.....	501
Uludağ’ın Eteklerinde Bir Köy: Cumalıkızık ve Peyzaj Tasarımı Üzerine Bir Çalışma.....	521
Kentlerde Alternatif Kış Mekanları ve Peyzaj Tasarımı: Bartın Kenti Esmerkuyu Sokak Örneği.....	531
Erzurum Kent Merkezi Ve Kent Girişlerinde Yol Ağaçlandırmalarının Ekolojik Uyum ve Dikim Standartları Yönünden Değerlendirilmesi.....	542
Kış Kentlerine Dış Mekân Rekreasyon Olanaklarının Geliştirilmesine İlişkin Stratejiler.....	583
Kış Kentlerinde Çocuk Aktivite Mekânları.....	592
Kış Kentlerinde Pavyon Yapıları ve Açık Alan Tasarımı.....	605
Kış Kenti Erzurum’un Köylerinde Misafir Odaları ve Konaklar.....	622
Kullanılabilirlik Kavramının Alanyazına Dayalı Değerlendirilmesi ve Bir Kavramsal Çerçeve Önerisi: “Şehir Kullanılabilirliği”Yaklaşımı.....	630
Kış Kenti Erzurum’da Yolculuk Ve Taşımacılığın Dünü- Bugünü.....	644
Kış Kentlerinin Ulaşımında Engellerin Kaldırılması: Erzurum İli Örneği.....	651
Erzurum Kentiçi Ulaşım Planlamasında Kullanılmak Üzere; Cbs Tabanlı Trafik Kazalarının Analizi.....	663
Alışveriş Merkezlerinin Mevsimlere Göre Rekreasyonel Tercih Nedenlerinin Belirlenmesi; Erzurum Kenti Örneği.....	684
Bingöl İli Yeşil Alanlarında Kullanılan Odunsu Bitkiler Ve Kullanım Amaçları.....	699
Kış Kentlerinde Ergonomi ve Engelliler İçin Tasarım.....	712
İklim Konforu Açısından Yaz Kentlerinde Su Kullanımı ve Antalya Bölgesi Antik Dönem Anıtsal Çeşmeleri.....	724
Kış Kentlerinde Kullanılan Döşeme Malzemelerinin Analizi.....	740

Kış Kentleri Ofis Yapılarında Sürdürülebilir İklimlendirme.....	751
Kış Kenti Erzurum’da İklim, Planlama ve Yerel Yönetim Politikalarının Etkileşim Düzeyi.....	761
Kent Estetiği Açısından Toplu Taşıma Duraklarında Farklı Bir Tasarım Yaklaşımı.....	780
Kış Dönemi Riskli Alanların Coğrafi Bilgi Sistemleri Kullanılarak Bartın İli Örneğinde Tespit Edilmesi.....	789
Kış Kentlerinde Peyzaj Çalışmalarında Kullanılabilecek Orman Ağacı Türleri.....	803
Kış Kentlerinde Isınma Kaynaklı Partikül Maddenin Hava Kalitesi Üzerine Etkisi Ve Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Ağrı, Ardahan, Erzurum Ve Kars İlleri Örneği.....	817
Soğuk İklim Bölgelerinde Sağlık Odaklı Peyzajlar.....	832
Kış Kentlerinde Sportif Olta Balıkçılığının Doğa İle Kentin İç İçe Yaşanılabilirliğine Katkısı Ve Rekreatif Açından Değerlendirilmesi.....	850
Kış Kentlerinde Kapalı Mekanlarda Bitkisel Tasarımlar ve Kış Bahçeleri.....	853
Kastamonu İli Kış Koşullarında Sosyal Hayatın Yaşanılabilirliği ve Kış Peyzajı Örneklerinin İncelenmesi.....	865
Meryemana Deresi (Maçka-Trabzon) Yukarı Havzasında Alternatif Turizm Olanaklarının Araştırılması.....	867
Trabzon Meydan Parkı Bitkisel Elemanların Estetik Ve İşlevsel Özelliklerinin Kış Peyzajı Açısından İncelenmesi.....	883
Ankara’da Evsizlerin/Yoksulların Konut Problemi.....	896
Kış Kentlerinin Markalaşmasında Etkinlik Yönetiminin Rolünü Tartışmak.....	912
Kış Şehirleri Bağlamında Compact (Yoğunlaştırılmış) City Kavramının Analizi Dantzig ve Saaty’den Erskine’e Soğuk İklimlerde Şehirselleştirme ve Planlama ve Tasarım.....	925
Kış Kenti Erzurum İçin Kentsel Tasarım Rehberi.....	935

Alternatif Turizm Açısından Erzincan Ergan Dağı Kış Turizmine Bakış.....	959
Erciyes Dağı'nın Turizm ve Rekreatyonel Kullanım Potansiyeli Üzerine Bir Araştırma.....	973
Geleneksel Kış Kenti Yerleşmelerin Sürdürülebilirliği ve Yaşam Kalitesinin Belirlenmesi: Erzurum Kenti Örneği.....	985
Kent Parklarında İklim Değişikliği Etkisinin Belirlenmesi: Sazova Parkı Örneği.....	1001
Kış Kentlerinde Kullanılan Işıklı Terapinin Bireyler Üzerindeki Etkisi Ve Mekânsal Öneriler.....	1012
Küre Dağları Milli Parkında Bisiklet.....	1022
Palandöken Dağı Kayak Tesislerinde Rekreatyon Kalitesinin Saptanması.....	1037
Kış Peyzajları: "Zigana Dağı Örneği".....	1052
2011 Kış Üniversite Oyunları'nın Erzurum'a Etkisi Ve Erzurum'un Turistik Gelişimi İçin Gelecek Perspektifleri.....	1067
"The Comparison Of Housing Buildings Which Made After 2010, And Made Before 1970 İn The Case Of Building Performances: Kadıköy Example".....	1074
Enerji Etkinliği Sağlayan Mimari Bütünleşik Aktif Sistemlerin Güneş Ve Rüzgâr Enerjisi Açısından Soğuk İklim Koşullarında Uygulanabilirliğinin İrdelenmesi.....	1082
Climate Responsive Building: A New Architectural Typology For Erzurum.....	1097
Vernacular Architecture, One Of The Principal Infrastructures Of Ecotourism Development: A Case Study Of Kaleybar Town In Iran.....	1100
Alternatif Bir Kış Turizmi Destinasyonu Olan Kapadokya'nın Uluslararası İmajına Kış Uykusu (Winter Sleep) Filminin Etkisi.....	1127
Buzlanmaya Karşı Uygulanan Yöntemlerin Karşılaştırılması: Erzurum İli Örneği.....	1143
Erzurum Palandöken'in Kış Turizmi Açısından Değerlendirilmesi.....	1155
Çatılarda Oluşan Buz Sarkıtları İçin Çözüm Önerileri.....	1171
Geleneksel Mimarinin Kış Koşulları Ve Soğuk Hava İle Uyumunun Araştırılması Tebriz (İran) Örneği.....	1180
Erzurum Yöresinden Çıkarılan Pomzanın Binalarda Kullanımı Ve Enerji Tasarrufuna Etkileri.....	1188
Erzurum Kar Ve Buz Heykel Work-Shopları.....	1202
Davraz Kayak Merkezi'nin Isparta Kentine Çok Yönlü Etkileri.....	1216
Erzurum Kent Merkezinde Kitle Yeşil Alanların Hava Kalitesine Etkisi.....	1232
Kış Kentlerinde Çocuk Oyun Alanları İçin Öneriler.....	1243

Eskişehir İli yeşil Su Ayak İzinin Belirlenmesi.....	1255
Automation Systems Based on the Sustainable Energy in Smart Homes.....	1256
Amasra-Bartın-Safranbolu Otoyol Güzergâhında Olumsuz Kış Şartları İçin Topoğrafyaya Bağlı Ulaşım Risk Sınıflandırması.....	1257
Bartın Kenti Ve Yakın Çevresindeki Orman Peyzajının Sonbaharkış Ekofizyolojik Değişiminin Kent Estetiği Açısından İrdelenmesi.....	1268
Kış Turizmi Açısından Erciyes Dağının Rekreatif Önemi.....	1281
Dış Mekan Süs Bitkisi Olarak Süs Lahanası Bitkisinin Kullanım Olanaklarının Değerlendirilmesi: Erzurum Örneği.....	1290
Kış Kentlerinde Kış Manzarasına Uygun Bazı Bitkiler.....	1306
Güneş Ve Deniz Kenti Antalya'nın Soğuk Yüzü.....	1314
Eskişehir İli yeşil Su Ayak İzinin Belirlenmesi.....	1329
Kış Kentlerinde Geliştirilen Yeşil Çatı Uygulamalarının Değerlendirilmesi.....	1337
Kış Kentlerinde Geliştirilen Yeşil Çatı Uygulamalarının Değerlendirilmesi.....	1348

EVALUATION OF HUMAN THERMAL COMFORT RANGES IN THE RESPECT OF URBAN CLIMATE OF WINTER CITIES ON THE EXAMPLE OF ERZURUM CITY

^aSüleyman TOY

^bNoemi KANTOR

^aAtatürk University Architecture and Design Faculty, City and Regional Planning Department, Erzurum, Turkey, stoy58@gmail.com

^bUniversity of Szeged, Faculty of Science and Informatics, Department of Climatology and Landscape Ecology, Szeged, Hungary, sztyepp@gmail.com

Abstract

Human thermal comfort conditions can be evaluated by using various indices based either on simple empirical approaches or on more complex and reliable human-biometeorological approaches. Latter ones are based on the energy balance models of the human body and their calculation is supplemented with some computer software. Facilitating the interpretation of the results, the generally applied indices express the effects of the thermal environment in the well-known temperature-unit; just like in the case of the widely used PET (Physiological Equivalent Temperature) index. Several studies adopting PET index for characterizing the thermal component of the climate (climate of a region, urban climate at local scale or microclimate within different city structures) preferred to organize the resulted PET values into thermal sensation or thermal stress categories in order to demonstrate the spatial and/or temporal characteristics of human thermal comfort conditions. The generally adopted PET ranges, however, were derived by Central-European researchers and they are only valid for the assumed values of internal heat production of light activity and thermal resistance of clothing representing a light business suit. Based on the example of Erzurum city, the present work clearly demonstrates that in harsh winter conditions the original PET ranges show purely discomfort. Thus the generally adopted human thermal comfort ranges of PET index seem to be less applicable regarding cold climate conditions, and detailed investigations would be required in order to define new categorization being of greater importance for local residents who are adapted to this climatic background, and for tourists on the other hand who may perform winter sport activities and therefore perceive the thermal environment more comfortable.

Keywords: human-bio meteorological assessment, physiological effective temperature, cold climate

1. Introduction

The thermal component of the atmospheric environment includes air temperature (T_a), air humidity (expressed as vapour pressure VP or relative humidity RH), wind velocity (v), as well as mean radiant temperature (T_{mrt}); the latter is consisted of short- and long-wave radiation flux densities with a thermal effect (Figure 1). All of the mentioned parameters affect the human thermoregulation system (Matzarakis and Mayer 1996).

The relationship between humans and climate begins at the moment when people sense the atmospheric conditions (Lim et al. 2008). However, the human organism does not have any specific sensors for the perception of individual climate parameters. Our thermoregulation system can register only the temperature of the skin and blood flow passing the hypothalamus. These body parameters, however, are influenced by the integrated effect of more thermal parameters which, in addition, affect each other's impact (Höppe 1999).

Figure 1. Schematic overview about the determination of thermal comfort conditions

In certain cases, one or more of the mentioned climatic elements may affect humans more than the others. For instance, low temperature coinciding with strong wind may cause strong cold stress because of the enhanced convective heat loss while high temperature together with excessive humidity level decrease the chance of evaporative heat loss thus increases the probability of serious heat stress. On days with weak wind, the mean radiant temperature has roughly the same importance as the air temperature while in the case of stronger air velocities, air temperature may be more important than the mean radiation temperature, especially in overcast conditions or in the shade.

There are many issues within the field of applied climatology (e.g. urban and landscape planning, public health, tourism) which require well-established evaluation regarding the thermal components of the atmospheric environment (Matzarakis et al. 1999). These conditions can be evaluated by using various thermal comfort (or stress) indices based either on simple empirical approaches or on more complex and reliable human-biometeorological approaches. Earlier indices combined only a couple of meteorological parameters either in the forms of simple equations or on different thermal comfort charts. They combined generally air temperature with wind velocity in cold climate regions while air temperature with humidity in the case of warm climates. Although it was easy to obtain the necessary input parameters from

synoptic stations, these earlier indices had a major limitation that they lacked relevance from thermo-physiological point of view (Matzarakis and Mayer 1996; Matzarakis et al. 1999).

The complex interactions between the human organism and the thermal environment are quantifiably only with the help of human heat balance models (Höppe 1993; 1999) which take into account all relevant thermal parameters together with some personal factors (Figure 1). These models are able to quantify different forms of energy exchange (radiation, convection, evaporation) between the human body and its thermal environment, and they result in easily understandable thermal comfort indices too (Höppe 1999). In order to facilitate the interpretation of the results, the generally applied human comfort indices express the effects of the thermal environment in the well-known temperature-unit.

One of the most popular indices for outdoor usage is the Physiological Equivalent Temperature – PET index which can be used for the assessment of both hot and cold conditions and therefore all year around (Mayer and Höppe 1987; Höppe 1999). The basic idea behind PET is that the actual bioclimate is transferred to an equivalent fictive indoor bioclimate in which the same thermo-physiological reactions of the human body can be expected. The indoor reference environment is described with the following thermal parameters: $T_{mrt}=T_a$, $VP=12hPa$, $v=0.1m/s$. PET can be interpreted as the very air temperature ($PET=T_a$) of this reference environment in which the human body (performing light activity 80W and wearing light suit 0.9 clo) would experience the same thermal impacts as calculated for the actual outdoor conditions, described with any combinations of T_a , T_{mrt} , v and VP (Höppe 1999).

PET was used world-wide for characterizing the thermal component of the climate in different regions, urban climates at local scale or several microclimates within different city structures. A great part of these studies conducted on-site micrometeorological measurements (e.g. Streiling and Matzarakis 2003; Gulyás et al. 2006; Ali-Toudert and Mayer 2007a; Mayer et al. 2008; Lin et al. 2010; Deb and Ramachandraiah 2011; Holst and Mayer 2011; Hwang et al. 2011; Shashua-Bar et al. 2011; Charalampopoulos et al. 2013; Gómez et al. 2013), while others applied numerical simulations in order to model the thermal comfort or stress conditions that may occur as a consequence of different landscape design strategies even under different future climate scenarios (e.g. Ali-Toudert and Mayer 2006, 2007b; Huttner et al. 2008; Shashua-Bar et al. 2012; Fröhlich and Matzarakis 2013; Müller et al. 2014).

During human-bioclimate analyses the resulted PET values, generally, are organized into previously defined “thermal comfort-ranges” (Table 1) in order to demonstrate the spatial and/or temporal characteristics of human thermal comfort conditions (e.g. Toy and Yilmaz 2010). The widely used PET threshold values were introduced by Matzarakis & Mayer (1996). The aim of the present study is to analyse the applicability of these present category benchmarks in the case of cold climate regions on the example of Erzurum city.

Table 1. Ranges of PET for different categories of human thermal sensation and grades of thermo-physiological stress; internal heat production by activity: 80W, heat transfer resistance of clothing: 0.9 clo. (According to Matzarakis and Mayer 1996; Matzarakis et al. 1999).

2. Materials and Methods

The study relates to the city of Erzurum in northeast of Turkey (39.55N and 41.16E; TRA1 NUTSII Region; **Figure 2**). Erzurum is located at an altitude of 1.850m on a highland surrounded by mountains up to 3500m. Population of the city is 763,323 (TurkStat 2014). The city is out of marine effect due to high mountains surrounding it and harsh continental climate characteristics are prevalent in it. According to data obtained from the meteorological station at the airport, the long-term annual mean temperature is 5.1°C while the minimum and maximum temperature extremes are -37.2°C and 35.6°C. Mean annual rainfall is 413.3 mm and the yearly means of relative humidity and vapour pressure are 63.3% and 6.0 hPa, respectively. Mean annual wind speed is 2.7 m/s and the prevalent wind directions are ENE in summer and WSW in winter.

Figure 2. Geographical location of Erzurum

For the calculation of PET, it is necessary to determine all basic thermal parameters – i.e. T_a , VP (or RH as an alternative), v , and T_{mrt} – at a human-biometeorologically significant height, e.g. 1.1 m above ground (the average height of a standing person’s centre of gravity). These parameters can be measured and/or calculated by numerical models (Matzarakis et al. 1999). In the case of this study, PET values were calculated considering daily mean data of air temperature T_a [°C], relative humidity RH [%], cloudiness C [octa] and wind speed v [m/s] measured over a 34-year period from 1975 to 2008 at the weather observation station locating at the airport (at 1.758 m and 39°57' N and 41°10' E). Wind velocity data measured at 10 m

above ground level were reduced to the required height of 1.1 m according to the generally adopted empirical formula. The widely-known RayMan software (Matzarakis et al. 2000, 2007; Matzarakis and Rutz 2005) was utilized to model the necessary radiation parameter (i.e. T_{mrt}) from the cloudiness data (according to the geographical and temporal characteristics), as well as to calculate the PET values.

Temporal distribution of the calculated daily mean PET values was analyzed on a daily basis instead of the usage of 10-day intervals as was usual in earlier studies (e.g. Toy & Yilmaz 2010). The total number of days considered in this examination was 12,410 (365 days X 34 years). The results were represented in the form of bioclimate charts, showing the percentage distribution of selected PET categories over the year.

3. Results

Occurrence probability of the original PET categories (**Table 1**) throughout the year is demonstrated on **Figure 3**. The most obvious feature of this diagram is that the “very cold” range (PET values below 4°C) is dominant during a fairly long period. The relative frequency of this category is generally above 50%, except for the time interval between the days of 100 and 300. The occurrence of this PET domain is high above to the others (**Table 2**). The second most prevalent range refers to “slightly cool” thermal sensation; these PET values may occur most frequently in late spring and early autumn, similarly to the cases of the third and fourth most frequent PET categories: “neutral” and “cold” (**Figure 3, Table 2**). In line with expectations regarding a cold-climate city, the least prevalent ranges are “very hot”, “hot” and “warm”, occurring very rarely and only on a couple of summer days.

Figure 3. Bioclimate diagram of Erzurum city according to the original PET categorization system

Table 2. Frequency distribution of the obtained PET categories over the investigation period

It is obvious that a bioclimatic diagram presented on **Figure 3**. is not appropriate enough to describe the thermal comfort conditions of cold climate cities. Indeed, according to the widely-adopted original PET categorization-system almost half of the year can be characterized as “very cold”. More specifically, 5394 from the 12410 days fell into this category, representing

43.46% of all cases (**Table 2**). Prevalence of this range is nearly four times higher than the closest ranges i.e. “slightly cool”, “comfortable” and “cool” with 12.92%, 12.33% and 12.00% relative frequencies, respectively. Important to note that the lowest PET value was found to be at -30.1 °C (on 23rd day of 1995), being much cooler than the lower boundary of the “very cold” range, i.e. 4°C.

With the intention of demonstrating the various degrees of harsh winter conditions, **Figure 4** illustrates the frequency distribution of the calculated PET values according to an evenly graded PET classification-system. The 7°C-wide PET intervals were chosen arbitrarily in order to cover the obtained range of PET values in Erzurum. This type of categorization allows us to ascertain more easily those parts of the year which can be characterized with the highest probability of extreme cold stress (January and February), as well as with the highest PET values (days from 190 to 230). Besides, this categorization results in a more even frequency distribution between the PET categories compared to the original PET thresholds (**Figure 5**).

Figure 4. Bioclimate diagram of Erzurum city according to 7°C-wide PET categories

Figure 5. Percentage distribution of days falling in different PET ranges within an average year in Erzurum

Discussion and outlook

The number of studies adopting PET (or other thermal indices) for characterizing the thermal component of the climate (climate of a region, urban climate at local scale or microclimate within different city structures) is very high, and it is growing continuously. Researchers organize the resulted index values into thermal sensation (or thermal stress) categories and discuss their occurrence within a year or across a geographical region in order to demonstrate the spatial and/or temporal characteristics of human thermal comfort conditions.

Based on the example of Erzurum city, the present work evinced that in a region with harsh climatic background the original PET ranges are not applicable to demonstrate the interannual differences in the thermal conditions, especially during the long winter period. However, another classification seemed to be useful to reveal more closely the inter-annual differences. It must be noted that this categorization was made arbitrarily, without detailed outdoor thermal

comfort surveys those are required for the development of new classification-systems (Figure 1).

Another important issue have to mention is that the original ranges of PET (Table 1; Matzarakis & Mayer 1996; Matzarakis et al. 1999) were assigned to the different grades of thermal stress and human thermal sensation on the basis of analogous PMV ranges, which in turn were derived from previous investigations by Fanger (1972). These obtained PET ranges however depend on the internal heat production and the thermal resistance of clothing. In the case of the generally adopted “original” PET categories the metabolic heat production due to the physical activity was assumed to be 80 W (equivalent of a light office work), which have added to the basal metabolism (ca. 80–85W for a healthy adult subject). The heat resistance of clothing was set to be 0.9 clo, which corresponds for example to a light business suit (Matzarakis & Mayer 1996; Matzarakis et al. 1999). However, people spending their time in a “winter-city” like Erzurum wear heavier clothing; and there must be several tourists who perform intensive activity like skiing and other winter sports. This suggest that the original PET-categorization needs to be revised regarding these altered personal conditions.

Even the authors of the widely-used original PET-scale posed the question: “**are these PET ranges valid world-wide for humans?**” (Matzarakis et al. 1999). They suspected that the PET category boundaries may move to higher or lower values according to thermal adaptation mechanisms, and proposed special investigations aiming to answer this question (Matzarakis et al. 1999).

Accordingly, several outdoor thermal comfort surveys were conducted world-wide and shed light on different forms of adaptation taking place at physical (behavioural adaptation), physiological (acclimatization) and psychological (mental) level (Höppe 2002, Nikolopoulou & Steemers 2003). These mechanisms, together with the influence of some subjective factors, result in culturally different thermal perception patterns (e.g. Knez and Thorsson 2006, Nikolopoulou & Lykoudis 2006, Kántor et al. 2012), as well as remarkable inter-annual differences regarding the subjective assessment of the thermal environment (e.g. Nikolopoulou & Lykoudis 2006, Lin 2009). Recognizing the importance of these issues, a couple of researchers decided recently to derive own grading-system for PET index in different regions (hot-humid, hot-arid or even in Central-East-Europe), being in better accordance with the

thermal perception patterns of people living there (e.g. Lin & Matzarakis 2008; Cohen et al. 2013; Yang et al. 2013; Lai et al. 2014; Pearlmutter et al. 2014; Kovács et al. 2015).

The presented example of Erzurum city, as well as all of the mentioned international experiences lead us to the final conclusion that it is highly recommended to ascertain own PET-ranges in the case of winter cities too. The schematic overview presented on **Figure 1** as well as the international examples regarding the procedure of PET-rescaling may offer good starting point for this goal.

References

- Ali-Toudert F, Mayer H (2006) Numerical study on the effects of aspect ratio and orientation of an urban street canyon on outdoor thermal comfort in hot and dry climate. *Build Environ* 41:94–108
- Ali-Toudert F, Mayer H (2007a) Thermal comfort in an east–west oriented street canyon in Freiburg (Germany) under hot summer conditions. *Theor Appl Climatol* 87:223–237
- Ali-Toudert F, Mayer H (2007b) Effects of asymmetry, galleries, overhanging facades and vegetation on thermal comfort in urban street canyons. *Sol Energy* 81:742–754
- Charalampopoulos I, Tsiros I, Chronopoulou-Sereli A, Matzarakis A (2013) Analysis of thermal bioclimate in various urban configurations in Athens, Greece. *Urban Ecosyst* 16:217–233
- Cohen P, Potchter O, Matzarakis A (2013) Human thermal perception of Coastal Mediterranean outdoor urban environments. *Appl Geogr* 37:1–10
- Deb C, Ramachandraiah A (2011) A simple technique to classify urban locations with respect to human thermal comfort: proposing the HXG scale. *Build Environ* 46:1321–1328
- Fanger PO (1972): *Thermal Comfort*. McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, USA, 244 p
- Fröhlich D, Matzarakis A (2013) Modeling of changes in thermal bioclimate: examples based on urban spaces in Freiburg, Germany. *Theor Appl Climatol* 111:547–558
- Gómez F, Pérez Cueva A, Valcuende M, Matzarakis A (2013) Research on ecological design to enhance comfort in open spaces of a city (Valencia, Spain). Utility of the physiological equivalent temperature (PET). *Ecol Eng* 57:27–39
- Gulyás Á, Unger J, Matzarakis A (2006) Assessment of the microclimatic and human comfort conditions in a complex urban environment: modelling and measurements. *Build Environ* 41:1713–1722.
- Holst J, Mayer H (2011) Impacts of street design parameters on human-biometeorological variables. *Meteorol Z* 20:541–552
- Höppe, P., 1993. Heat balance modelling. *Experientia* 49: 741-746.
- Höppe, P., 1999. The physiological equivalent temperature-a universal index for the biometeorological assessment of the thermal environment. *Int. J. Biometeorol.* 43:71-75.
- Höppe, P., 1999. The physiological equivalent temperature-a universal index for the biometeorological assessment of the thermal environment. *Int. J. Biometeorol.* 43:71-75.
- Höppe, P., 2002. Different Aspects of assessing indoor and outdoor Thermal Comfort. *Energy and Buildings* 34: 661-665.

- Huttner S, Bruse M, Dostal P (2008) Using ENVI-met to simulate the impact of global warming on the microclimate in central European cities. *Ber Meteor Inst Albert-Ludwigs Univ Freiburg* 18:307–312
- Hwang R-L, Lin T-P, Matzarakis A (2011) Seasonal effects of urban street shading on long-term outdoor thermal comfort. *Build Environ* 46:863–870
- Kántor N, Unger J, Gulyás Á (2012): Subjective estimations of thermal environment in recreational urban spaces - Part 2: international comparison. *Int J Biometeorol* 56, 1089-1101
- Knez I, Thorsson S (2006): Influences of culture and environmental attitude on thermal, emotional and perceptual evaluations of a public square. *Int J Biometeorol* 50, 258-268.
- Kovács A, Unger J, Gál CV, Kántor N (2015) Adjustment of the thermal component of two tourism climatological assessment tools using thermal perception and preference surveys from Hungary. *Theor Appl Climatol*. doi: 10.1007/s00704-015-1488-9
- Lai D, Guo D, Hou Y, Lin C, Chen Q (2014) Studies of outdoor thermal comfort in northern China. *Build Environ* 77:110–118
- Lim, C.L., Byrne, C., Lee, J. K.W., 2008. Human Thermoregulation and Measurement of Body Temperature in Exercise and Clinical Settings. Review Article. *Annals Academy of Medicine Singapore*. 37 (4):347-353.
- Lin TP (2009): Thermal perception, adaptation and attendance in a public square in hot and humid regions. *Build Environ* 44, 2017-2026
- Lin TP, Matzarakis A (2008): Tourism climate and thermal comfort in Sun Moon Lake, Taiwan. *Int J Biometeorol* 52, 281-290
- Lin T-P, Matzarakis A, Hwang RL (2010) Shading effect on long-term outdoor thermal comfort. *Build Environ* 45:213–221
- Matzarakis A, Mayer H., 1996. Another kind of environmental stress: thermal stress. *WHO Newsletters*, 18: 7-10.
- Matzarakis A., Mayer H., Iziomon M. G., 1999. Applications of a universal thermal index: physiological equivalent temperature *Int J Biometeorol* 43:76–84.
- Matzarakis, A., Rutz, F., 2005. Application of RayMan for tourism and climate investigations. *Annalen der Meteorologie* 41, (2), 631-636.
- Matzarakis, A., Rutz, F., Mayer, H., 2007. Modelling Radiation fluxes in simple and complex environments – Application of the RayMan model. *International Journal of Biometeorology* 51, 323-334.
- Matzarakis, A.; Rutz, F.; Mayer, H., 2000. Estimation and calculation of the mean radiant temperature within urban structures. In: *Biometeorology and Urban Climatology at the Turn of the Millenium* (ed. by R.J. de Dear, J.D. Kalma, T.R. Oke and A. Auliciems): Selected Papers from the Conference ICB-ICUC'99, Sydney, WCASP-50, WMO/TD No. 1026, 273-278.
- Mayer H, Holst J, Dostal P, Imbery F, Schindler D (2008) Human thermal comfort in summer within an urban street canyon in Central Europe. *Meteorol Z* 17:241–250
- Mayer, H. and Höppe, P., 1987. Thermal comfort of man in different urban environments. *Theor. Appl. Climatol.* 38, 43-49.
- Müller N, Kuttler W, Barlag AB (2014) Counteracting urban climate change: adaptation measures and their effect on thermal comfort. *Theor Appl Climatol* 115:243–257
- Nikolopoulou M, Lykoudis S (2006): Thermal comfort in outdoor urban spaces: Analysis across different European countries. *Build Environ* 41, 1455-1470

- Nikolopoulou M, Steemers K (2003): Thermal comfort and psychological adaptation as a guide for designing urban spaces. *Energy Build* 35, 95-101
- Pearlmutter D, Jiao D, Garb Y (2014) The relationship between bioclimatic thermal stress and subjective thermal sensation in pedestrian spaces. *Int J Biometeorol* 58:2111–2127
- Shashua-Bar L, Pearlmutter D, Erell E (2011) The influence of trees and grass on outdoor thermal comfort in a hot-arid environment. *Int J Climatol* 31:1498–1506
- Shashua-Bar L, Tsiros, IX, Hoffman M (2012) Passive cooling design options to ameliorate thermal comfort in urban streets of a Mediterranean climate (Athens) under hot summer conditions. *Build Environ* 57:110–119
- Streiling S, Matzarakis A (2003) Influence of single and small clusters of trees on the bioclimate of a city: a case study. *J Arboriculture* 29:309–316.
- Toy, S. and Yilmaz, S, 2010: Thermal sensation of people performing recreational activities in shadowy environment: a case study from Turkey. *Theor Appl Climatol* 101:329–343
- TurkStat 2014. Turkish Statistics Institution Census based on addresses 2014 results. www.tuik.gov.tr
- Yang W, Wong NH, Zhang G (2013) A comparative analysis of human thermal conditions in outdoor urban spaces in the summer season in Singapore and Changsha, China. *Int J Biometeorol* 57:895–907

Figures and Tables




Figure 1. Schematic overview about the determination of thermal comfort conditions



Figure 2. Geographical location of Erzurum




Figure 3. Bioclimate diagram of Erzurum city according to the original PET categorization system




Figure 4. Bioclimate diagram of Erzurum city according to 7°C-wide PET categories




Figure 5. Percentage distribution of days falling in different PET ranges within an average year in Erzurum

Table 3. Ranges of PET for different categories of human thermal sensation and grades of thermo-physiological stress; internal heat production by activity: 80W, heat transfer resistance of clothing: 0.9 clo. (According to Matzarakis and Mayer 1996; Matzarakis et al. 1999).

PET [°C]	Thermal sensation	Level of thermal stress
< 4°C	very cold	extreme cold stress
4.1 - 8°C	cold	strong cold stress
8.1 - 13°C	cool	moderate cold stress
13.1 - 18°C	slightly cool	slight cold stress
18.1 - 23°C	neutral (comfortable)	no thermal stress
23.1 - 29°C	slightly warm	slight heat stress
29.1 - 35°C	warm	moderate heat stress
35.1 - 41°C	hot	strong heat stress
41°C >	very hot	extreme heat stress

Table 4. Frequency distribution of the obtained PET categories over the investigation *period*

PET range [°C]	Thermal sensation	Number of Days	%
<= 4°C	very cold	5394	43.46
4.1 - 8°C	cold	1179	9.50
8.1 - 13°C	cool	1489	12.00
13.1 - 18°C	slightly cool	1603	12.92
18.1 - 23°C	neutral (comfortable)	1530	12.33
23.1 - 29°C	slightly warm	1001	8.07
29.1 - 35°C	warm	194	1.56
35.1 - 41°C	hot	18	0.15
41°C <	very hot	2	0.02
Total		12410	100