Evaluation of vertically resolved longwave radiation in SPARTACUS-Urban 0.7.3 and the sensitivity to urban surface temperatures
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Abstract. Cities materials and urban form impact radiative exchanges, and hence both surface and air temperatures. Here, the ‘SPARTACUS’ multi-layer approach to modelling longwave radiation in urban areas (SPARTACUS-Urban) is evaluated using the explicit DART (Discrete Anisotropic Radiative Transfer) model. SPARTACUS-Urban describes realistic 3D urban geometry statistically, rather than assuming an infinite street canyon. Longwave flux profiles are compared across an August day for a 2 km x 2 km domain in central London. Simulations are conducted with multiple temperature configurations, including realistic temperature profiles derived from thermal camera observations. The SPARTACUS-Urban model performs well (cf. DART) when all facets are prescribed a single temperature, with normalised bias errors (nBE) < 2.5% for longwave downwelling at the surface fluxes, and < 0.5% for the top-of-canopy upwelling longwave at the top of the canopy fluxes. Errors are larger (nBE < 8%) for the net longwave fluxes from walls and roofs. Using more realistic surface temperatures, which vary depending on whether a surface is sunlit or shaded, the nBE in upwelling longwave increases to ~2%. Errors in roof and wall net longwave fluxes increase through the day, but still nBE are still 8–11%. This increase in nBE occurs because SPARTACUS-Urban represents vertical variation of but not horizontal, surface temperature but not horizontal variations within a domain. Additionally, SPARTACUS-Urban outperforms the Harman single-layer canyon approach, particularly in the longwave interception by roofs. We conclude that SPARTACUS-Urban accurately predicts longwave fluxes, requiring less computational time cf. DART, but with larger errors when surface temperatures vary because of being sunlit and/or shaded due to shading. SPARTACUS-Urban could enhance multi-layer urban energy balance schemes prediction of within-canopy temperatures and fluxes.

1 Introduction

The differences in energy exchanges between urban and rural areas leads to canopy layer air temperature differences of 3-10°C (Oke 1987). This phenomenon, known as the canopy layer urban heat island effect (CL-UHI), has been studied and observed worldwide (Oke 1982; Zhang et al. 2012; Wu et al. 2014; Guo et al. 2016; Dou and Miao 2017; Gaitani et al. 2017). The CL-UHI is driven by contrasting radiative exchanges between urban and rural environments, resulting from the heterogeneous nature of cities (Aida and Gotoh 1982; Oke 1982; Kondo et al. 2001; Harman and Belcher 2006; Ao et al.
With increasing urbanization, and more people residing in cities than rural areas since 2007 (Heaviside et al. 2017), there is greater exposure of vulnerable people to extreme weather, such as heatwaves, with the severity of such events potentially exacerbated by the CL-UHI.

The heterogenous 3D structures of urban areas lead to changes in the surface energy balance, and diurnal temperatures (Souch and Grimmond 2006; Masson et al. 2008), due to the resultant differential shortwave (SW) input and radiative cooling across a city. The crenulated urban morphology and resultant deep canyons cause an uneven exposure to the sky and an increased surface area available for exchange (cf. rural areas), which increases the SW absorption throughout the day. This differential solar irradiance drives temperature variations between facets, including vertical gradients (Oke 1981; Blankenstein and Kuttler 2004; Harman and Belcher 2006; Hénon et al. 2012; Hu and Wendel 2019).

The spatial variation of facet temperatures is highest during the daytime, due to variations in the absorption and reflection of the dynamic solar radiation (Myint et al. 2013; Crum and Jenerette 2017; Antoniou et al. 2019). However, temperatures remain high overnight from the morphology reducing exposure to the sky therefore increasing radiative trapping and slowing cooling rates, and lowering effective albedo. Facet materials (e.g., concrete, tarmac) can have low albedo, high heat capacities and high thermal inertia (Bohnenstengel et al. 2011). This results in large daytime heat storage in the urban volume, which is released slowly at night (Meyn and Oke 2009; Kershaw and Millward 2012).

These impacts on the radiative and other energy exchanges need to be parameterised within the numerical weather prediction (NWP) land surface schemes (Masson 2006). A common approach to simplifying the 3D structure of cities is to treat the urban form as a single canyon between buildings of equal height (Nunez and Oke 1977). Initially, in some standalone models, some complexity was considered (e.g., allowing intersections) (e.g., Aida 1982; Arnfield 1982a, 1988), when modelling urban radiative exchanges. But for NWP, with computer resource limitations, this was simplified to assuming an infinite canyon, as it simplifies view factor geometry and computations (e.g., Masson 2000; Harman et al. 2004), an approach which has been adopted for the other energy balance fluxes (e.g., Masson 2000; Kusaka et al. 2001a; Lee and Park 2008). Many of these models calculate the fluxes for individual facets (wall, roof, and ground) (Masson 2006). However, assuming the constant building height and lack of intersections neglects the variability of urban geometry (e.g., clusters of tall buildings, courtyards) that influence shadowing and trapping of radiation, and wind fields (e.g., Hertwig et al. 2019, 2021).

Sub-facet differences (e.g., roof orientation, and slopes, high/low parts of walls, wall orientation, sunlit/shaded pavement) can create surface temperature variability, which is not captured if represented by a single mean surface temperature in an urban energy balance scheme (Hilland and Voogt 2020). For example, diurnal variations of wall temperature are linked to their orientation relative to the sun, and additionally to inter-building interactions (e.g. shadows) (Nazarian and Kleissl 2015;...
This is important as 12-50% of the urban surface is comprised of walls (Voogt et al. 1997; Grimmond and Oke 1999; Hénon et al. 2012). Similarly, roofs differ from walls, with high incident SW radiation (Harman and Belcher 2006; Morrison et al. 2018), and ground surfaces in deep urban canyons may have dampened diurnal temperature variability (Hu and Wendel 2019). Inclusion of the vertical variability of the urban form may allow such features to be captured by models, unlike within the infinite homogenous canyon approach.

Some of these features can be addressed by utilising multi-layer radiative transfer models, allowing more nuanced radiative trapping and realistic vertical temperature distributions (e.g., Seoul National University Canopy Model (Ryu and Baik 2012; Ryu et al. 2013), and SPARTACUS-Urban (Hogan 2019)), which allow for variations in roof and wall heights. This leads to more nuanced radiative trapping and more realistic vertical temperature distributions. The SPARTACUS-Urban model uses vertical profiles of urban geometry to simulate radiation between buildings to account for atmospheric absorption, emission, and scattering, whilst being fast enough to be used for NWP. Wall and roof areas are derived from building footprint data but can be simplified to two parameters. The shortwave (SW) capabilities, evaluated using an explicit radiative transfer model, are in good agreement for realistic urban domains (Stretton et al. 2022).

Building Effect Parameterisation (BEP, Martilli et al. (2002); Schubert et al. (2012)), the Town Energy Balance model (TEB, Hamdi and Masson (2008)), and SPARTACUS-Urban (Hogan 2019a). Most assume a canyon geometry, those with varying building heights permitting more realistic inter-building shading (e.g., Schubert et al. (2012)). SPARTACUS-Urban assumes buildings are distributed randomly in the horizontal plane, with geometry describable by vertical profiles of building plan area and building edge length, allowing radiative exchanges simulations fast enough for NWP accounting for atmospheric absorption, emission, and scattering between buildings. The approach provides a more accurate description of radiation exchange than single layer street-canyon approaches (Hogan 2019b). The shortwave (SW) simulations for realistic urban domains have good agreement to an explicit radiative transfer model (Stretton et al. 2022).

In this study, the longwave (LW) capabilities of SPARTACUS-Urban are evaluated for the first time, using both SPARTACUS-Urban’s performance is compared to both the explicit scheme DART (Discrete Anisotropic Radiative Transfer (Gastellu-Etchegorry et al. 2015) and the Harman et al. (2004) models (Sect. 2). The former is an explicit scheme. The latter takes, Gastellu-Etchegorry et al. (2015)) and to a common approach used in operational weather and climate models, WeNWP and climate modelling, Harman et al. (2004) (Sect. 2). To examine SPARTACUS-Urban’s prediction of LW fluxes for a domain we simulate an area in central London, with varying complexities of facet temperatures derived available from thermal camera observations (Morrison et al. 2020, 2021) to undertake that can be prescribed with varying levels of complexity for the evaluation (Sect. 3). A comparison of SPARTACUS-Urban and DART is made (Sect. 4) and with the Harman et al. (2004) street canyon radiation (Sect. 5). The results of the evaluation are presented in Sect. 6.
2 Radiative transfer models

2.1 SPARTACUS-Urban

The SPARTACUS approach, developed to model radiative exchange within cloud fields (Hogan et al. 2016), has been applied to both vegetated (Hogan et al. 2018) and built areas (Hogan 2019b). Obstacles to radiation are assumed to be randomly distributed within the horizontal plane, allowing simulation of a mean radiation field with height. Although we use SPARTACUS-Surface open-source software (Hogan 2021) which includes both SPARTACUS-Urban and SPARTACUS-Vegetation, given our buildings focus (i.e., excluding urban vegetation), we refer to this as “SPARTACUS-Urban”. We previously used DART to evaluate SW part of SPARTACUS-Urban (Stretton et al. 2022).

A discrete-ordinate method is used to solve coupled ordinary-differential equations for 2N radiation streams (N streams per hemisphere, here N = 8). Radiative fluxes are calculated per height interval, $z$, for layers split into clear-air and building ‘regions’ in the horizontal plane. The incoming and outgoing fluxes (W m$^{-2}$), and absorption (W m$^{-3}$) profiles are calculated for three facets (wall, roof, and ground). SPARTACUS-Urban requires profiles information for characterises each scene (i.e., geometry model grid cell simulated using its morphology, emissivity ($\varepsilon$), and surface temperature ($T$) provided as). For morphology the plan area fraction ($\lambda_p$), building edge length ($L$), are required as a vertical profile that varies with height ($z$).

These, and like other, morphology parameters, can be derived from building footprint data (Martilli 2009; Kent et al. 2019; Stretton et al. 2022). SPARTACUS-Urban allows vertical variation of facet temperatures to be prescribed with one facet $T$ per height level.

Although we assume a vacuum, SPARTACUS-Urban can account for atmospheric absorption. For this paper, we assume a wavelength of 10 μm (where atmospheric absorption is weak), so the emission rate in SPARTACUS-Urban (and DART) makes use of the Plank function at 10 μm, with a top-of-canopy downwelling longwave spectral flux at that wavelength (LW$_\downarrow$).

2.2 DART

The DART (Discrete Anisotropic Radiative Transfer) model (Gastellu-Etchegorry et al. 2015) simulates the can simulate variability of radiative exchanges of radiation across one SPARTACUS-Urban grid cell in heterogeneous scenes. Scenes are imported as detail using a 3D model which can contain digital surface model (DSM) with vegetation and buildings (simulated as turbid media and planar triangle facets, respectively), with varying topography and a within-canopy and atmosphere. These scene elements interact with radiation iteratively within each voxel (or grid box) size has a 3D array of voxels. Scene element user-prescribed resolution. The model domain’s elements (e.g., vegetation, buildings) within a given voxel can interact with each other. The per-voxel flux radiative budget products are stored after each iteration—numerical iteration, DART.
scene elements are often represented by flat ‘triangles’ making up building walls and roofs or leaves on trees. Each triangle has an area, orientation, and optical properties. Alternatively, DART can represent vegetation as ‘turbid media’ (or volumes filled with randomly distributed infinitely small facets) characterised by an angular distribution and an area volume density.

To model the urban LW exchanges field in DART, both a 3D building model and a full 3D field of surface temperatures (prescribed to the triangles) are needed. The latter can be determined by prescribed based on solar irradiance. DART’s planar triangles can only state (e.g., currently sunlit, shaded). Here, each building’s triangles are categorised based on facet type (e.g., roof, wall) and orientation (e.g., west, east) to allow realistic spatial values. As a triangle can have only one temperature, if a single-triangle covers the whole wall (i.e., vertical extent), it will only have one temperature to describe the area.

DART has been evaluated using observations for vegetation (Sobrino et al. 2011) and relative to other models. Given DART is an explicit radiative transfer model, it has more detailed radiative interactions than the simpler radiative transfer models (e.g., SPARTACUS, Harman). DART has been evaluated in vegetated areas using thermal infrared observations (Sobrino et al. 2011) and relative to other models in the RAMI intercomparison project (Widlowski et al. 2015). It has been applied in urban areas (e.g., Landier et al. 2018; Chrysoulakis et al. 2018; Morrison et al. 2020) and used for evaluations of simpler radiative transfer models (e.g., SPARTACUS-Urban, Stretton et al. 2022). The DART version including buildings (Gastellu-Etchegorry et al. 2015) has not been explicitly evaluated in urban areas, but has been used to assess urban SW and LW radiation and albedo (Chrysoulakis et al. 2018; Landier et al. 2018), variations in urban surface temperatures (Morrison et al. 2020, 2021), and mean radiant temperature (Dissegna et al. 2021), and to assess simpler radiative transfer models (e.g., SPARTACUS-Urban, Stretton et al. 2022).

2.3 Single-layer street canyon approach (Harman)

The Harman et al. (2004) approach has a system of linear equations that compute the exact radiative transfer with vertically constant wall temperatures. Hogan (2019b) compared SPARTACUS Urban to Harman et al.’s (2004) LW radiation after modifying Harman’s horizontal geometry to have an exponential distribution, as assumed by SPARTACUS, but with all buildings having equal height. Agreement was found between the two models for the net outward LW flux from the ground and walls when greater than 4 streams were used by SPARTACUS Here, we use the Harman implementation in the SPARTACUS Surface software package (implemented as in Sect. 4.2 of Hogan (2019)).

Harman assumes two parallel buildings of infinite length with constant height $\overline{H}$ separated by a constant street width $W$. For this comparison, the total area of the ground, walls, and roofs are equal to the real-world domain (Sect. 3.1) with $H$ set equal to the mean building height $\overline{H}$, and the building fraction equal to the surface $(\lambda_c(\tau = 0))$ value. The $H/W$ is calculated using (Hertwig et al. 2020 their Eq. 3):
Harman et al. (2004) use a system of linear equations to compute the exact LW radiative transfer from one temperature per facet (e.g., one for walls). Hogan (2019b), after modifying Harman’s horizontal geometry to have an exponential distribution, to be consistent with SPARTACUS’s assumptions, finds agreement between the two models for the net outward LW flux from the ground and walls when SPARTACUS uses more than 4 streams. Here, the SPARTACUS-Surface software package (see Sect. 4.2 of Hogan 2019a) implementation of Harman is used for the simulations.

Harman assumes two parallel buildings of infinite length with constant height ($H$) separated by a constant street width ($W$). For this comparison, the real-world domain (Sect. 3.1) total area of the ground, walls, and roofs (i.e., building fraction at the surface ($\lambda_p(z = 0)$)), and mean building height ($\bar{H} = H$) are used. $H/W$ is calculated using (Hertwig et al. (2020), their Eq. 3):

$$\frac{H}{W} = \frac{\pi \lambda_f}{2 (1 - \lambda_p)}$$

where the frontal area index ($\lambda_f$) is calculated using $\lambda_w = \lambda_f \pi$, where $\lambda_w$ is the total normalised wall area, calculated from the vertical profile of normalised building edge length ($L$) derived from vertical profile:

$$\lambda_w = \sum_{i} L_i \Delta z_i$$

This implementation of Harman requires a single simulation to have only one temperature (i.e., not a profile) for each of the three urban facets: per facet (i.e., wall, roof, ground).

### 3 Methodology

#### 3.1 Model Domain

The evaluation focuses on is undertaken for a 2 km $\times$ 2 km area of central London, with residential and commercial buildings of varying horizontal extent and height (Figure 1a). This domain’s buildings have varying horizontal size and height, with some high-rise buildings used for residential and commercial purposes. The digital surface model (DSM) and digital elevation model (DEM) used are derived from “Virtual London” building footprint dataset (Evans et al. 2006). For heights, the 25th percentile of the DEM and 75th percentile of the DSM are used giving individual buildings a single height, flat roofs, and flat, vertical walls.

For SPARTACUS-Urban, the required vertical profiles of $\lambda_p$ and $L$ are derived from a 1 m x 1 m building footprint raster, as rasterization removes internal walls between buildings. For DART, the 3D building roof and ground level geometry are determined from the DSM and DEM. The Stretton et al. (2022) To simplify buildings so they have flat both roofs and walls, for each building the 25th percentile of the DEM and 75th percentile of the DSM heights are used. For DART, the resulting 3D
building roof DSM and ground DEM are used. The Stretton et al. (2022) 3D building model is improved slightly (e.g. shift in vertical plane, removal of some internal walls). The DART voxel resolution used in DART is 1 m vertically and 5.206 m horizontally. For SPARTACUS-Urban has the same vertical resolution as DART (1 m) is used. To remove internal walls between buildings, the SPARTACUS-Urban vertical profiles of $\lambda_p$ and $L$ are derived from a 1 m x 1 m building footprint raster.
3.2 Observations used for radiative transfer inputs

In the model domain, three observation sites are present (Table 1). We focus on a day (27th August 2017) with detailed surface temperature observations and almost clear skies (<45-min cloud mid-afternoon) (Morrison et al. 2020).

Given computational constraints, DART is run for a single wavelength (10 μm). Hence, we are unable to use the LW infrared band, hence some additional uncertainty arises in SPARTACUS-Urban results for other wavelengths and broadband longwave flux measurements. Instead, we have rerun the ECMWF atmospheric radiation scheme using pressure, temperature and humidity profiles for the site 0.25° grid-cell from ERA5 (Hersbach et al. 2020) for that day (Figure 2), and extracted bottom-of-atmosphere (BOA) clear-sky downwelling spectral flux at 10 μm. For the SPARTACUS-Urban and Harman et al. (2004) simulations, changes were made to SPARTACUS Surface so that emission is calculated for a single spectral wavelength. SPARTACUS Surface additionally requires $T_{ed}$, but as we simulate radiative fluxes in a vacuum, this is set to 0 K. Each model requires an emissivity, $\varepsilon$, for each surface. We use a homogenous $\varepsilon = 0.93$, based on the mean urban value determined for the SPARTACUS-Urban and Harman et al. (2004) simulations, SPARTACUS-Surface is modified to calculate the single spectral wavelength emission.
SPARTACUS-Surface requires $T_{air}$, but as we simulate radiative fluxes in a vacuum, it is set to 0 K. Each model requires an emissivity (ε) per surface. We assume homogenous value of 0.93, based on the mean urban value in the Kotthaus et al. (2014b) spectral library.

Facet surface temperatures are prescribed using thermal camera imagery (Optris PI-160 LW infrared cameras) observed for a 420 m x 420 m area within this domain (Morrison et al. 2020, 2021) (Figure 3). Detailed modelling has categorised these observations by facet type, sunlit/shaded, and orientation (Morrison et al. 2020, 2021). Surface temperatures are split into roof, ground, and cardinal wall orientation (etc.) types. Although we evaluate SPARTACUS-Urban across the whole day, to demonstrate the performance for multiple surface temperature configurations, we select times with distinct temperature profiles (e.g., just after sunrise, with no facet temperature range) and summarise the general model performance. As surface temperature processing constraints (Morrison et al. 2020) gives observations from 5:45 UTC (sunrise: 5:04 UTC), the models are runs for every hour from then to end of the day. The mid-afternoon cloud period is discarded, as no sunlit/shaded temperature range is observed (Figure 3).

Table 1: Sensors used from within domain (Figure 1a). Meteorological time series, and further details of observations within this domain can be found in Morrison et al. (2021)

Facet surface temperatures are prescribed using thermal camera imagery (Optris PI-160 LW infrared cameras) observed for a 420 m x 420 m area within this domain (Morrison et al. 2020, 2021) (Figure 3). Detailed modelling has categorised these observations by facet type, sunlit/shaded, and orientation (Morrison et al. 2020, 2021). Surface temperatures are split into roof, ground, and cardinal wall orientation (etc.) types. Although we evaluate SPARTACUS-Urban across the whole day, to demonstrate the performance for multiple surface temperature configurations, we select times with distinct temperature profiles (e.g., just after sunrise, with no facet temperature range) and summarise the general model performance. As surface temperature processing constraints (Morrison et al. 2020) gives observations from 5:45 UTC (sunrise: 5:04 UTC), the models are runs for every hour from then to end of the day. The mid-afternoon cloud period is discarded, as no sunlit/shaded temperature range is observed (Figure 3).

Table 1: Sensors used from within domain (Figure 1a). Meteorological time series, and further details of observations within this domain can be found in Morrison et al. (2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Full name</th>
<th>Latitude °N</th>
<th>Longitude °W</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCT</td>
<td>Barbican Cromwell Tower</td>
<td>51.5206</td>
<td>0.09230</td>
<td>Davis weather station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMU</td>
<td>Islington Michael Cliffe House Upper</td>
<td>51.526</td>
<td>0.1061</td>
<td>Davis weather station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCT</td>
<td>Wycliffe Court Tower</td>
<td>51.5267</td>
<td>0.1036</td>
<td>Kipp and Zonen CNR1 radiometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optris Pi160 infrared thermal camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optris Pi160 infrared thermal camera</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: Diurnal timeseries for 27th August 2017 of (a) downwelling shortwave (SW) observations from a Kipp and Zonen CNR1 radiometer located at IMU, (b) Clear-sky 10-min brightness temperatures calculated from ERA5, and (c) solar zenith angle ($\theta_0$). Additional meteorological observations for the day of interest are shown in Morrison et al. (2021).
Figure 3: Mean Observed mean (line) and range (shading: mean ±1, [between sunlit to shaded areas]) temperature observations on 27th August 2017 (Morrison et al. 2021) for each (a) facet type (walls - all weighted equally) and (b) wall azimuthal orientation.

3.3 Model surface temperature (\(T\)) prescription

The three radiative transfer models (Sect. 2) require different \(T\) inputs. To assess the sources of error between SPARTACUS-Urban and DART (i.e., radiation calculation or surface temperature values), two complexities of model runs are undertaken. First, simulations assume an isothermal temperature within each surface type, with DART surfaces prescribed the single mean \(T\) from the camera observations (Figure 3a, line). To match this, SPARTACUS-Urban roofs and ground are prescribed the mean DART input temperature. For SPARTACUS-Urban \(T_{wall}\), each wall orientation is weighted equally (Figure SM 1), following the SPARTACUS-Urban assumption that walls equally face in all directions, such that:

\[
T_{Wall} = \frac{(T_{Wall\ N} + T_{Wall\ E} + T_{Wall\ S} + T_{Wall\ W})}{4} \tag{3}
\]

where \(T_{Wall\ N,E,S,W}\) are one of the four cardinal directions. For Harman, the same temperatures as SPARTACUS-Urban are
Non-isothermal surface temperatures varying by sunlit – shaded status allow for horizontal and vertically differences by facet type. These can be represented in multi-layer energy exchange schemes. DART-scenes can have a temperature mean and range (Fig. 3) and be prescribed across a in DART allowing sunlit-shaded variations. However, given level of detail of the surface type (e.g., roof, west facing wall, east facing wall). This allows for the impacts of variation in SW flux to be simulated. A-model used (Figure 1) the observed surface temperatures are not directly usable as camera pixels has much higher resolution than the DART SW simulation triangles. DART SW simulations are used to determine whether each facet triangle is sunlit or shaded, and therefore which temperature to utilize (maximum/minimum) range (Figure 3) is assigned by type (e.g., roof, west facing wall, east facing wall). As noted, as DART triangles may have whole wall resolution but only one prescribed temperature.

To enable SPARTACUS-Urban as it is complex to capture the horizontal surface- vertical profile of temperature variations for each surface type from DART, solar zenith angle (Ω) dependent SW SPARTACUS-Urban simulations are conducted. To estimate the sunlit fraction of sunlit (for the walls or roofs at each height interval (F_{Sun,Wall,i}) and roofs (F_{Sun,Roof,i}) by height interval, and for the ground (F_{Sun,Ground}), using the solar zenith angle (Ω) with. The shaded fractions determined are obtained by the difference e.g., F_{sh,Wall,i} = 1 - F_{Sun,Wall,i}. The appropriate DART sunlit and shaded temperatures are assigned to SPARTACUS-Urban sunlit (shaded) fraction. Similarly, the sunlit and shaded roof temperatures (T_{Sun,Roof}, T_{Sh,Roof}) are simply-weighted at each height by the appropriate sunlit and shaded fractions to obtain T_{Roof,i}. The and at z=0 for the ground temperatures (T_{Ground,sun}, T_{Ground,sh}) are treated in the same way, but at just z=0. Thus, enabling SPARTACUS-Urban to capture the horizontal surface temperature variations.

As the four wall orientations have different temperatures depending on their shadow history (Morrison et al. 2021), for SPARTACUS-Urban we weight them to obtain one average sunlit and shaded wall temperature (T_{Wall,sun}, T_{Wall,sh}). Given the SPARTACUS-Urban assumption that walls face equally in all directions, we weight the sunlit and shaded temperatures (as Eq. 3), but use the solar azimuth angle - (Ω) to determine the ‘dominant’ sunlit wall orientation. The dominant sunlit facing surface (e.g., south) temperature (in this example, T_{Sun,South}) is double weighted in Eq. 3 (i.e., replacing T_{Sun,North}) assuming the wall 180° (i.e., north facing surfaces in example) are shaded. The opposite is done for the T_{Sh,Walls}, obtaining (for this example):

\[ T_{Sun,Wall} = 0.0 \cdot T_{Sun,Wall\,N} + 0.25 \cdot T_{Sun,Wall\,E} + 0.25 \cdot T_{Sun,Wall\,W} + 0.5 \cdot T_{Sun,Wall\,S} \]  

\[ T_{Sh,Wall} = 0.5 \cdot T_{Sh,Wall\,N} + 0.25 \cdot T_{Sh,Wall\,E} + 0.25 \cdot T_{Sh,Wall\,W} + 0.0 \cdot T_{Sh,Wall\,S} \]  

The T_{Wall,sun} and T_{Wall,sh} are weighted using F_{Wall,sun} and F_{Wall,sh}, to determine the T_{Wall} for each height:

\[ T_{Wall,i} = F_{Wall,sun,i} T_{Wall,sun} + F_{Wall,sh,i} T_{Wall,sh} \]
To visualise this at several times see Figure SM 1. Combining $F_{\text{Sun,Wall},i}$ and $F_{\text{Sun,Roof},i}$ gives a larger weight to warmer sunlit surface temperatures in the simulations, better matching the emission from the DART model scenes.

For the Harman et al. (2004) simulations, area-weighted surface temperatures from the SPARTACUS-Urban profiles are used:

$$T_{\text{Wall}} = \sum_{i} n_{\text{Wall},i} \left( \lambda_{\text{Wall},i} / \lambda_{\text{Wall}} \right)$$

where $\lambda_{\text{Wall},i}$ is the exposed normalised wall area at each height, which is normalised by the total wall area, $\lambda_{\text{W}}$. Eq. 7 is also applied to roofs. This ensures that warmer surfaces at the top of the canopy with small areas are not overweighted.

### 3.4 Evaluation Metrics

We evaluate SPARTACUS-Urban using DART by comparing the profiles of LW upwelling and downwelling clear-air spectral fluxes ($LW_\uparrow, LW_\downarrow$), and the intercepted, outgoing, and net (= incoming − outgoing, relevant for facet temperature evolution) flux into walls, roofs, and ground (i.e., $LW_{\text{In,Wall}}, LW_{\text{Out,Wall}}, LW_{\text{*Wall}}$). The LW clear-air fluxes have units of $\text{W m}^{-2} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$ of the entire horizontal scene, while the fluxes from walls and roofs have units $\text{W m}^{-3} \mu\text{m}^{-1}$, as we divide by the layer thickness (1 m) to obtain a resolution independent flux.

For the comparison between SPARTACUS-Urban and DART, we examine the downwelling longwave at the base of the canopy, and the upwelling longwave at the top of the canopy in DART ($H_{\text{max}}$) to obtain a normalised bias error. The $LW_\uparrow$ flux profiles are evaluated using the normalized bias error at a specified height ($n\text{BE}$), expressed as a percentage of the DART flux:

$$n\text{BE} = \frac{LW_{\text{SU}} - LW_{\text{DART}}}{LW_{\text{DART}}} \times 100\%.$$  

We compare the differences in the wall and roof fluxes between the two models by using a $n\text{BE}$ in the total interception, emission, and net LW flux, calculated from 1 m to $H_{\text{max}}$.

### 4 Results

#### 4.1 Prescribed surface temperatures

The $F_{\text{Sun,Wall},i}$ and $F_{\text{Sun,Roof},i}$ are calculated from SPARTACUS-Urban SW simulations for each time period (Figure 4). The sunlit fraction into the canopy increases as zenith angle, $\theta_0$, decreases until about 11:45 UTC (Figure 2). As more walls become illuminated within the canopy, there is an increase in $T_{\text{Wall}}$ (Figure 3, Figure 4). As $\theta_0$ increases again (Figure 2c), the within-canopy surfaces become more shaded than sunlit.
From combining the $F_{2\beta}$ and $F_{\text{Sun}}$ profiles with the DART prescribed facet $T$ (Eq. 4-6) the $T_{\text{Wall}}$ and $T_{\text{Roof}}$ profiles are obtained (Figure 5). At 5:45 UTC all DART temperatures are the same, so all temperature configurations and SPARTACUS-Urban temperatures are equal. At 7:45 UTC, the first vertical variations in temperature occur with sunlit roof facets higher in the canopy causing warmer temperatures above. Both 11:45 UTC and 13:45 UTC share similar $T_{\text{Wall}}$ profiles, and do not have much influence from the warmer south facing walls despite their greater weighting. The most different $T_{\text{Roof}}$ profile, spanning the widest temperature range, occurs at 17:45 UTC.

**Figure 4:** Sunlit (blue) and shaded (black) fraction of (a) walls and (b) roofs during the study day from SPARTACUS-Urban shortwave simulations using solar zenith angles (Figure 2). Lines are shown as dashed when no roofs occurs at a height. Mean building height ($H_{B}$ = 25.5 m, grey dashed).
Figure 5: Temperature profiles at six times (UTC) used in SPARTACUS-Urban simulations (averaging methods, Sect. 3.3) with temperatures prescribed to DART surface types given in the error bars below each set of temperature profiles, with the mean temperature denoted by open circles, and sunlit-shaded range given (Figure 3). Note x-axes differ between panels.

4.2 Comparison of SPARTACUS-Urban and DART: One facet temperature (T)

First, when T does not vary have sunlit-shaded variations, there is good agreement between SPARTACUS-Urban and DART.

There is good agreement for both LW↑ at the top of the canopy (nBE < 0.5% across the whole day, Table 2, Figure SM 3-7, Figure SM 4-6), and for the LW↓ across the day (nBE ~2%). The LW↓ nBE is < 0.1%, and the nBE for LW↑Wall is 8-11%. The nBE is less when TWall is warmer (i.e., middle of day). The larger error in LW↑Wall is caused by a small net flux as LW↓Wall and LW↑Wall cancel each other thus small errors result in large nBE.

SPARTACUS-Urban slightly underestimates LW↓Wall and LW↓Roof (Figure 6) at the base of the canopy, therefore LW↑Wall is slightly overestimated. SPARTACUS-Urban overestimates LW↓Roof below H. With just one T↑Roof per time interval, LW↓Roof error is small (nBE ~3%), causing underestimates of LW↑Roof and larger nBE (5.5 to 8.5%).

Across the multiple cases for different facet T and with different differences in between facet T (e.g., magnitude of T↑Roof > TWall), the agreement is consistent between the two models. These differences may have arisen due to the geometry assumptions in SPARTACUS-Urban or the wall temperature averaging, but despite this, their magnitudes remain low.
Figure 6: Longwave fluxes (LW) for a 2 km $\times$ 2 km domain in central London (Figure 1) simulated with SPARTACUS-Urban (green) and DART (purple) with an emissivity of 0.93 at 5:45 UTC on the 27th August 2017 with (e) single facet T: (a) downwelling clear air flux (LW$_d$), (b) upwelling clear air flux (LW$_u$), (c) wall interception, outgoing and net flux (LW$_{wall}^{out}$, LW$_{wall}^{in}$, LW$_{wall}^{n}$), (d) roof interception, outgoing and net flux (LW$_{roof}^{out}$, LW$_{roof}^{in}$, LW$_{roof}^{n}$). Prescribed facet temperatures using: a single temperature per surface type for DART, and (e) single temperatures per facet type for SPARTACUS-Urban.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (UTC)</th>
<th>LW$_{wall}^{in}$ (W m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>LW$_{wall}^{out}$ (W m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>LW$_{wall}^{n}$ (W m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>LW$_{roof}^{in}$ (W m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>LW$_{roof}^{out}$ (W m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>LW$_{roof}^{n}$ (W m$^{-2}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:45</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-0.0043</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Evaluation of SPARTACUS-Urban (cf. DART) for a 2 km $\times$ 2 km domain in central London on an August day, for facets prescribed a single surface temperature. Upwelling and downwelling clear-air fluxes (LW$_d$, LW$_u$), and the total outgoing and net flux into each urban facet (wall, roof, ground, e.g., LW$_{wall}^{out}$, LW$_{wall}^{n}$), assessed using the normalised bias error (nBE, Eq. 8).
### 4.3 Comparison of SPARTACUS-Urban and DART: Varying facet temperature with solar irradiance

Second, we compare the two models when facets are prescribed a $T$ range. Here, SPARTACUS-Urban has good agreement with DART for $LW_{↓}$ at the base of the canopy (nBE - 2.9%–2.9%, Table 3) and at the top of the canopy, for all times (Table 2, Figure 7, Figure 8, Figure 8SM to Figure 8SM-12). There are some disagreements towards the centre of the canopy (~10 – 40 m), at all times, where SPARTACUS-Urban overestimates the $LW_{↓}$. There is also good agreement in $LW_{↑}$ up to ~40 m. SPARTACUS-Urban has good agreement (nBE < 0.5%) at the start and end of the day when there is a small range in facet $T$ (Figure 5), and so temperature averaging (i.e., wall orientation) has little impact. The nBE in $LW_{↑}$ is poorest in middle of the day (11:45 UTC–14:45 UTC) when the facets have a large range in temperature but is still < 2.5%.

The largest errors occur in the $LW_{\text{roof}}$ fluxes. The $LW_{\text{wall}}$ is always overestimated by SPARTACUS-Urban overestimates all the $LW_{\text{roof}}$ below the $H$ (as in Sect. 4.2). However, $LW_{\text{wall}}$ is similar to between SPARTACUS-Urban and DART (nBE ~ 3%), suggesting the $T_{\text{sun,roof}}$ and $T_{\text{sh,roof}}$ averaging method provides a good approximation to DART. The Hence, SPARTACUS-Urban underestimates the $LW_{\text{wall}}$ in SPARTACUS-Urban below the $H$, with nBE 6 – 8 %.

These differences could be associated with SPARTACUS-Urban building height having the 1 m vertical resolution whereas used in SPARTACUS-Urban of DART’s roof fluxes areaggregates to each voxel top. Despite this, the vertical profiles of $LW_{\text{roof}}$ fluxes in SPARTACUS-Urban and DART are still close (Figure 7d, Figure 7e).

The SPARTACUS-Urban $LW_{\text{wall}}$ generally compare well to DART. There are slight differences in the $LW_{\text{wall}}$ close to the surface, which is likely associated with is attributable to removal of the internal building walls being removed (Sect. 3.1). The nBE in $LW_{\text{wall}}$ is ~8% throughout the day, for all surface temperature configurations. The nBE in the $LW_{\text{wall}}$ the nBE is ~8% throughout the day. Through the day $LW_{\text{wall}}$ nBE varies from 0 – 10% through the day with it. It is smallest (11:45 UTC–14:45 UTC), when there is the largest $T_{\text{wall}}$ variation gives largest (11:45 – 14:45 UTC, Figure 3).

The good agreement in $LW_{\text{ground}}$ suggests the averaging method for sunlit and shaded temperatures performs well. SPARTACUS-Urban underestimates $LW_{\text{ground}}$ but with low nBE (2 - 5%).
As Figure 6, but for facet temperatures prescribed based on SW simulations at 13:45 UTC. DART simulations use a full temperature profile.
Longwave fluxes (LW) for a 2 km x 2km domain in central London (Figure 1) simulated with SPARTACUS-Urban (green) and DART (purple) with an emissivity of 0.93 at 13:45 UTC on the 27th August 2017: (a) downwelling clear air flux (LW↓), (b) upwelling clear air flux (LW↑), (d-f) wall interception, outgoing and net flux (LW↓wall, LW↑wall, LW*wall), (g-i) roof interception, outgoing and net flux (LW↓roof, LW↑roof, LW*roof). Prescribed facet temperatures based on SW simulations at 13:45 using: a full 3D temperature field for DART, and (c) temperature profiles per facet type for SPARTACUS-Urban.
Figure 8: As Figure 7, but for 17:45 UTC

Longwave fluxes (LW) for a 2 km × 2 km domain in central London (Figure 1) simulated with SPARTACUS-Urban (green) and DART (purple) with an emissivity of 0.93 at 17:45 UTC on the 27th August 2017: (a) downwelling clear air flux (LW↓), (b) upwelling clear air flux (LW↑), (c) wall interception, outgoing and net flux (LWOut,Wall, LWall, LW*,Wall), (d-f) roof interception, outgoing and net flux (LW*,Roof, LWOut,Roof), (g-i) wall interception, outgoing and net flux (LW*,Wall, LWOut,Wall, LW*,Wall), (g-i) roof interception, outgoing and net flux (LW*,Roof, LWOut,Roof). Facet temperatures used are prescribed based on SW simulations at 17:45, with DART using a full 3D temperature field and (c) SPARTACUS-Urban using temperature profiles for each facet type.

Table 3: As Table 2, but facets T-profile based on SW simulations, DART full temperature profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (UTC)</th>
<th>LW↓, ζ = 1</th>
<th>LW↑, ζ = Hmax</th>
<th>LW*Wall</th>
<th>LW*Roof</th>
<th>LW*Ground</th>
<th>LWOut,Wall</th>
<th>LWOut,Roof</th>
<th>LWOut,Ground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DART</td>
<td>nBE (%)</td>
<td>DART</td>
<td>nBE (%)</td>
<td>nBE (%)</td>
<td>nBE (%)</td>
<td>nBE (%)</td>
<td>nBE (%)</td>
<td>nBE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4 Impact of surface temperature prescription imprescribed to SPARTACUS-Urban

Third, as As SPARTACUS-Urban performs well (cf. DART) for both temperature scenarios (Sect. 4.2-4.3), we compare examining differences between using a single facet temperatures (Sect. 4.2), or a profile (T_profile, Sect. 4.3). To ensure the average emission is the same in each, the single temperature SPARTACUS-Urban simulations use weighted average mean vertical profiles of $T_{\text{Wall}}$ and $T_{\text{Roof}}$ (as Eq. 7, as for Harman). This ensures the average emission is the same for each simulation, allowing both simulations to be compared.

There are negligible differences between the LW↑ and LW↓ within the canopy, for both simulations (Figure 9). As the geometry is identical between simulations, the LW_in,Roof and LW_in,Wall are also the same. The nBE in the LW_out,Roof and LW_out,Wall are small (< -0.2%), but larger in the for LW_out,Ground (nBE < 4%) (Table 4, Figure SM 13). The largest nBE are in the for LW*,Wall (nBE < -3%) and LW*,Ground (nBE < 4.8%). The LW_out,Wall switches from an overestimate to underestimate in the single $T$ simulation at ~12 m, corresponding to where the single wall temperature overestimates and then underestimates the $T$ profile. This then impacts the LW*,Wall profile. These changes in wall and roof temperature profiles mimic the cumulative profiles in the wall and roof fraction (Figure SM 2).
Figure 9: Longwave (LW) SPARTACUS-Urban simulations for a 2 km × 2 km domain in central London (Figure 1) with an emissivity of 0.93 for 13:45 UTC on the 27th August 2017: (a) downwelling clear air flux (LW↓), (b) upwelling clear air flux (LW↑), (d)–(f) wall interception, outgoing and net flux (LW↓wall, LW↑wall, LW↓wall), (g)–(i) roof interception, outgoing and net flux (LW↓roof, LW↑roof, LW↓roof). Facet temperatures prescribed are (c) a single (T\text{Single}, black dashed) and range temperature per facet (T\text{Profile}, black dashed) and using temperature profiles for each facet type (T\text{Profile}, facet T, green).

Table 4: As Table 2, but comparison between SPARTACUS-Urban simulations for one central London grid-cell (for 27th August) with surface temperature profile assigned based on SW simulations (T\text{Profile}) and single facet (T\text{Single}) and facet T range (T\text{Profile}, T\text{Single}), assessed using the normalised bias error (nBE, Eq. 8) for upwelling and downwelling clear-air fluxes (LW↓, LW↑), and the total outgoing and net flux into each urban facet (wall, roof, ground, e.g., LW↓wall, LW↓wall).
Comparison with the Harman et al. (2004) approach

Finally, SPARTACUS-Urban, DART and Harman et al. (2004) are applied to a case with an infinitely long canyon surrounded by buildings of equal height. The temperature configurations are used with the area-weighted SPARTACUS-Urban temperature profiles used in Harman approach (Eq. 7). For the more realistic temperature configurations, SPARTACUS-Urban single-layer and the Harman approach have similar run-times (Table 5). This increases by a factor of $10^2$ s when realistic geometry is used in SPARTACUS-Urban. The full-temperature DART runs are $10^7$ times slower than the most complex SPARTACUS-Urban simulations.

For simulations with each facet having a single surface temperature (cf. temperature profile), Harman et al. (2004) agrees better to DART. LW↑ at the top of canopy ($H_{\text{max}}$) for single surface temperatures per facet simulations (cf. temperature profile). LW↓ at the top of canopy ($H_{\text{max}}$) Harman et al. (2004) is more similar to DART with 5:45 UTC approximately equal (Figure 10). The poorest Harman - DART agreement for LW↓,Roof and LW*Wall. Although, at 5:45 UTC, the nBE LW*Wall is approximately the same for SPARTACUS-Urban and Harman (Figure 10). This may be because no walls exist above $H$, so roofs cannot intercept radiation from above, leading to a underestimate in LW↓,Roof. When DART simulations use a $T$ range, the Harman performance is similar to the single facet $T$ simulations (Figure 11). However, the nBE are generally higher, except for the LW*Roof and the LW↓,Wall fluxes (e.g., 13:45 UTC).

Generally, SPARTACUS-Urban agrees more closely to DART than Harman et al. (2004). In the varied facet $T$ simulations, SPARTACUS-Urban and Harman approach are similar for LW↓ and LW*Roof with nBE < 3%. The two models are similar for LW↓,Roof and LW*Wall throughout the day, with the smallest nBE (Figure SM 14, Figure SM 15). Largest differences are seen in the LW↓,Wall (SPARTACUS nBE 2.5% compared to Harman nBE > 20%), and in the LW*Wall (SPARTACUS nBE 0-10% cf. 8-16%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Temp</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>LST</th>
<th>Temp</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Temp</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>-0.0045</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Generally, SPARTACUS-Urban agrees more closely to DART than Harman et al. (2004). In the varied facet T simulations, SPARTACUS-Urban and Harman approach are similar for LW↑ and LW↓ with nBE < 3%. The two models are similar for LW↓Ground and LW↓Wall throughout the day, with the smallest nBE (Figure SM 14-15). Largest differences are seen for LW↓Ground (SPARTACUS nBE 2-5%, cf. Harman nBE > 20%) and LW↓Wall (SPARTACUS nBE 0-10% cf. 8-16%).
Figure 11: As Figure 10 but comparison of simulations for one grid-cell in central London on 27th August using nBE (values, Eq. 8) relative to realistic world DART, for SPARTACUS-Urban (SU) and Harman et al. (2004) longwave fluxes with facets temperature profile/facet temperatures prescribed based on SW simulations. DART: full T profile, Harman: area-weighted average of. (Sect. 3.3). upwelling clear air flux at the SPARTACUS-Urban surface temperature profile, top of the canopy (LW↑), and the roof, wall, and ground total interception, outgoing, and net flux, for two times (rows).

Table 5 Absolute run-time of Harman, (Sect. 2.3), SPARTACUS-Urban, (open-source version 0.7.3 compiled with gfortran, O3 optimization), and DART with the indicated version 5.7.5 build number 1126 for simulations with n vertical layers (n) and N diffuse streams per hemisphere (N). Open-source SPARTACUS-Surface version 0.7.3 compiled with gfortran (O3 optimization). Runs All runs undertaken in a single-threaded Linux environment on a dual Xeon E5-2667 v3 processor with 256 GB of RAM, with a single-thread for Harman and SPARTACUS-Urban, but for DART version 5.7.5 build number 1126 run in the same Linux environment with 14 parallel threads using 32 CPU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
<th>Time relative to Harman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 x 10⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARTACUS-Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 x 10⁵</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 x 10⁴</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 x 10³</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 x 10³</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 x 10³</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DART</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.6 x 10⁷</td>
<td>3.3 x 10³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Conclusions

Here, the longwave capabilities of the multi-layer radiative transfer model SPARTACUS-Urban are assessed using the explicit radiative transfer model, DART. DART resolves radiative interactions between individual facets of buildings, whereas SPARTACUS-Urban models the mean radiation field with height using building fraction and wall area at each height. Real-
world geometry is considered using prescribed, categorised, observed surface temperatures ($T$) categorised from urban surface temperature observations measured in London (Morrison et al. 2020, 2021).

Longwave (LW) fluxes are predicted well when one surface $T$ is prescribed per facet type (or sub-facet, e.g., wall orientation). The clear-air upwelling and downwelling fluxes are predicted well, although there is some disagreement in the mid-canopy. SPARTACUS-Urban underestimates the net LW roof flux (normalised bias errors (nBE) $-5.5$ to $-8.2\%$) the net LW roof flux, suggesting too much emission from surrounding walls. Errors in this configuration could be from the SPARTACUS-Urban geometry assumptions, or the wall-temperature averaging methods.

Similar agreement is found when facets are prescribed a temperature range based on shortwave simulations. The clear-air fluxes are in good agreement, with nBE less than $3\%$ for all times assessed. The net wall LW is overestimated (nBE up to $10\%$) at times when of with low intra-facet temperature variability (e.g., early morning and evening). Roof interception also is overestimated nearer the ground, leading to an underestimation in the net roof LW. However, all nBE $< 11\%$. This suggests the average $T$ profiles, informed by shortwave geometry are acceptable approximations of the true $T$ field. However, we note the sub-facet wall $T$ range is small, which may differ in different conditions (e.g., atmospheric, geometry).

SPARTACUS-Urban outperforms the frequently used infinite street canyon approach (Harman et al. 2004) (cf. DART). Both are similar if single $T$ facets are used, except for the intercepted roof and net wall LW, when SPARTACUS-Urban is better. When using a facet temperature range the performance for both models is poorer. Harman notably underestimates roof interception, most likely linked to the absence of downward emission from walls higher in the canopy, given all are same height. …

The impact of vertically varying $T$ is small to SPARTACUS-Urban, with little impact on the net LW fluxes. However, only one summer day in central London is considered, possibly with small variations in wall $T$. In other geometries or climates (e.g., subtropical city with taller buildings), the impact of $T$ profile (single, varied) application on the results still needs to be assessed and could be explored in future research.

Overall, this work suggests SPARTACUS-Urban’s longwave fluxes agree well relative to the more complex, computationally and data demanding DART model. Alongside the evaluation of SPARTACUS-Urban for shortwave radiation (Stretton et al. 2022), good model performance is shown here, indicating it is suitable for implementing into a multi-layer urban model. Testing is underway with SPARTACUS-Urban coupled to the Surface Urban Energy and Water balance Scheme. Overall, this offline evaluation suggests SPARTACUS-Urban’s longwave fluxes agree well relative to the more complex, computationally and data demanding DART model. Alongside the evaluation of SPARTACUS-Urban for shortwave radiation (Stretton et al. 2022), good model performance is shown here, indicating it is suitable for implementing into a multi-layer urban model.
Testing is underway with SPARTACUS-Urban coupled to the Surface Urban Energy and Water balance Scheme (SUEWS, Järvi et al. (2011, 2014); Ward et al. (2016); Omidvar et al. (2022), to predict the vertical profile of fluxes, surface temperatures, and heat stress metrics within the canopy. Such models require high resolution building geometry information (i.e., vertical descriptions of the urban canopy), which are unavailable for most cities. Therefore, to supplement these implementations an assessment should be made on how realistically available data influences model outputs, e.g., vertically distributed fluxes and temperatures.
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