



1 Mapping urban fabric for enhanced urban climate modelling 2 based on a historical building classification

3 **Bianca E. Sandvik**¹, Dragan Milošević^{1,2}, and Gert-Jan Steeneveld¹

4 ¹Meteorology and Air Quality Section, Wageningen University, Wageningen, 6708PB, The Netherlands

5 ²Hydrology and Environmental Hydraulics Section, Wageningen University, Wageningen, 6708PB, The
6 Netherlands

7 *Correspondence to:* Bianca E. Sandvik (bianca.sandvik@wur.nl)

8 **Abstract**

9 The urban climate conditions are heavily influenced by the morphological and thermal properties of buildings.
10 Recent studies have been focussed on the representation of urban morphology using standardised Local Climate
11 Zones (LCZs) whereas relatively little research has been performed on the impact of thermal properties of
12 buildings. Though useful for categorising and modelling urban climates, generic LCZ classes can have a low
13 representativeness for local spatial heterogeneity while also not accounting for variations in building thermal
14 properties.

15
16 Using Amsterdam (the Netherlands) as a case study, we develop an alternative classification of urban fabric based
17 on construction period, historical construction practices and regulations. This HERITAGE classification consists
18 of 10 distinct classes which we combine with 3D building model data, the Dutch cadastre and previous studies
19 using GIS to derive their accompanying morphological traits. This approach offers a new method to create
20 literature- and data-based urban classes with customised spatially varying morphological and thermal parameter
21 values which are more representative of the real world compared to the LCZ approach. The HERITAGE-classes
22 contain all necessary variables for conducting thermal and energy assessments as well as numerical modelling of
23 the urban climate using for example the Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) model.

24 **1 Introduction**

25 The urban climate is affected by the complex processes at hand. A building interacts with neighbouring buildings
26 and streets through energy gain and loss depending on occupancy behaviour, heating and cooling devices – and
27 the prevailing weather and climate conditions. The heat exchange between a building and the environment
28 depends on the buildings shape, its material composition and placement, insulation, orientation, and relation to
29 other objects. These governing factors are what researchers, architects and spatial planners adjust in optimising
30 indoor and outdoor urban spaces for thermal comfort, climate change mitigation and aesthetics.

31
32 When buildings amass into urban areas, they can significantly modify the local energy and radiation balance
33 compared to rural areas (Oke et al., 2017). Due to the concentration of material and people, together with trapping
34 of radiation between structures, heat tends to accumulate and store longer in urban areas compared to rural
35 counterparts. This phenomenon is most known as the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect and is a subject of continuous
36 study within urban meteorology and climate research (Bahadori et al., 2025; Cheval et al., 2024).



37
38 Historically the options for modifying urban environments have encountered restrictions. Availability of space,
39 financial resources, construction materials, technological advances, local climatological adaptations and building
40 regulations are among factors that affect historical and contemporary building construction. This may lead to
41 different neighbourhoods within the same city to have completely different characteristics with regards to
42 aesthetical, morphological and thermal properties, which may again affect the local- and micro-climate conditions.
43 Capturing this heterogeneity of urban characteristics remains a challenge for multiple research fields such as
44 meteorology, hydrology, remote sensing, architecture, spatial planning, public health and energy demand (Cheng
45 et al., 2025; Esch et al., 2022; Li et al., 2024; Lindenthal and Johnson, 2025; Masson et al., 2020; TABULA
46 Project Team, 2012). Better insight into urban complexity helps us understand what makes a place desirable to
47 live in, how the area functions and how to improve the living conditions over time.
48
49 Earlier studies have attempted to systematically describe the urban environment with increasing granularity. In an
50 attempt to standardise descriptions of urban environments, Stewart and Oke (2012) developed a framework of
51 Local Climate Zones (LCZs) to facilitate comparison of urban environments and simplify descriptions of climate
52 measurement sites. This framework has been widely adopted both within and outside the climate research
53 community to assess the impact of a city's *standardised morphology* on topics such as local climate and
54 meteorology, urban design and planning, pollution, human health and building energy use (Han et al., 2024; Huang
55 et al., 2023).
56
57 Stewart and Oke (2012) defined ten LCZ classes that can be grouped into four categories of surface properties:
58 surface structure, surface cover, surface material and human activity. Initial efforts to classify individual cities
59 into LCZs have over time grown into the development of global and continental maps through the WUDAPT-
60 project (Brousse et al., 2016; Demuzere et al., 2019, 2022). Despite the versatility of the LCZ approach its
61 generalisability has its use limits. In a large review of LCZ mapping, Huang et al. (2023) found that, of the four
62 categories of surface properties, mainly surface structure and surface cover have been used for LCZ classification
63 methods. Whereas – despite their potential importance for characterising the urban environment – “surface
64 material and human activity are rarely employed due to a lack of data”. Parameters of surface materials are usually
65 considering only albedo and emissivity and are commonly taken from conventional LCZ tables provided by e.g.
66 Stewart and Oke (2012).
67
68 The choice of surface material affects the thermal properties of the surface which again affect the energy balance
69 of the surface through a change in albedo, emissivity and thermal storage capacity. In the context of modelling
70 building energy fluxes, it is important to know the thermal properties of an entire facet (aka. the walls and roof)
71 to properly quantify the energy transfer between the indoor and outdoor environment. To estimate this as
72 accurately as possible, it is critical to know how the building is constructed and its building materials. Despite this
73 knowledge, there has been limited research efforts going into categorising urban environments based on primarily
74 thermal aspects instead of morphological aspects.
75



76 Tornay et al. (2017, hereafter T17) developed 10 building archetypes based on building morphology, construction
 77 period and materials, building use and geographical location for France and assessed the sensitivity of the Town
 78 Energy Balance model (Masson, 2000) to these archetypes and their properties. They found especially roof albedo,
 79 presence and thickness of insulation material and its position in the facet to strongly affect the urban energy
 80 balance through modifying the radiation balance and thermal storage. Buildings with slate roofs showed higher
 81 values of net radiation, sensible heat flux, indoor temperatures and higher amplitudes in diurnal heat storage
 82 compared to buildings with roofs of zinc and tiles in their summer simulations. They also found that the relative
 83 importance of building wall material to roof material increases with building density. Walls with lower thermal
 84 conductivity stored less heat but showed higher sensible heat flux compared to highly thermal conductive wall
 85 materials. During winter, they found only a 10 % variation in heating demand between material setups because
 86 wall materials with larger thermal conductivity tended to be thicker. When comparing construction periods, they
 87 found a generally decreasing trend in heat energy consumption and sensible heat flux with increasing building
 88 year during winter due to increased insulation. Interestingly, their oldest (<1949) and most recent (>2012)
 89 construction periods showed comparable low values for stored sensible heat and similar diurnal variability for
 90 sensible heat flux which they attributed to lack of concrete under the roof tiles and external placement of insulation
 91 material, respectively.

92
 93 In order to couple buildings to specific energy consumption load curves, Pappacogli et al. (2021) categorised
 94 buildings in Bolzano, Italy into four building classes: non-residential, hospitality, and residential buildings before
 95 and after 1978. They found that buildings constructed before 1978 had a higher morning peak energy load but a
 96 lower energy load in the evening across multiple seasons. For their WRF model simulations they used three
 97 building classes (high- and low-energy consumption residential, and industrial/commercial), but both residential
 98 classes had the same thermal properties. They hypothesised the model's overestimation and underestimation of
 99 energy consumption during peaks and mid-day hours respectively could be caused by an incorrect definition of
 100 thermal properties of the buildings.

101
 102 Aksoezen et al. (2015) studied links between measured energy consumption and building properties in Basel,
 103 Switzerland. They grouped and analysed buildings based on four periods of construction and found that building
 104 volume, gross floor area, compactness and building age affect energy demand. As expected, larger buildings lead
 105 to higher energy demand. The authors found compactness (building surface area to volume ratio) to be
 106 significantly negatively correlated (-0.6) to building age and significantly positively correlated (+0.3) to energy
 107 demand. Surprisingly they also found that the connection between energy demand and building age was not linear
 108 with time, but concave. They found that buildings constructed before 1921 have lower energy demand than
 109 buildings constructed in the following six decades. Like Huang et al. (2023), they acknowledged that a key
 110 limitation of using general building typologies connected to the lack of data on material composition and
 111 refurbishments, especially for older buildings.

112
 113 To summarise: previous urban studies have overwhelmingly focused on morphological building parameters to
 114 quantify the environmental impacts of the urban environment due to a lack of data on thermal properties of
 115 buildings. A limited number of previous studies have focused on the impacts of the construction period on the



116 surface energy balance and energy consumption and found them to be non-linear with time due to changes in
117 materials and construction practices. All these findings demonstrate the importance of properly accounting for the
118 thermal properties of buildings in urban energy modelling in order to fully assess their current and future impact
119 on the environment and society. However, it remains unclear how age-dependent building properties affect urban
120 climate modelling.

121

122 Therefore, our research question is: *what is the impact of spatially varying thermal and morphological properties*
123 *based on historical building construction on the local meteorology and climate?*

124

125 Hence, we introduce a novel methodology for categorising buildings and neighbourhoods into distinct classes
126 based on building period. We demonstrate the approach for Amsterdam, the Netherlands, linking historical
127 construction practices and materials to building periods, 3D building data and road data. This results in 10
128 HERITAGE-classes that contain variables suitable for conducting thermal and energy assessments and modelling
129 of the urban environment using numerical models such as WRF (Chen et al., 2011) and PALM4U (Maronga et
130 al., 2020).

131 **2 Data and methods**

132 This section explains the methodology for creating the 10 HERITAGE-classes (HCs) and the data sourced for this
133 purpose (Figure 1).

134

135 Amsterdam was selected as a testbed due to its historic expansion and variable building stock as well as the
136 presence of long-term urban meteorological observations for model validation (Ronda et al., 2017). Resulting
137 building parameter values are customised to fit the inner city of Amsterdam but is also representative for similarly
138 constructed Dutch cities. Despite differences in regional historical construction, we consider the resulting thermal
139 parameter values to be fairly representative for the Netherlands as a whole. Contrarily, differences in
140 morphological parameters can vary strongly between cities and are recommended to be tailored to the area of
141 interest.

142

143 Creating spatial datasets for categorisation of urban environments require information on five major parameter
144 groups: land use and land cover, morphological parameters, architectural parameters, socio-economic parameters
145 and building use, and urban vegetation. The main approaches for creating spatial datasets are either based on
146 remote sensing techniques or GIS approaches, or a combination of the two. For a thorough overview of needs and
147 sources from a LCZ perspective see Masson et al. (2020). This current work aggregates multiple mainly existing
148 GIS and remote sensing data sources.



149

150 **Figure 1: Simplified workflow diagram for developing the HERITAGE-classes and HERITAGE-raster with input**
 151 **sources (•), outcomes (→), and processes (⌋).**

152 2.1 Data collection

153 2.1.1 Sourcing thermal properties

154 We start with an extensive literature review to identify building periods that are distinctly different in terms of
 155 thermal properties of buildings. We combine documentation on historical building construction practices and
 156 archetypes, and historical building regulations. Subsequently, 19 building periods were identified based on typical
 157 building construction factors, such as thickness and material composition of facets, presence of cavity walls and
 158 insulation, and changes in building regulations. In total, 28 different sources have been used consisting of journal
 159 articles, government reports and numerous diverse sources (Table A1).

160

161 Next, typical values of thermal properties for the identified materials were gathered and used to estimate
 162 representative values for thermal conductivity, specific heat capacity, surface albedo, and surface emissivity per
 163 facet and building period. In total, 13 different materials were identified, and their thermal property values were
 164 estimated based on nine different sources (Table A2). Finally, building periods with similar thermal property
 165 values were grouped resulting in 10 HCs with distinctly different thermal property values (Table 1 and 2).



Table 1: The 10 HERITAGE-classes with example buildings from Amsterdam (Google Streetview) and their occurrence within our area of interest as reported by 3DBAG.

HERITAGE 1 <1800	HERITAGE 2 1800–1929	HERITAGE 3 1930–1945	HERITAGE 4 1946–1964	HERITAGE 5 1965–1974
1.5 %	18.1 %	9.4 %	16.1 %	10.7 %
HERITAGE 6 1975–1991	HERITAGE 7 1992–2005	HERITAGE 8 2006–2014	HERITAGE 9 ≥2015	HERITAGE 10 Unknown (1005)
19.3 %	12.1 %	7.3 %	5.3 %	0.2 %

Values of surface albedo and surface emissivity of the HCs are mainly taken from reference lookup tables based on the outermost material listed for their respective facet composition (Table A2). Since windows can significantly affect the thermal transfer through walls, the window coverage fraction (aka. window-to-wall ratio) per period was taken from (Dang et al., 2024). The 10th HERITAGE-class “Unknown” (HC10) is based on – as Huang et al. (2023) pointed out – the fact that data on building year and construction often is lacking. All thermal property values for this “Unknown” class are the average of each parameter of all the other HCs. This allows all buildings to be categorised into a HERITAGE-class depending on their (un)known building year.

2.1.2 Sourcing morphological properties

The second step entails collecting multiple spatial datasets which were processed in QGIS before morphological values could be calculated per HERITAGE-class.

Extracting building polygons

Our approach is based on 3DBAG (v2024.12.16) – a 3D building dataset covering the whole of the Netherlands (Peters et al., 2022). The 3DBAG data have been generated based on the Dutch building cadastre and the National Digital Elevation Model of the Netherlands (AHN) which results in the 3D building model containing parameters such as building ID, original building year, height above sea level, roof type, ground floor area, volume, roof elevation and location. We extracted all building polygons for Level of Detail (LoD) 2.2 (Peters et al., 2022) in a rectangular area covering the whole city of Amsterdam through 3DBAGs WFS service in combination with QGIS version 3.34.

We first identified and then addressed two issues with the 3DBAG data: 1) each building may be composed of more than one polygon, and 2) the building heights come from AHN LiDAR data which need correction for the terrain height. To address these issues, we aggregated all polygons based on their building ID, multiplying the ground floor area and volume of the polygons together before calculating a new mean building height based on



the area weighted building height of the aggregated polygons. Subsequently we adjusted this area weighted mean building height by subtracting the height above sea level. Data attributes not needed were removed leaving a building layer with one polygon per building with attributes such as: building ID, area weighted mean building height, total ground floor area, volume, and original building year. We then grouped the building polygons into 10 separate QGIS layers based on their building year attribute according to the 10 HCs.

197 **Extracting building heights and their distributions**

Depending on the use case, different building height statistics need to be estimated. For relatively straightforward schemes, such as WRFs Single Layer Urban Canopy Model (SLUCM, Kusaka et al., 2001), mean and standard deviations were obtained through the use of zonal statistics directly in QGIS. For more advanced model schemes – such as BEP-BEM (Martilli et al., 2002; Salamanca et al., 2010) – requiring building height distributions, we calculated building height distributions in 5 m bins. The upper bin bound was selected based on the first occurrence below 10 % for each class. Manual adjustment was done by grouping unusually tall buildings into the highest building height category, rounding each bin to whole percentages, and ensuring the distribution added up to 100 %. Due to a highly right-skewed building height distribution caused by a disproportionate number of smaller entities (such as sheds, house boats, market stands and house expansions) in outer districts, this binning process was redone for a subset of buildings covering the inner-city of Amsterdam (4.87159°E, 52.38677°N, 4.92801°E, 52.35809°N). We chose to implement the inner-city building height distribution for the HCs because this distribution is less impacted by more rural and suburban building practices and thus better reflects the urban environment of Amsterdam. The resulting building height distributions per HC is presented in Table 3.

211 **Extracting roof widths**

Buildings in Amsterdam have typically a rectangular footprint with the shortest side facing the street (Peters et al., 2022). This feature is utilised when calculating the typical building roof width needed for representing the urban canyon for modelling applications. We first generate building “skeletons” with centerlines for all buildings using the Skeleton-tool from the BecaGIS plugin (Quach, 2024). We then calculate the length of the centerline and add this as a building attribute. To estimate the median roof width for each HC, we use QGISs built in zonal statistics. To be consistent for building morphology parameters, only the roof width values for buildings located in the inner-city domain was used for the HCs. The resulting median roof width estimates per HC are presented in Table 3.

220 **Extracting road widths**

The last morphological parameter to obtain is road width. This parameter were calculated based on the road area layer (“wegdeel_vlak”) from the TOP10NL dataset provided by the Dutch cadastre (Kadaster, n.d.). To estimate the road width, we first extracted and merged all road polygons within our study area based on road name in order to avoid big roads being underestimated when they consist of multiple polygons. Thereafter, we calculated the length of the road polygons using the Skeleton-tool as outlined before for the roof width estimates and added this as an attribute to the polygons. The road width was calculated as the polygon area divided by its length and was added as an attribute field to each road polygon.



229 Next, we needed to calculate road statistics on neighbourhood level to align with the HCs. We calculated and
 230 transferred statistics on occurring building year and road width by joining neighbourhood polygons (“buurten”)
 231 provided by the Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2024) with attributes from the singular 3DBAG building layer
 232 and the road polygons from before. Subsequently, we allocated a HC to each neighbourhood using the field
 233 calculator with the criteria that both the mean and median calculated building year falls within a singular HC range
 234 (e.g. 1930–1945). If the criteria were not fulfilled the neighbourhood was allocated to the HERITAGE-class 10
 235 (Unknown) (HC10). We set a requirement of at least one road and 10 buildings per neighbourhood polygon and
 236 excluded the rest as input for the final calculation of median road width per HERITAGE-class.

237 **2.1.3 Sourcing vegetation and urban fraction**


238 Two non-morphological properties were sourced from established sources: vegetation and urban fraction. To
 239 include vegetation and facilitate easy comparison between the LCZ and HERITAGE approaches, we based our
 240 vegetation data on the global CGLC-MODIS-LCZ dataset from Demuzere et al. (2023a), which is the default
 241 dataset in WRF. We extracted our region of interest and reclassified all LCZ-classes to “Bare rock/paved” (class
 242 61) to remove the LCZs and avoid missing pixels when merging this modified CGLC-MODIS-LCZ raster with
 243 the HERITAGE-raster pixels after their generation outlined in Sect. 2.2 (Figure 2). Section 3.2 discloses the 19
 244 natural landcover categories from CGLC-MODIS-LCZ and the differences between this default LCZ-raster and
 245 the HERITAGE-raster.

246
 247 Urban fraction was estimated based on 30 m×30 m data from Ronda et al. (2017). We refined these data to even
 248 finer pixels of 1/3 of the original size and calculated the urban fraction by dividing the pixel colour value by the
 249 maximum colour value before spatially joining them to the HERITAGE class-pixels generated in the following
 250 section (Sect. 2.2). The final urban fraction values per HC were obtained using zonal statistics in QGIS and are
 251 available in Table 2.

252 **2.2 Developing the HERITAGE-raster**

253 We developed a HERITAGE-raster using 3DBAG and the modified CGLC-MODIS-LCZ based on area weighting
 254 using pixels in QGIS (Figure 2). We first created two HERITAGE-rasters with different pixel sizes from the
 255 original HERITAGE polygon layer created from 3DBAG in Sect. 2.1.2, where the largest match the grid of the
 256 CGLC-MODIS-LCZ raster (60 m×100 m) and the finest is 50 times finer (1.2 m×2 m). Secondly, we converted
 257 the raster pixels of both layers to polygons again and joined the attributes by location using majority as the
 258 discerning factor. This determines the most frequently occurring HERITAGE-class in the fine raster within each
 259 larger pixel; i.e. this approach creates an alternative area weighting technique using raster pixel sizes. Third, we
 260 converted the new generated pixel layer with the same grid size as CGLC-MODIS-LCZ to raster format. Finally,
 261 we merged the HERITAGE-raster with the modified CGLC-MODIS-LCZ vegetation raster from Sect. 2.1.3. This
 262 resulted in a HERITAGE-raster with CGLC-MODIS vegetation.

263



264
265 **Figure 2: Illustration of the workflow of generating the HERITAGE-raster based on the building polygon layer from**
266 **3DBAG (Peters et al., 2022) and CGLC-MODIS-LCZ (Demuzere et al., 2023a) for a sample neighbourhood in**
267 **southeastern Amsterdam. White background represents areas or pixels without buildings or vegetation. Pixel**
268 **resolution is stated for each raster or pixel layer.**

269 2.3 Implementation in the WRF model

270 This section outlines how the HERITAGE-raster can be implemented in WRF. In WRF, all urban properties
271 sourced and described in Table 2 and Table 3 need to be incorporated into the urban parameter lookup table
272 (URBPARM_LCZ.TBL). We make a customised version of URBPARM_LCZ.TBL, where the 10 HERITAGE-
273 classes takes the numbered positions of the LCZ-classes for all morphological and thermal parameters and urban
274 fraction. Table C1 lists the corresponding parameter names in URBPARM_LCZ.TBL to the parameters identified
275 before. Finally, we convert the raster tiff-file to geogrid binary files, create an “index”-file and modify dataset
276 references instructing the model how and where to read the binary files (Appendix D).

277 3 Results

278 In this section, we discuss the application of the HERITAGE-approach for Amsterdam (the Netherlands) and
279 compare the resulting parameter values and raster to the default LCZ-raster and table values used in WRF. We
280 also discuss some limitations and considerations for future applications of the approach for other locations.

281 3.1 HERITAGE parameter values

282 The determined wall and roof materials, thickness and composition (Table 2) clearly show the historical
283 improvements in building insulation, technological advancement, and stricter building regulations in the
284 Netherlands. Wall thickness has more than doubled from 18 cm before 1800 to >38 cm in building standards since
285 2015. Cavity walls started becoming the norm in the Netherlands around 1930 and marked a significant jump in
286 insulation values and lower thermal conductivity (Delft University of Technology, 2024; Rijksdienst voor het
287 Cultureel Erfgoed, 2024; Vekemans, 2016). The most common building materials for walls are brick, mineral
288 wool and concrete. Roofs have thickened by more than four times and had a substantial change in complexity of



289 facet composition. The most common building materials for roofs are clay tiles, wood or chipboard, and mineral
 290 wool.

291 **Table 2: Overview table of the HERITAGE-classes and their properties.**

Class nr.	Example building	Building period	Adopted wall description			Adopted roof description			Thermal conductivity [J m ⁻¹ s ⁻¹ K ⁻¹]		(Volumetric) Heat capacity [J m ⁻³ K ⁻¹]		Surface albedo		Surface emissivity		Window coverage fraction	Urban fraction
			Thickness [mm]	Material division [mm]	Composition (inside -> outside)	Thickness [mm]	Material division [mm]	Composition (inside -> outside)	Wall	Roof	Wall	Roof	Wall	Roof	Wall	Roof		
1		<1800	180		Pure brick	79	18-50-11	Wooden boards- air-clay tile	0.90	0.17	1 428 000	390 130	0.30	0.23	0.91	0.90	0.46	0.56
2		1800– 1929	215		Pure brick	79	18-50-11	Wooden boards- air-clay tile	0.90	0.17	1 428 000	390 130	0.30	0.23	0.91	0.90	0.46	0.52
3		1930– 1945	270	105-60- 105	Brick-air-brick	79	18-50-11	Wooden boards- air-clay tile	0.46	0.17	1 110 935	390 130	0.30	0.23	0.91	0.90	0.46	0.48
4		1946– 1964	270	105-60- 105	Concrete-air- concrete	350	150-30- 50-70-20- 30	Reinforced concrete-perlite- air-woodwool cement slab- bitumen-gravel	0.40	0.20	1 637 957	1 387 064	0.23	0.15	0.81	0.92	0.46	0.48
5		1965– 1974	300	100- 100- 100	Sandlime brick-mineral wool-brick	131	12-40-18- 50-11	Chipboard- mineral wool- wooden boards- air-clay tile	0.10	0.09	1 076 402	391 459	0.30	0.23	0.91	0.90	0.46	0.48
6		1975– 1991	300	100-50- 40-100	Sandlime brick-mineral wool-air- concrete	141	12-50-18- 50-11	Chipboard- mineral wool- wooden boards- air-clay tile	0.15	0.08	1 303 561	364 348	0.23	0.23	0.81	0.90	0.44	0.51
7		1992– 2005	300	100-50- 40-100	Concrete- mineral wool- air-brick	191	12-100- 18-50-11	Chipboard- mineral wool- wooden boards- air-clay tile	0.16	0.06	1 077 694	271 377	0.30	0.23	0.91	0.90	0.48	0.52
8		2006– 2014	340	100- 100-40- 100	Concrete- mineral wool- air-concrete	211	12-120- 18-50-11	Chipboard- mineral wool- wooden boards- air-clay tile	0.10	0.06	1 060 318	246 527	0.23	0.23	0.81	0.90	0.48	0.51
9		≥2015	380	100- 140-40- 100	Concrete- mineral wool- air-concrete	331	12-240- 18-50-11	Chipboard- mineral wool- wooden boards- air-clay tile	0.09	0.05	948 706	160 487	0.23	0.23	0.81	0.90	0.48	0.37
10		Unknown (1005)	284			177			0.36	0.12	1 230 175	443 517	0.27	0.22	0.86	0.90	0.46	0.56

292 We find that over the entire period the thermal conductivity decreased by 90 % and 72 % for walls and roofs,
 293 respectively (Table 2). Wall thermal conductivity decreased rapidly from 1800–1929 (HC2) until 1965–1974
 294 (HC5) and remained fairly stable at ~13 %. Roof thermal conductivity shows a constant decline over time only
 295 interrupted by a 17 % increase for post-war buildings in 1946–1964 (HC4).

296
 297 The heat capacity of both facets has also seen a general decline across time. However, the post-war housing of
 298 1946–1964 (HC4) shows a deviation from this trend. This period marks a distinct difference in dominating
 299 building technique and materials used. Building regulations were more lenient in many countries after the second
 300 world war to accelerate the rebuilding process of the countries resulting in generally lower quality housing and
 301 worse thermal properties (Van de Voorde et al., 2015; Vekemans, 2016). In the Netherlands, this led to
 302 construction of larger buildings and more multi-unit housing out of cheaper building materials (Havinga et al.,
 303 2020; Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland, 2022). This is reflected for HC4 in higher roof thermal
 304 conductivity and higher heat capacity of both facets.



Albedo and emissivity values are determined by the outermost material of each facet. For walls, these parameters are dictated by the use of brick or concrete, whereas roofs have prescribed clay tiles, except for HC4 which has a gravel roof. Overall, both parameters differ maximum with about 10 percent points between the HCs.

Our analysis indicates that building size does not vary that much between classes. Most HCs show fairly small buildings with mean building width varying between 12.0 m to 17.3 m and a collective mean of 13.2 m. The only exception is HC10 which has a mean of 5.8 m which could be due to it containing buildings of unknown origin which may encompass a lot of smaller buildings and structures, such as sheds and annexes which might not have required a building permit and thus a full registration.

Building height distributions follow a fairly normal distribution for most HCs with a mean building height around 12 m (Table B1). However, HC9 and HC10 show a clear right-skewed distribution which might again reflect a larger number of sheds, garages, houseboats or smaller temporary housing units. The standard deviation of the building heights has also grown over time starting at a standard deviation of 3.0 m for HC1 and ending at 8.2 m and 7.7 m for HC8 and HC9, respectively.

Table 3: Overview of morphological parameters for each HERITAGE-class for Amsterdam. If a building has a building height of <5 m it will be allocated to the “0 m” bin, and the “5 m” bin represents buildings between 5 and <10 m.

Class nr.	Building period	Building heights [m]			Building height distribution [%]						Median roof width [m]	Road width [m]
		Mean	Median	SD	< 5 m	5–10 m	10–15 m	15–20 m	20–25 m	≥ 25 m		
1	< 1800	13	13	3	2	20	64	13	1		14.4	9.4
2	1800–1929	13.3	14.3	4.2	8	14	44	33	1		12.4	15.5
3	1930–1945	12.5	13	4.1	9	17	60	13	1		12.0	17.7
4	1946–1964	11.9	11.6	5.7	11	32	39	13	5		17.3	10.5
5	1965–1974	14.3	14.1	4.9	6	14	47	24	9		16.1	12.6
6	1975–1991	12.2	12.8	4.2	11	16	61	11	1		12.8	11.5
7	1992–2005	12.7	13.2	5.2	13	16	47	20	4		12.9	9.6
8	2006–2014	13.7	13.1	8.2	13	23	39	11	5	9	15.6	8.6
9	≥ 2015	10.6	9.3	7.7	39	17	22	12	6	4	12.4	7.7
10	Unknown (1005)	7.2	4.8	4.7	59	17	16	8			5.8	11.9

Road width sees a peak in HC3 (1930–1945) at 17.7 m. Since then, the road width has decreased to its narrowest with 7.7 m for HC9 (≥2015). This could be due to a larger focus away from car-centric planning to densification and space efficiency of modern spatial planning.


Urban fractions are varying across the classes with a mean of 0.5. The highest urban fraction appears in the classes located in the inner-city area (HC1 and HC10) with a mean of 0.56. Lower densities occur in HC3–5 (1930–1974) which coincides with the tendency to build more community housing following the world wars. The newest areas represented with HC9 (≥2015) have the lowest urban fraction which might reflect areas still in development and the city’s expansion into more rural areas.



334 **3.2 HERITAGE VS LCZ**
335 **3.2.1 Spatial class changes**

336 The HERITAGE-raster clearly shows the historical expansion of the city (Figure 3). HC1 is clearly confined to
337 the inner city inside a ring (the famous canal district) of what used to be the old city walls. Outside of this ring
338 HC2 and HC3 create two layers of expansion which coincides with the growth of the population of Amsterdam
339 beyond the city walls in the 19th century and their gradual decay and removal (Glaudemans, 2008; Tussenbroek,
340 2019). Newer urban expansions have been concentrated along public transport routes and major roads. Patches of
341 one HERITAGE-class inside another dominating class also show trends of densification, and in some cases,
342 rebuilding.

343
344 This historical expansion is less clear in the LCZ-raster since LCZs primarily focus on building morphology and
345 density (Figure 4). Building morphology does have some relation to building period but it is often heavily dictated
346 by the availability of land. This trend is reflected in Figure 4 where compact mid-rise (LCZ 2) dominate in the
347 inner-city area whereas open LCZ-classes (LCZ 4–6) dominate in outer districts which also overlap with the post-
348 war expansion of the city (see HC4–9 in Figure 3). To the northwest and southwest of the inner-city there are
349 larger areas identified as LCZ 8 and 10 showcasing a known issue of the classification algorithms to struggle
350 separating these two categories (Bechtel et al., 2019; Zhu et al., 2022).



351
352 **Figure 3: The HERITAGE-raster for Amsterdam with classes. Classes 1-21 and 61 are the same as for CGLC-MODIS-**
353 **LCZ (Figure 4). The HERITAGE-classes (HCs) are numbered 51-60 in correspondence with their position in WRF.**




Figure 4: The CGLC-MODIS-LCZ raster for Amsterdam incorporated as the default land use map in WRF (Adapted from Demuzere et al., 2023a).

A number of differences between the default LCZ-raster and the HERITAGE-raster stands out for Amsterdam. First, the CGLC-MODIS-LCZ raster (LCZ-raster) is representative of the year 2018 (Demuzere et al., 2023b) whereas the HERITAGE-raster inherits the same vegetation layer from the LCZ-raster but is updated with urban classes based on data from 2024. This creates a difference in coverage between urban and natural vegetation classes. The HERITAGE-raster contains ~10 % more urban land cover than the LCZ-raster with 36.2 % against 26.0 %. This reduction mostly originates from a reduction in class number 8 (woody savanna) with 4.2 % (Table 4). The difference in representation year also causes the LCZ-raster to miss recent urban developments, for example at the eastern harbour.

Each HC replaces multiple LCZ-classes revealing no clear connection between the two classification schemes (Figure 5). The non-compact low-rise classes (LCZs 6 and 8) are the most frequently occurring LCZs and are spatially overlapping with 9 out of 10 HCs. Only HC1 (<1800) sees a majority of its buildings belonging to one class, LCZ 2. HC6 (1975–1991) and HC7 (1992–2005) are the most frequent HCs in Amsterdam representing 38.7 % of the building pixels in the HERITAGE-raster. HC5 and HC6 have a similar distribution of LCZs probably reflecting a similar development policy in this period (1965–1991). All HCs show a displacement of vegetation of 11–43 % compared to the LCZ-raster, but this is partially offset by the increase in vegetation fraction within each HC.



Table 4: Occurrence of the different classes in the HERITAGE-raster compared to the default CGCL-MODIS-LCZ raster. Note that classes nr. 51-60 represent the HERITAGE-classes and the LCZ-classes for the HERITAGE- and the LCZ-raster, respectively and cannot be directly compared.

Class nr.	HERITAGE-raster class name	LCZ-raster class name	HERITAGE coverage [%]	LCZ-raster coverage [%]
1	Evergreen Needleleaf Forest		0.51	0.59
4	Deciduous Broadleaf Forest		0.47	0.48
5	Mixed Forest		3.25	3.63
7	Open shrublands		5.34	6.43
8	Woody savanna		8.34	12.62
9	Savanna		3.68	4.31
10	Grassland		1.90	2.57
11	Permanent wetlands		3.15	3.95
12	Croplands		19.58	21.14
16	Barren/sparsely vegetated		0.07	0.08
17	Water (like oceans)		12.43	12.74
21	Lake		5.09	5.42
51	HC1 (<1800)	LCZ 1 (Compact high-rise)	0.35	0.04
52	HC2 (1800-1929)	LCZ 2 (Compact mid-rise)	4.23	0.74
53	HC3 (1930-1945)	LCZ 3 (Compact low-rise)	1.71	0.02
54	HC4 (1946-1964)	LCZ 4 (Open high-rise)	3.88	3.95
55	HC5 (1965-1974)	LCZ 5 (Open mid-rise)	3.82	2.83
56	HC6 (1975-1991)	LCZ 6 (Open low-rise)	6.85	8.56
57	HC7 (1992-2005)	LCZ 7 (Lightweight low-rise)	5.81	-
58	HC8 (1992-2014)	LCZ 8 (Large low-rise)	3.57	8.24
59	HC9 (≥2015)	LCZ 9 (Sparsely built)	2.70	0.23
60	HC10 (Unknown)	LCZ 10 (Heavy industry)	0.02	1.44
61	Bare rock/paved		3.25	-

As expected, ~64 % of the raster pixels stay the same and at least 65 % of the spatial occurrence is preserved between the rasters for all vegetation classes (Figure F1). Among the urban classes, the most common replacement is for the compact LCZ-classes. 59 % of LCZ 3 (compact low-rise) tiles are replaced with HC2 (1800–1929), while LCZ 2 (compact mid-rise) is replaced with HC2 and HC1 (<1929) in about 52 % and 27 % of the cases, respectively. LCZ 1 is rarely occurring in Amsterdam but is usually replaced with HC7 or HC8 (1992-2014). Open low-rise buildings (LCZ 6) are in 24 % of the cases replaced with HC6 (1975–1991), while large low-rise buildings (LCZ 8) are in 40 % of the cases replaced with HC7 (1992–2005) or reclassified to a sealed surface type. It is also interesting to note that LCZ 1 is only appearing since HC5 (≥1965), and the growing dominance of more recent HCs are both evidence of the growing building stock and tendency to build higher and denser.




Figure 5: Spatial overlap between the HERITAGE-classes and the land use classes in CGLC-MODIS-LCZ. Percentages behind the HCs refer to their relative occurrence of all building classes in the HERITAGE-raster.



3.2.2 Comparison of parameter values in WRF

We find considerable numerical differences between the default LCZ parameter values and the HERITAGE-classes for Amsterdam. Table B1 shows the tabular values for the two classes. The values for the LCZs are taken from the default URBPARM_LCZ.TBL in WRF whereas the HERITAGE values are the same as in Table 2 and Table 3.

A large difference appears between the two classification systems for the building morphological parameters. Mean building height across all classes are higher for the LCZs mainly driven by the high-rise classes (LCZ 1 and 4). The building height distributions are also very different. The high-rise-classes show a clear shift in distribution to the right compared to the other LCZs with a mean of 37.5 m for SLUCM and 50 m for BEP(+BEM). Except for the high-rise classes and LCZ 10, none of the other LCZs follow a normal distribution of building height and most have a right skewed distribution. Building heights are more similar for the HCs with a collective mean of about 12 m and building height distributions closer to a normal distribution for all classes except HC9 and HC10 which show lower means and right skewed distributions. Standard deviations for building heights are considerably higher and more variable for the HCs than for the LCZs where only LCZs 1 and 2 have a standard deviation higher than 1 m. The mean standard deviation for the HCs is almost 3.5x the mean standard deviation for the LCZs which is an effect of incorporating different building types inside each HC. LCZ buildings and roads are also on average around twice as wide as the HCs.

Urban fraction shows a large variation for the LCZs ranging from 30 % to 95 %. The HCs show lower values and more stability in urban fraction with values between 37 % and 56 %. Excluding both LCZ 1 and 9 – representing together <1 % of the tiles and the extreme ends of the urban fraction distribution – the urban fraction spread is 35 % [55–90 %] for LCZs which is still greater than the 24 % spread for the HCs. The LCZs have a mean urban fraction of 72 % whereas the HCs have a mean of 50 %. This shows that there is a slight compensation in the HERITAGE-raster related to the amount of vegetation; there is a lower amount of vegetation tiles (~10 % less) but a larger green fraction (~50 %) in the urban HERITAGE tiles compared to the LCZs.

One of the main differences and strengths that the HERITAGE-approach offers is the diversity in thermal properties per class based on historical and spatial data. It is clear from Table B1 that all LCZs are represented identical from a thermal perspective. The mean heat capacity for the HCs is for roofs 66 % lower and for walls 20 % lower than the corresponding LCZ value. Mean thermal conductivity is 92 % lower for roofs and 76 % lower for walls in the HERITAGE-approach. For the HCs, mean roof heat capacity is $444 \text{ kJ m}^{-3} \text{ K}^{-1}$ with a value range of $1 \text{ 227 kJ m}^{-3} \text{ K}^{-1}$. Wall heat capacity has a mean of $1 \text{ 230 kJ m}^{-3} \text{ K}^{-1}$ and a value range of $689 \text{ kJ m}^{-3} \text{ K}^{-1}$. The mean albedo estimates with range are 0.22 [0.15–0.23] for roofs and 0.27 [0.23–0.30] for walls. Values of mean emissivity with its range are 0.90 [0.90–0.92] for roofs and 0.86 [0.81–0.91] for walls. The relatively small value range for albedo and emissivity reflects the strong tradition of using clay tiles for roofing, and bricks for walls in construction work in the Netherlands.

On average, the HCs show lower values for all thermal properties than the LCZs. The largest differences between the two approaches show up for heat capacity and thermal conductivity. This is where the assumptions of the facet



431 compositions matter the most since all of them influence the final value entering the model. Compared to the LCZ
 432 values, only HC4 has a higher heat capacity for both facets. This indicates that on average LCZs assume a higher
 433 storage capacity for heat than is present according to the literature review. LCZs also assume a higher thermal
 434 conductivity for all buildings than the literature review suggest. This means that heat is transferred quicker through
 435 the facets and the building envelope can accumulate more heat using the LCZ approach. Most of the HCs suggest
 436 that the studied buildings transfer heat slower through the facets and the walls have a lower heat storing capacity
 437 than previous model exercises using LCZs may indicate.

438 **4 Discussion**

439 **4.1 Comparison to other studies**

440 To the best of our knowledge, the HERITAGE-approach is the first building classification methodology developed
 441 with the primary goal of improving the representation and understanding of the impact of historical construction
 442 on meteorological variables for urban numerical modelling. Building classification based on (historical)
 443 construction archetypes is a common exercise in energy building modelling research (Carnieletto et al., 2021), but
 444 is absent from most meteorological and climate research.

445
 446 Aksoezen et al. (2015) found a statistical relationships between building age, energy demand and compactness
 447 (surface area to volume ratio) which relates to anthropogenic heat emissions and morphological aspects which
 448 affect the microclimate. Pappacogli et al. (2021) used three building classes in their WRF simulations but thermal
 449 properties only varied with building function (residential VS industrial/commercial use). T17 expanded building
 450 classes developed for energy consumption analysis in the TABULA-project (TABULA Project Team, 2012), and
 451 is the only study assessing the change of the energy balance for multiple construction periods.

452
 453 Compared to the model studies by T17 and Pappacogli et al. (2021), the HERITAGE-approach creates more
 454 detailed and longer historical representation of building classes. The former study groups buildings mainly based
 455 on French thermal regulations resulting in all buildings constructed before 1949 to belong to the same class. In
 456 comparison, we identify three HERITAGE-classes before 1946 for Amsterdam, also considering historical
 457 documents on construction practices before thermal regulations were implemented. For TEB modelling purposes
 458 T17's classes are sorted based on three steps: 1) morphology, 2) thermal properties, and 3) use function. This
 459 results in a potentially more accurate building classification but is also considerably more data intensive than our
 460 approach. T17 also mention uncertainties in how to categorise buildings with uncertain or mixed use. The HCs
 461 do not assume any particular building use, but depending on the urban model it is possible to prescribe different
 462 heating/cooling regimes to reflect different energy use.

463
 464 In our spatial comparison analysis of HCs to LCZs we find multiple LCZs occurring within each HCs. This aligns
 465 with recent findings of Habib et al. (2026) where they used a clustering approach to categorise Dutch
 466 neighbourhoods into (sub-)LCZ classes based on morphological and vegetation data. They found the frequency
 467 distribution of four architectural building periods to vary across their seven identified clusters. Their algorithm
 468 also classifies most of the central area of Amsterdam – overlapping with large parts of HC1–3 in Figure 3 and



469 LCZ 2, 4 and 5 in Figure 4 – as LCZ 2 with mean building heights of 9–17 m. This finding aligns well with the
 470 building heights for HC1–3 (Table 3) but also illustrates how sensitive LCZ mapping approaches are to mapping
 471 subjectivity.

472

473 Our study introduces the new perspective of categorising building classes based on a “thermal property centric”
 474 view while utilising existing numerical modelling infrastructure. This enables urban numerical modelling where
 475 thermal and morphological properties are disentangled, providing flexibility of integration into different models
 476 at various scales (LES and meso) and uses (e.g. microclimate or building energy modelling). The tables presented
 477 provide a detailed foundation that makes it easier to implement building properties for urban models with different
 478 requirements on level of detail. These parameter values provide a generalised first order estimate of thermal
 479 properties when detailed information on building level is lacking. This would also make it interesting to use as a
 480 possible starting point for building energy modelling purposes.

481

482 The HCs presented here provide customised thermal and morphological values for Amsterdam, but the
 483 methodology described above can be applied to other locations with similar data sources available. Given the
 484 domination of brick-based construction in the Netherlands, other Dutch cities can reasonably assume the same
 485 thermal property values (Table 2) but should consider recalculating the morphological statistics (Table 3) and
 486 urban fraction using 3DBAG and local cadastre data if the city is considerably differently structured. Applying
 487 the HERITAGE-approach to a non-Dutch setting requires – besides the local building construction literature
 488 review – shapefiles of roads and buildings (including building height and building year) and a spatial dataset of
 489 vegetation fraction.

490 **4.2 Limitations and uncertainty**

491 Urban environments vary greatly between countries, regions and even within city districts depending on historical
 492 developments and local practices. This fact makes every attempt at generalisation through categorisation to have
 493 limits in application. In this paper, we have outlined an approach for how to categorise buildings based on their
 494 thermal properties identified from literature on different historical construction practices in Amsterdam. The
 495 values from all tables are therefore only a good representation of Amsterdam. We would only consider regions
 496 with a similar historical building practice and morphological structure to be able to reasonably apply the same
 497 values. However, we consider the *thermal* properties to be representative for most cities in the Netherlands and
 498 potentially parts of Belgium and Germany, but a local expert assessment should be conducted before making this
 499 assumption. Morphological values and urban fractions need to be collected for the region of interest following an
 500 approach similar to what we describe in Sect. 2.

501

502 The urban modelling community is generally aware that the default values for the LCZs are not representative for
 503 many urban environments, especially at finer scales (Hammerberg et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2023; Stewart and
 504 Oke, 2012; Zonato et al., 2020). WRF was developed by NCAR and the current default urban variables are based
 505 on global averages from Stewart and Oke (2012) (Cenlin He, 2024). Most urban modelling studies use these
 506 values for their cities despite the following warning in the urban parameter tables in WRF: “The default
 507 [parameter] values are probably not appropriate for any given city. Users should adapt these values based on the



city they are working with.” This calls for the same customised approach for the urban morphology parameters as mentioned for the HERITAGE-approach.

When developing the HERITAGE-approach, we found that the estimation of urban fractions is highly sensitive to the input data used, especially based on resolution. We compared the urban fraction values per HERITAGE-class based on data from Ronda et al. (2017) to values obtained using the global urban fraction dataset by Patel and Roth (2022). The data from Ronda et al. (2017) was calculated based on NDVI data from 2008 and has a resolution of ~ 30 m, whereas the data from Patel and Roth (2022) was based on land cover data from 2021 with a ~100 m resolution. The mean and range of the urban fraction based on the former dataset was 50 % [37–56 %], compared to 59 % [54–74 %] for the later. Despite the older age, we opted for the higher resolution dataset as it demonstrated the sharp contrast and heterogeneity present in Amsterdam better.

Cutoffs between HCs were selected based on building years obtained from the literature (Table A1). The parameters of the resulting 10 classes were prepared to align with WRFs current code infrastructure and with urban modelling applications in mind. More or fewer classes might be relevant for other urban areas. The HCs outlined in this paper serve as an example and should be updated in the future as the city develops and more data becomes available.

Assumptions about facet composition and parameter values were made due to a lack of data for many parameters in the Netherlands. Because the Netherlands lacks a centralised database for construction practice, we had to derive materials and facet compositions from literature to estimate all thermal parameter values. Moreover, some buildings might have undergone refurbishments (e.g. post-insulation) since they were built. This leads to these houses having a different “thermal footprint” compared to what the literature suggest. Unfortunately, there is no central registry for refurbishments in the Netherlands. Therefore, representative parameter values were assumed based on the literature and mean parameter values for different materials from lookup tables. Among these parameters, albedo and emissivity are parameters which may vary greatly depending on the facet surface regardless of building period. Future efforts should therefore concentrate on establishing a database for these parameters, ideally on building level, to reduce uncertainty in these estimates. In its current form the HCs represent a conservative non-retrofit building state.

5 Conclusion

Urban climate modelling is crucial for planning and understanding the impact of weather on energy demand, urban heat and health. The accuracy of the urban representation in these models can significantly alter the modelling results and thus society’s preparedness under extreme conditions. Past urban modelling efforts have overwhelmingly focused on the characterisation and mapping of the morphological parameters of cities but ignored the potential impact of thermal properties of the buildings themselves.

This study demonstrates a new and alternative classification and modelling approach for urban numerical weather and climate modelling based on historical construction practices and thermal properties, i.e. the HERITAGE-



546 approach. The conventional approach of categorising buildings and neighbourhoods using LCZs are subject to
 547 significant mapping subjectivity and simplification of the morphology which may reduce a model's ability to
 548 capture the urban heterogeneity. Compared to the conventional LCZ approach, the HERITAGE-approach offers
 549 a novel method for developing literature- and data-based urban classes with customised spatially varying
 550 morphological and thermal parameter values which are more representative of the real world.

551

552 We apply our new approach on Amsterdam (the Netherlands) and compare the result with the default LCZ values
 553 and LCZ-raster in WRF. We identify 10 HERITAGE-classes (HCs) based on different building periods and
 554 estimate their respective thermal and morphological properties as well as their location. The HERITAGE-raster
 555 exhibits an updated land use map with urban developments not captured in the LCZ-raster. Little spatial
 556 correlation is found between specific LCZs and HCs.

557

558 For Amsterdam, the HCs show generally smaller variability in morphology parameters between classes, but larger
 559 building height variability within a class compared to the LCZs. The difference between LCZ and HERITAGE
 560 values for albedo and emissivity is on average only 8 % and 3 % lower respectively for the HCs due to the
 561 extensive use of bricks in the Netherlands. All HCs show higher thermal conductivity and 9 out of 10 classes show
 562 higher heat capacity for both walls and roofs compared to standard LCZ values in WRF. Compared to previous
 563 model exercises using LCZs, the HERITAGE-approach suggest that the buildings studied transfer heat slower
 564 through the facets and the heat storing capacity of the walls are lower. The effect of this building representation
 565 in modelling will be explored in a follow up paper.

566

567 The HCs contain all variables required – except anthropogenic heat related parameters – for conducting thermal
 568 and energy assessments, and modelling of the urban environment using numerical models such as WRF. Being a
 569 “thermal property centric” classification, the HERITAGE-approach allows for disentangling thermal and
 570 morphological parameter values making it suitable for modelling applications at different scales. This new
 571 approach has the potential to give researchers and policy makers new insights into the origin and spatial variability
 572 of urban meteorological variables, such as temperature, and learn from past construction practices to improve
 573 urban living conditions and future construction practices.

574



575 **Appendix A: Sources**

576 **Table A1: Overview of the sources used in the literature review with their respective use.**

Used for	Source
Roof construction and material	(Oltengarm et al., 2001)
Rc values and insulation	(Kuijeren, 2024)
Rc values and insulation	(Keesjan, 2020)
Insulation	(Do I need an air gap when using foil insulation, 2024)
Window coverage fraction	(Dang et al., 2024)
Rc values and insulation	(Isolatie waarde: de Rd waarde, Rc waarde en lambdawaarde, 2024)
Example housing in the Netherlands	(Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland, 2022)
Post-war buildings	(Van de Voorde et al., 2015)
Cavity walls	(Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed, 2024)
Amsterdam building history	(Tussenbroek, 2019)
History of Dutch brickwork and building codes	(Vekemans, 2016)
Rc values and insulation	(Kim, 2022)
Building regulations	(van Overveld et al., 2011)
Historical buildings in Amsterdam	(Glaudemans, 2008)
Insulation	(Scottish Government, 2020)
Cavity walls	(Rob, 2023)
Dutch brick history	(Orsel, 2006)
Roof construction and materials	(Oltengarm et al., 2001)
Historical building construction	(Museum Ons' Lieve Heer op Solder, 2024)
Roof insulation	(Milieu Centraal, 2024)
Rc values and building regulations	(Liebregts and Persoon, 2011)
Building construction	(Koninklijk Verbond van Nederlandse Baksteenfabrikanten, 2002)
Cavity walls	(Koninklijk Verbond van Nederlandse Baksteenfabrikanten, 1999)
Cavity wall construction	(Historic England, 2012)
Heritage value, post-war buildings	(Havinga et al., 2020)
Dutch building stock composition	(Delft University of Technology, 2024)
U-values and thermal conductivity	(Building Research Establishment, 1984)

577

578



579 **Table A2: Overview table of building materials and their estimated thermal property values based on the literature**
 580 **search with the associated sources.**

Facet	Material	Average thermal conductivity [W m ⁻¹ K ⁻¹]	Average specific heat capacity [J kg ⁻¹ K ⁻¹]	Surface albedo	Surface emissivity	Source
Both	Air	0.02	1005			(Building Research Establishment, 1984; Table 15 Thermal Resistances of Air Gaps, 2021)
	Mineral wool	0.038	920			(Table 6 Thermal Conductivity, Specific Heat Capacity and Density, 2024; The Engineering Toolbox, 2003b; Koninklijk Verbond van Nederlandse Baksteenfabrikanten, 2002)
Wall	Brick	0.9	840	0.3	0.91	(Koninklijk Verbond van Nederlandse Baksteenfabrikanten, 2002; Oke, 1987; Rasooli, 2020; The Engineering Toolbox, 2003a)
	Concrete	0.68	940	0.225	0.805	(Table 6 Thermal Conductivity, Specific Heat Capacity and Density, 2024; The Engineering Toolbox, 2003a; Koninklijk Verbond van Nederlandse Baksteenfabrikanten, 2002; Oke, 1987)
	Sand lime brick	0.64	1000			(Jasińska et al., 2021; de Vree, 2026)
Roof	Wooden boards	0.14	1200			(Table 6 Thermal Conductivity, Specific Heat Capacity and Density, 2021)
	Clay tile	0.8	800	0.225	0.9	(Table 6 Thermal Conductivity, Specific Heat Capacity and Density, 2024; The Engineering Toolbox, 2003a; Oke, 1987)
	Reinforced concrete	1.442	1000			(Farhan et al., 2021)
	Woodwool cement slab	0.085	1000			(Building Research Establishment, 1984; Table 6 Thermal Conductivity, Specific Heat Capacity and Density, 2021)
	Bitumen	0.5	1000			(Table 6 Thermal Conductivity, Specific Heat Capacity and Density, 2021)
	Gravel	0.36	840	0.15	0.92	(Oke, 1987; Oke et al., 2017; Pisello et al., 2014)
	Chipboard	0.15	2093			(Table 6 Thermal Conductivity, Specific Heat Capacity and Density, 2021)
	Perlite	0.08	837			(Table 6 Thermal Conductivity, Specific Heat Capacity and Density, 2021)

581



Appendix B: HERITAGE VS LCZ values in WRF

Table B1: Variable values for urban classes in WRF. The left table shows default values for the LCZs and the right table shows customised HERITAGE-class values for Amsterdam. Mini histograms to the right visualise the building height distribution for BEP(+BEM).

LCZ-class	SLUCH				BEP / BEP+BEM																									
	Building height [m]	SD building height [m]	Roof width [m]	Road width [m]	Urban fraction	Roof heat capacity [J m ⁻² K ⁻¹]	Wall heat capacity [J m ⁻² K ⁻¹]	Roof thermal conductivity [J m ⁻¹ s ⁻¹ K ⁻¹]	Wall thermal conductivity [J m ⁻¹ s ⁻¹ K ⁻¹]	Roof albedo	Wall albedo	Roof emissivity	Wall emissivity	Building heights distribution [%]																
														5 m	10 m	15 m	20 m	25 m	30 m	35 m	40 m	45 m	50 m	55 m	60 m					
1	37.5	4.0	22.2	20.0	0.95	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90																	
2	17.5	3.0	22.0	14.0	0.90	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90				50	50												
3	6.5	1.0	9.6	5.2	0.85	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90				72	28												
4	37.5	1.0	42.9	50.0	0.85	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90																	
5	17.5	1.0	26.3	35.0	0.70	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90																	
6	6.5	1.0	13.0	13.0	0.60	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90				72	28												
7	3.0	1.0	25.0	3.3	0.85	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90				100													
8	6.5	1.0	28.9	32.5	0.85	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90				72	28												
9	6.5	1.0	43.3	43.3	0.30	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90				72	28												
10	10.0	1.0	23.8	28.6	0.55	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90				16	68	16											
LCZ mean:	14.9	1.5	25.7	24.5	0.72	1320 000	1540 000	1.54	1.51	0.30	0.30	0.90	0.90				36.7	16.4	10.5	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	3.8	4.4	3.8	3.1		

HERITAGE-class	SLUCH				BEP / BEP+BEM																									
	Building height [m]	SD building height [m]	Roof width [m]	Road width [m]	Urban fraction	Roof heat capacity [J m ⁻² K ⁻¹]	Wall heat capacity [J m ⁻² K ⁻¹]	Roof thermal conductivity [J m ⁻¹ s ⁻¹ K ⁻¹]	Wall thermal conductivity [J m ⁻¹ s ⁻¹ K ⁻¹]	Roof albedo	Wall albedo	Roof emissivity	Wall emissivity	Building heights distribution [%]																
														5 m	10 m	15 m	20 m	25 m	30 m	35 m	40 m	45 m	50 m	55 m	60 m					
1	13.0	3.0	14.4	9.4	0.56	390 130	1428 000	0.17	0.90	0.23	0.30	0.90	0.91				2	20	64	13	1									
2	13.3	4.2	12.4	15.5	0.52	390 130	1428 000	0.17	0.90	0.23	0.30	0.90	0.91				8	14	44	33	1									
3	12.5	4.1	12.0	17.7	0.48	390 130	1110 935	0.17	0.46	0.23	0.30	0.90	0.91				9	17	60	13	1									
4	11.9	5.7	17.3	10.5	0.48	1367 064	1637 957	0.20	0.40	0.15	0.23	0.92	0.81				11	32	39	13	5									
5	14.3	4.9	16.1	12.6	0.48	391 459	1076 402	0.09	0.10	0.23	0.30	0.90	0.91				6	14	47	24	9									
6	12.2	4.2	12.8	11.5	0.51	364 348	1303 561	0.08	0.15	0.23	0.23	0.90	0.81				11	16	61	11	1									
7	12.7	5.2	12.9	9.6	0.52	271 377	1077 694	0.06	0.16	0.23	0.30	0.90	0.91				13	16	47	20	4									
8	13.7	8.2	15.6	8.6	0.51	246 527	1060 318	0.06	0.10	0.23	0.23	0.90	0.81				13	23	39	11	5									
9	10.6	7.7	12.4	7.7	0.37	150 487	948 706	0.05	0.09	0.23	0.23	0.90	0.81				39	17	27	12	6	4								
10	7.2	4.7	5.8	11.9	0.56	443 517	1230 175	0.12	0.36	0.22	0.27	0.90	0.86				59	17	16	6	2									
HC mean:	12.1	5.2	13.2	11.5	0.50	443 517	1230 175	0.12	0.36	0.22	0.27	0.90	0.86				17.1	18.6	43.9	15.6	3.5	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



588 Appendix C: WRF parameter names

589 Table C1: Corresponding parameter names in URBPARAM.TBL in WRF.

Parameter name	Name in URBPARAM.TBL	Parameter name	Name in URBPARAM.TBL
Building heights mean [m]	ZR	Roof thermal conductivity	AKSR
Building heights SD [m]	SIGMA_ZED	Wall thermal conductivity	AKSB
Median roof width [m]	ROOF_WIDTH	Roof surface albedo	ALBR
Road width [m]	ROAD_WIDTH	Wall surface albedo	ALBB
Urban fraction	FRC_URB	Roof surface emissivity	EPSR
Roof (volumetric) heat capacity	CAPR	Wall surface emissivity	EPSB
Wall (volumetric) heat capacity	CAPB	Window coverage fraction [%]	PWIN
Road width [m]	STREET PARAMETERS: street width	Building height distribution 5 m bins per class	BUILDING HEIGHTS
Median roof width [m]	STREET PARAMETERS: building width		

590 Appendix D: Technical details for implementing the HERITAGE-raster in WRF

591 The HERITAGE-raster needs to be converted to a readable binary format for WRF and appropriate changes need
 592 to be added to the preprocessing modules in WRF. We used the `convert_geotiff` tool (Beezley et al., 2025) to
 593 convert the raster tiff-file to geogrid binary files using the following command:

594 `convert_geotiff -c 60 HERITAGE-raster_final.tif`

595 This creates multiple files labelled “00XXX-00XXX.00XXX-00XXX” and an “index”-file. It is necessary to add
 596 the line: “`mminlu=MODIFIED_IGBP_MODIS_NOAH`” to the index-file. All of these files are then added to a
 597 “HERITAGE”-folder which should be placed in the same directory as the other land surface files (e.g. LCZ
 598 rasters) and needs to be pointed to in the GEOGRID.TBL and the namelist.wps.

599

600 In the GEOGRID.TBL the following lines need to be added above the existing LANDUSEF section:

601 =====

602 `name=LANDUSEF` *#Insert HERITAGE-raster*

603 `priority = 3`

604 `dest_type = categorical`

605 `z_dim_name = land_cat`

606 `interp_option = default:nearest_neighbor`

607 `abs_path = default: <HERITAGE folder location>`

608 =====

609 `name=LANDUSEF` *#Insert CGLC_MODIS_LCZ_global as backup*

610 `priority = 2`

611 `dest_type = categorical`

612 `z_dim_name = land_cat`

613 `interp_option = default:nearest_neighbor`



614 `rel_path = default:CGLC_MODIS_LCZ_global/`

615 =====

616

617 To link the HERITAGE-raster in the WPS, the following lines need to be changed in the namelist.wps:

618 `geog_data_res = 'default','default','default','default',`


619 `geog_data_path = '<location of land surface files and HERITAGE folder>'`

620 `opt_geogrid_tbl_path = './'`

621

622 It is important to refer to and store the files correctly. The abs_path in GEOGRID.TBL needs to point to where
623 the HERITAGE-folder with the converted binary-files and the index-file is located. The geog_data_path in
624 namelist.wps needs to point to the directory where all land surface files are located. Note that geog_data_res is set
625 to 'default' and is aligned with the selection for interp_option, abs_path and rel_path. This results in a smooth
626 transition between datasets as they are available regardless of nesting domain.

627 **Appendix F: Conversion of land use classes from CGLC-MODIS-LCZ to HERITAGE**



628

629 **Figure F1 shows the changes of land use classes moving from the CGLC-MODIS-LCZ raster to the HERITAGE-raster.**
630 **Most of the natural classes stay the same and there is not a clear link between specific LCZs and specific HCs.**

631



632 **Code and data availability**

633 The HERITAGE-raster.tiff with corresponding binary and index-file for WRF as well as the HERITAGE-
 634 modified URBPARM_LCZ.TBL are available at 4TU.ResearchData: <https://doi.org/10.4121/8687610F-A25E-49CA-ADC6-8BCCE0F5A22B> (Sandvik et al., 2026). Other underlying data can be provided by the
 636 corresponding authors upon request.

637 **Author contributions**

638 BES performed the conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, software, validation,
 639 visualization and writing. GJS contributed to the conceptualisation, data curation, funding acquisition, project
 640 administration, resources, supervision, review and editing of the study. DM contributed to the conceptualisation,
 641 supervision, review and editing of the study.

642 **Competing interests**

643 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

644 **Acknowledgements**

645 We acknowledge some technical support for WRF from Srinidhi Gadde (University of Twente), Peter Kalverla
 646 (Netherlands eScience Center), Claire Donnelly (Netherlands eScience Center), Andrea Zonato (CIMA Research
 647 Foundation) and Alberto Martilli (CIEMAT). We also thank Daniella Maiullari (Delft University of Technology)
 648 and Marjolein van Esch (Delft University of Technology) for informative early discussions of this work.

649 **Financial support**

650 This work is supported by the 4TU program HERITAGE (HEat Robustness in Relation To AGEing cities), funded
 651 by the High Tech for a Sustainable Future (HTSF) program of 4TU, the federation of the four technical universities
 652 in the Netherlands. This work used the Dutch national e-infrastructure with the support of the SURF Cooperative
 653 using grant no. EINF-2023.042.

654 **References**

- 655 Aksoezen, M., Daniel, M., Hassler, U., and Kohler, N.: Building age as an indicator for energy consumption,
 656 Energy Build., 87, 74–86, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.10.074>, 2015.
- 657 Bahadori, E., Rezaei, F., He, B.-J., Heiranipour, M., and Attia, S.: Evaluating urban heat island mitigation
 658 strategies through coupled UHI and building energy modeling, Build. Environ., 280, 113111,
 659 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2025.113111>, 2025.
- 660 Bechtel, B., Alexander, P. J., Beck, C., Böhner, J., Brousse, O., Ching, J., Demuzere, M., Fonte, C., Gál, T.,
 661 Hidalgo, J., Hoffmann, P., Middel, A., Mills, G., Ren, C., See, L., Sismanidis, P., Verdonck, M.-L., Xu, G., and
 662 Xu, Y.: Generating WUDAPT Level 0 data – Current status of production and evaluation, Urban Clim., 27, 24–
 663 45, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2018.10.001>, 2019.



- 664 Beezley, J., Mandel, J., Farguell, A., and Chef, B.: `openwfm/convert_geotiff` (0.1), GitHub [code],
 665 https://github.com/openwfm/convert_geotiff (last access: 7 August 2025), 2013.
- 666 Brousse, O., Martilli, A., Foley, M., Mills, G., and Bechtel, B.: WUDAPT, an efficient land use producing data
 667 tool for mesoscale models? Integration of urban LCZ in WRF over Madrid, *Urban Clim.*, 17, 116–134,
 668 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2016.04.001>, 2016.
- 669 Building Research Establishment: Building Research Establishment Digest: Standard U-values, Digest 108, ISBN
 670 0 85125 285 0, Building Research Establishment, Department of the Environment, Garston Watford, 1984.
- 671 Carnieletto, L., Ferrando, M., Teso, L., Sun, K., Zhang, W., Causone, F., Romagnoni, P., Zarrella, A., and Hong,
 672 T.: Italian prototype building models for urban scale building performance simulation, *Build. Environ.*, 192,
 673 107590, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.107590>, 2021.
- 674 Cenlin He: Update urban LCZ parameter table with more reasonable values (#1969) · `wrf-model/WRF@6156b78`,
 675 GitHub [code], <https://github.com/wrf-model/WRF/commit/6156b78dfd350e0514d2455badcd7eab9b7d2d31>
 676 (last access: 27 March 2026), 2024.
- 677 Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek: CBS Wijken en Buurten 2024 versie 1 WFS (v1), PDOK [data set], ID:
 678 ed249628-41f0-4fdd-81a8-838f7a3a8344, [https://www.pdok.nl/ogc-webservices/-/article/cbs-wijken-en-](https://www.pdok.nl/ogc-webservices/-/article/cbs-wijken-en-buurten)
 679 [buurten](https://www.pdok.nl/ogc-webservices/-/article/cbs-wijken-en-buurten), 2024.
- 680 Chen, F., Kusaka, H., Bornstein, R., Ching, J., Grimmond, C. S. B., Grossman-Clarke, S., Loridan, T., Manning,
 681 K. W., Martilli, A., Miao, S., Sailor, D., Salamanca, F. P., Taha, H., Tewari, M., Wang, X., Wyszogrodzki, A. A.,
 682 and Zhang, C.: The integrated WRF/urban modelling system: development, evaluation, and applications to urban
 683 environmental problems, *Int. J. Climatol.*, 31, 273–288, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.2158>, 2011.
- 684 Cheng, Y., Zhao, L., Chakraborty, T. C., Oleson, K., Demuzere, M., Liu, X., Che, Y., Liao, W., Zhou, Y., and Li,
 685 X. “Cathy”: U-Surf: a global 1 km spatially continuous urban surface property dataset for kilometer-scale urban-
 686 resolving Earth system modeling, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 17, 2147–2174, [https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-17-2147-](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-17-2147-2025)
 687 [2025](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-17-2147-2025), 2025.
- 688 Cheval, S., Amihăsesei, V.-A., Chitu, Z., Dumitrescu, A., Falcescu, V., Iraşoc, A., Micu, D. M., Mihuleţ, E., Ontel,
 689 I., Paraschiv, M.-G., and Tudose, N. C.: A systematic review of urban heat island and heat waves research (1991–
 690 2022), *Clim. Risk Manag.*, 44, 100603, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2024.100603>, 2024.
- 691 Dang, M., van den Dobbelsteen, A., and Voskuilen, P.: A Parametric Modelling Approach for Energy Retrofitting
 692 Heritage Buildings: The Case of Amsterdam City Centre, *Energies*, 17, 994, <https://doi.org/10.3390/en17050994>,
 693 2024.
- 694 Delft University of Technology: Residential Building Typology - NL, [https://episcopus.eu/building-](https://episcopus.eu/building-typology/country/nl/)
 695 [typology/country/nl/](https://episcopus.eu/building-typology/country/nl/), last access: 10 September 2024, 2014.
- 696 Demuzere, M., Bechtel, B., Middel, A., and Mills, G.: Mapping Europe into local climate zones, *PLOS ONE*, 14,
 697 e0214474, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214474>, 2019.
- 698 Demuzere, M., Kittner, J., Martilli, A., Mills, G., Moede, C., Stewart, I. D., van Vliet, J., and Bechtel, B.: A global
 699 map of local climate zones to support earth system modelling and urban-scale environmental science, *Earth Syst.*
 700 *Sci. Data*, 14, 3835–3873, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-3835-2022>, 2022.
- 701 Demuzere, M., He, C., Martilli, A., and Zonato, A.: A hybrid 100-m global land cover dataset with Local Climate
 702 Zones for WRF (1.0.0), Zenodo [data set], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7670653>, 2023a.
- 703 Demuzere, M., He, C., Martilli, A., and Zonato, A.: Technical documentation for the hybrid 100-m global land
 704 cover dataset with Local Climate Zones for WRF, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7670792>, 2023b.
- 705 Do I need an air gap when using foil insulation, [https://insulationgo.co.uk/blog/do-i-need-an-air-gap-when-using-](https://insulationgo.co.uk/blog/do-i-need-an-air-gap-when-using-foil-insulation/)
 706 [foil-insulation/](https://insulationgo.co.uk/blog/do-i-need-an-air-gap-when-using-foil-insulation/), last access: 9 September 2024.



- 707 Esch, T., Brzoska, E., Dech, S., Leutner, B., Palacios-Lopez, D., Metz-Marconcini, A., Marconcini, M., Roth, A.,
 708 and Zeidler, J.: World Settlement Footprint 3D - A first three-dimensional survey of the global building stock,
 709 Remote Sens. Environ., 270, 112877, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112877>, 2022.
- 710 Farhan, S. A., Ismail, F. I., Kiwan, O., Shafiq, N., Zain-Ahmed, A., Husna, N., and Hamid, A. I. A.: Effect of
 711 Roof Tile Colour on Heat Conduction Transfer, Roof-Top Surface Temperature and Cooling Load in Modern
 712 Residential Buildings under the Tropical Climate of Malaysia, Sustainability, 13, 4665,
 713 <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094665>, 2021.
- 714 Glaudemans, R.: Een bouwhistorische waardenkaart voor de stadskern van Amsterdam [A map of architectural
 715 heritage values for Amsterdam city centre], Gemeente Amsterdam, Bureau Monumenten & Archeologie,
 716 Amsterdam, ISSN: 1875-7839, 2008.
- 717 Habib, M., Zendeli, D., van Esch, M., Timmermans, W. J., and van Ham, M.: Unsupervised clustering approach
 718 to residential typo-morphologies across multiple cities for urban heat vulnerability assessment, Sustain. Cities
 719 Soc., 137, 107107, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2025.107107>, 2026.
- 720 Hammerberg, K., Brousse, O., Martilli, A., and Mahdavi, A.: Implications of employing detailed urban canopy
 721 parameters for mesoscale climate modelling: a comparison between WUDAPT and GIS databases over Vienna,
 722 Austria, Int. J. Climatol., 38, e1241–e1257, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5447>, 2018.
- 723 Han, J., Mo, N., Cai, J., Ouyang, L., and Liu, Z.: Advancing the local climate zones framework: a critical review
 724 of methodological progress, persisting challenges, and future research prospects, Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.,
 725 11, 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03072-8>, 2024.
- 726 Havinga, L., Colenbrander, B., and Schellen, H.: Heritage attributes of post-war housing in Amsterdam, Front.
 727 Archit. Res., 9, 1–19, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2019.04.002>, 2020.
- 728 Historic England: Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings: Insulating Early Cavity Walls,
 729 <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/eehb-early-cavity-walls/heag083-early-cavity-walls/>
 730 (last access: 20 August 2024), 2012.
- 731 Huang, F., Jiang, S., Zhan, W., Bechtel, B., Liu, Z., Demuzere, M., Huang, Y., Xu, Y., Ma, L., Xia, W., Quan, J.,
 732 Jiang, L., Lai, J., Wang, C., Kong, F., Du, H., Miao, S., Chen, Y., and Chen, J.: Mapping local climate zones for
 733 cities: A large review, Remote Sens. Environ., 292, 113573, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2023.113573>, 2023.
- 734 Isolatietaal: de Rd waarde, Rc waarde en lambdawaarde [Insulation values: the Rd value, Rc value, and lambda
 735 value], [https://www.isolatiemateriaal.nl/kenniscentrum/isolatietaal-de-rd-waarde-rc-waarde-en-](https://www.isolatiemateriaal.nl/kenniscentrum/isolatietaal-de-rd-waarde-rc-waarde-en-lambdawaarde)
 736 [lambdawaarde](https://www.isolatiemateriaal.nl/kenniscentrum/isolatietaal-de-rd-waarde-rc-waarde-en-lambdawaarde), last access: 5 September 2024.
- 737 Jasińska, I., Dachowski, R., and Jaworska-Wędzińska, M.: Thermal Conductivity of Sand-Lime Products
 738 Modified with Foam Glass Granulate, Materials, 14, 5678, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ma14195678>, 2021.
- 739 Kadaster: BRT TOP10NL (OGC API), PDOK [data set], ID: 576ac56d-14de-477b-a536-b430cd6ff03e,
 740 <https://api.pdok.nl/brt/top10nl/ogc/v1> (last access: 5 February 2025).
- 741 Keesjan: Isolatiemogelijkheden huis per bouwjaar [Insulation possibilities house by year of construction],
 742 <https://papagreen.org/wonen/isolatie/isolatiemogelijkheden-huis-per-bouwjaar/> (last access: 9 September 2024),
 743 2020.
- 744 Kim: Rc-waarde of Rd-waarde voor isolatie – Welke waarde is goed? [Rc value or Rd value for insulation – What
 745 value is good?], [https://www.fabercomfortvloer.nl/blog/rc-waarde-of-rd-waarde-voor-isolatie-welke-waarde-is-](https://www.fabercomfortvloer.nl/blog/rc-waarde-of-rd-waarde-voor-isolatie-welke-waarde-is-goed/)
 746 [goed/](https://www.fabercomfortvloer.nl/blog/rc-waarde-of-rd-waarde-voor-isolatie-welke-waarde-is-goed/), last access: 23 April 2024, 2022.
- 747 Koninklijk Verbond van Nederlandse Baksteenfabrikanten: Construeren met Metselwerk van Baksteen
 748 [Constructing with Masonry from Bricks], Koninklijk Verbond van Nederlandse Baksteenfabrikanten, De Steeg,
 749 [https://www.knb-keramiek.nl/media/269958/brochure-construeren-met-metselwerk-van-baksteen-herziene-](https://www.knb-keramiek.nl/media/269958/brochure-construeren-met-metselwerk-van-baksteen-herziene-omslag.pdf)
 750 [omslag.pdf](https://www.knb-keramiek.nl/media/269958/brochure-construeren-met-metselwerk-van-baksteen-herziene-omslag.pdf), 1999.



- 751 Koninklijk Verbond van Nederlandse Baksteenfabrikanten: Bouwfysische Eigenschappen en Detaillering
 752 Metselwerk [Building Physics Properties and Detailing of Masonry], Koninklijk Verbond van Nederlandse
 753 Baksteenfabrikanten, De Steeg, [https://www.knb-keramiek.nl/media/269955/brochure-bouwfysische-](https://www.knb-keramiek.nl/media/269955/brochure-bouwfysische-eigenschappen-en-detaillering-metselwerk-herziene-omslag.pdf)
 754 [eigenschappen-en-detaillering-metselwerk-herziene-omslag.pdf](https://www.knb-keramiek.nl/media/269955/brochure-bouwfysische-eigenschappen-en-detaillering-metselwerk-herziene-omslag.pdf), 2002.
- 755 Kuijeren, F. van: To see how your house is insulated by the year of construction,
 756 <https://vkmakelaars.nl/en/blog/architectural/to-see-how-your-house-is-insulated-by-the-year-of-construction/>,
 757 last access: 8 August 2024, 2022.
- 758 Kusaka, H., Kondo, H., Kikigawa, Y., and Kimura, F.: A Simple Single-Layer Urban Canopy Model For
 759 Atmospheric Models: Comparison With Multi-Layer And Slab Models, *Bound.-Layer Meteorol.*, 101, 329–358,
 760 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019207923078>, 2001.
- 761 Li, R., Sun, T., Ghaffarian, S., Tsamados, M., and Ni, G.: GLAMOUR: GLobAl building MORphology dataset
 762 for URban hydroclimate modelling, *Sci. Data*, 11, 618, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-024-03446-2>, 2024.
- 763 Liebrechts, M. and Persoon, J.: Technische Eigenschappen van het Woningcasco in de Tijd [Technical
 764 Characteristics of the Building Shell Over Time],
 765 [http://www.bouwhulparchief.nl/kennisdeling/artikelen/417_Technische_eigenschappen_van_het_woningcasco_](http://www.bouwhulparchief.nl/kennisdeling/artikelen/417_Technische_eigenschappen_van_het_woningcasco_in_de_tijd.php)
 766 [in_de_tijd.php](http://www.bouwhulparchief.nl/kennisdeling/artikelen/417_Technische_eigenschappen_van_het_woningcasco_in_de_tijd.php), 2011.
- 767 Lindenthal, T. and Johnson, E. B.: Machine Learning, Architectural Styles and Property Values, *J. Real Estate*
 768 *Finance Econ.*, 71, 353–384, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11146-021-09845-1>, 2025.
- 769 Maronga, B., Banzhaf, S., Burmeister, C., Esch, T., Forkel, R., Fröhlich, D., Fuka, V., Gehrke, K. F., Geletić, J.,
 770 Giersch, S., Gronemeier, T., Groß, G., Heldens, W., Hellsten, A., Hoffmann, F., Inagaki, A., Kadasch, E., Kanani-
 771 Sühling, F., Ketelsen, K., Khan, B. A., Knigge, C., Knoop, H., Krč, P., Kurppa, M., Maamari, H., Matzarakis, A.,
 772 Mauder, M., Pallasch, M., Pavlik, D., Pfafferoth, J., Resler, J., Rissmann, S., Russo, E., Salim, M., Schrempf, M.,
 773 Schwenkel, J., Seckmeyer, G., Schubert, S., Sühling, M., von Tils, R., Vollmer, L., Ward, S., Witha, B., Wurps,
 774 H., Zeidler, J., and Raasch, S.: Overview of the PALM model system 6.0, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 13, 1335–1372,
 775 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-1335-2020>, 2020.
- 776 Martilli, A., Clappier, A., and Rotach, M. W.: An Urban Surface Exchange Parameterisation for Mesoscale
 777 Models, *Bound.-Layer Meteorol.*, 104, 261–304, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016099921195>, 2002.
- 778 Masson, V.: A Physically-Based Scheme For The Urban Energy Budget In Atmospheric Models, *Bound.-Layer*
 779 *Meteorol.*, 94, 357–397, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1002463829265>, 2000.
- 780 Masson, V., Heldens, W., Bocher, E., Bonhomme, M., Bucher, B., Burmeister, C., de Munck, C., Esch, T.,
 781 Hidalgo, J., Kanani-Sühling, F., Kwok, Y.-T., Lemonsu, A., Lévy, J.-P., Maronga, B., Pavlik, D., Petit, G., See,
 782 L., Schoetter, R., Tornay, N., Votsis, A., and Zeidler, J.: City-descriptive input data for urban climate models:
 783 Model requirements, data sources and challenges, *Urban Clim.*, 31, 100536,
 784 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2019.100536>, 2020.
- 785 Milieu Centraal: Dakisolatie: lagere energiekosten [Roof insulation: lower energy costs],
 786 <https://www.milieucentraal.nl/energie-besparen/isoleren-en-besparen/dakisolatie/>, last access: 9 September 2024.
- 787 Museum Ons' Lieve Heer op Solder: Our Lord in the Attic: A Case Study - Building construction,
 788 [https://www.getty.edu/conervation/publications_resources/teaching/case/olita/building/construction_building.ht](https://www.getty.edu/conervation/publications_resources/teaching/case/olita/building/construction_building.html)
 789 [ml](https://www.getty.edu/conervation/publications_resources/teaching/case/olita/building/construction_building.html), last access: 9 August 2024.
- 790 Oke, T. R.: *Boundary Layer Climates*, 2nd ed., Routledge, United Kingdom, 464 pp., ISBN: 97811381704381987,
 791 1987.
- 792 Oke, T. R., Mills, G., Christen, A., and Voogt, J. A.: *Urban Climates*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
 793 <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139016476>, 2017.
- 794 Oltengarm, J., van Kampen, B. J. M., Reijenga, T. H., and Drok, M.: PV system en renovatie - Een potentieel
 795 studie [PV system and renovation - A potentiality study],
 796 <https://publications.tno.nl/publication/34619407/zzEymi/2001-G&I-R0067.pdf>, 2001.



- Orsel, E.: Brickwork in Leiden: a Survey of Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Characteristics, in: Proceedings of The Second International Congress on Construction History, Queens' College, Cambridge University 29th March–2nd April, The Second International Congress on Construction History, Queens' College, 2379–2394, ISBN 0701702052, 2006.
- van Overveld, M., van der Graaf, P. J., Eggink-Eilander, S., and Berghuis, M. I.: Praktijkboek Bouwbesluit 2012, [Practical Guide to Building Regulation 2012], ISBN: 9789012134248, 2011.
- Pappaccogli, G., Giovannini, L., Zardi, D., and Martilli, A.: Assessing the Ability of WRF-BEP + BEM in Reproducing the Wintertime Building Energy Consumption of an Italian Alpine City, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 126, e2020JD033652, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JD033652>, 2021.
- Patel, P. and Roth, M.: A High-Resolution Dataset of Global Urban Fraction for Mesoscale Urban Modelling (2.0.1), Zenodo [data set], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7298393>, 2022.
- Peters, R., Dukai, B., Vitalis, S., Van Liempt, J., and Stoter, J.: Automated 3D Reconstruction of LoD2 and LoD1 Models for All 10 Million Buildings of the Netherlands, *Photogramm. Eng. Remote Sens.*, 88, 165–170, <https://doi.org/10.14358/PERS.21-00032R2>, 2022.
- Pisello, A. L., Pignatta, G., Castaldo, V. L., and Cotana, F.: Experimental Analysis of Natural Gravel Covering as Cool Roofing and Cool Pavement, *Sustainability*, 6, 4706–4722, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su6084706>, 2014.
- Quach, T.: opengeoshub/becagis (24.11.6), GitHub [code], <https://github.com/opengeoshub/becagis> (last access: 18 June 2025), 2024.
- Rasooli, A.: In-Situ Determination of Buildings' Thermo- Physical Characteristics: Method Development, Experimentation, and Computation, *ABE Archit. Built Environ.*, 1–228, <https://doi.org/10.7480/abe.2020.07.4989>, 2020.
- Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed: Spouwmuren [Cavity walls], <https://kennis.cultureelerfgoed.nl/index.php/Spouwmuren>, last access: 12 August 2024.
- Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland: Voorbeeldwoningen 2022 | bestaande bouw [Reference dwellings 2022 | existing buildings], Publication number: RVO-231-2022/BR-DUZA, <https://www.rvo.nl/sites/default/files/2023-01/brochure-voorbeeldwoningen-bestaande-bouw-2022.pdf>, 2022.
- Rob: Wat Is Een Spouwmuur? [What is a cavity wall?], Grimbergen Isolatietechniek, <https://grimbergenisolatie.nl/wat-is-een-spouwmuur/>, last access: 15 August 2024, 2023.
- Ronda, R. J., Steeneveld, G. J., Heusinkveld, B. G., Attema, J. J., and Holtslag, A. a. M.: Urban Finescale Forecasting Reveals Weather Conditions with Unprecedented Detail, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 98, 2675–2688, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0297.1>, 2017.
- Salamanca, F., Krpo, A., Martilli, A., and Clappier, A.: A new building energy model coupled with an urban canopy parameterization for urban climate simulations—part I. formulation, verification, and sensitivity analysis of the model, *Theor. Appl. Climatol.*, 99, 331–344, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-009-0142-9>, 2010.
- Sandvik, B., Milošević, D., and Steeneveld, G.-J.: Data supporting the publication: Mapping urban fabric for enhanced urban climate modelling based on a historical building classification, <https://doi.org/10.4121/8687610f-a25e-49ca-adc6-8bce0f5a22b>, 2026.
- Scottish Government: U-value: guidance, <https://www.gov.scot/publications/tables-of-u-values-and-thermal-conductivity/>, 2020.
- Stewart, I. D. and Oke, T. R.: Local Climate Zones for Urban Temperature Studies, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 93, 1879–1900, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00019.1>, 2012.



- 838 Table 6 Thermal Conductivity, Specific Heat Capacity and Density,
 839 https://help.iesve.com/ve2021/table_6_thermal_conductivity_specific_heat_capacity_and_density.htm, last
 840 access: 16 August 2024, 2021.
- 841 Table 15 Thermal Resistances of Air Gaps,
 842 https://help.iesve.com/ve2021/table_15_thermal_resistances_of_air_gaps.htm, last access: 16 August 2024, 2021.
- 843 TABULA Project Team: Typology Approach for Building Stock Energy Assessment. Main Results of the
 844 TABULA project, Institut Wohnen und Umwelt GmbH, Darmstadt,
 845 https://episcopo.eu/fileadmin/tabula/public/docs/report/TABULA_FinalReport.pdf, 2012.
- 846 The Engineering Toolbox: Emissivity Coefficients of Common Materials: Data & Reference Guide,
 847 https://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/emissivity-coefficients-d_447.html, last access: 14 August 2024, 2003a.
- 848 The Engineering Toolbox: Specific Heat of Common Materials – Engineering Reference,
 849 https://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/specific-heat-capacity-d_391.html, last access: 14 August 2024, 2003b.
- 850 Tornay, N., Schoetter, R., Bonhomme, M., Faraut, S., and Masson, V.: GENIUS: A methodology to define a
 851 detailed description of buildings for urban climate and building energy consumption simulations, *Urban Clim.*,
 852 20, 75–93, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2017.03.002>, 2017.
- 853 Tussenbroek, G. V.: The great rebuilding of Amsterdam (1521–1578), *Urban Hist.*, 46, 419–442,
 854 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926818000561>, 2019.
- 855 Van de Voorde, S., Bertels, I., and Wouters, I.: Post-war building materials in housing in Brussels 1945-1975 /
 856 Naoorlogse bouwmaterialen in woningen in Brussel 1945-1975 / Matériaux de construction d'après-guerre dans
 857 l'habitation à Bruxelles 1945-1975, Graphius Group, Gent, ISBN 978-94-91912-04-7, 2015.
- 858 Vekemans, H.: Legislation and Brickwork Facades in A Historical Perspective 1900-2015, in: *Brick : an exacting*
 859 *material*, edited by: Wingender, J. P., Architectura & Natura, Amsterdam, 135–148, ISBN 978-94-6140-027-7,
 860 2016.
- 861 de Vree, J.: warmtegeleidings-coëfficiënt (lambda) [thermal conductivity coefficient (lambda)],
 862 <https://www.joostdevree.nl/w/warmtegeleidingscoefficient?highlight=WyJsYWliZGEiXQ==>, last access: 22
 863 September 2026, 2026.
- 864 Zhu, X. X., Qiu, C., Hu, J., Shi, Y., Wang, Y., Schmitt, M., and Taubenböck, H.: The urban morphology on our
 865 planet – Global perspectives from space, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 269, 112794,
 866 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112794>, 2022.
- 867 Zonato, A., Martilli, A., Di Sabatino, S., Zardi, D., and Giovannini, L.: Evaluating the performance of a novel
 868 WUDAPT averaging technique to define urban morphology with mesoscale models, *Urban Clim.*, 31, 100584,
 869 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2020.100584>, 2020.
- 870