

1 **Cool roofs could be most effective at reducing outdoor**
2 **urban temperatures in London compared with other**
3 **roof top and vegetation interventions: a mesoscale**
4 **urban climate modelling study**

5 **O. Brousse^{1*}, C. Simpson¹, A. Zonato², A. Martilli³, J. Taylor⁴, M. Davies¹,**
6 **and C. Heaviside¹**

7 ¹University College London

8 ²Koninklijk Nederlands Meteorologisch Instituut

9 ³Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas

10 ⁴Tampere University

11 **Key Points:**

- 12 • City scale deployment of cool roofs have the highest impact on 2 m air temper-
13 ature
14 • Green roofs do not decrease daily average temperature but have a daytime cool-
15 ing effect
16 • Solar PV can reduce temperatures in London by capturing sensible heat, gener-
17 ating electrical power and reducing sensible heat flux

*University College London, United-Kingdom

Corresponding author: O. Brousse, o.brousse@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

Comprehensive studies comparing impacts of building and street level interventions on air temperature at metropolitan scales are still lacking despite increased urban heat-related mortality and morbidity. We therefore model the impact of 9 interventions on air temperatures at 2 m during 2 hot days from the summer 2018 in the Greater London Authority area using the WRF BEP-BEM climate model. We find that on average cool roofs most effectively reduce temperatures (~ -1.2 °C), outperforming green roofs (~ 0 °C), solar panels (~ -0.3 °C) and street level vegetation (~ -0.3 °C). Application of air conditioning across London increase air temperatures by $\sim +0.15$ °C but related energetic consumption could be covered by energy production from solar panels. Current realistic deployments of green roofs and solar panels are ineffective at large scale reduction of temperatures. We provide a detailed decomposition of the surface energy balance to explain changes in air temperature and guide future decision-making.

Plain Language Summary

Multiple common city scale passive and active interventions exist to reduce urban population's exposure to extreme heat during hot spells. Nonetheless, a proper comparison of the effect that each of these interventions may have on the temperatures experienced within large cities is missing. Additionally, energetic mechanisms that lead to outdoor temperature changes are often not detailed and could lead to detrimental effects for local populations, such as indirect increase of relative humidity or outdoor temperatures. Our study, focusing over London, compares several common interventions through a modelling experiment and finds that cool roofs largely outperform other interventions during the two hottest days of the summer 2018. We also find that green roofs are ineffective on average and that solar panels and tree vegetation would only marginally change temperature exposures. Large scale deployment of air conditioning would lead to increased temperature in the core of London. Solar panels could potentially provide sufficient energy for running air conditioning all over London, creating comfortable indoor environments, and green roofs could reduce temperatures during the day. We argue that such inter-comparisons should guide future decision making.

1 Introduction

Cities have become a focus of attention for climate adaptation and mitigation solutions in the face of the increasing challenges induced by global urbanization and climate warming. More specifically, interest in urban temperatures has been growing, as cities are known to alter the local climate to which urban citizens are exposed (e.g., through the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect (Oke et al., 2017) and thereby impact their thermal comfort and climate-related mortality (Arbutnott et al., 2016; Gasparrini et al., 2015; Masselot et al., 2023). During hot spells, higher mortality and increased likelihood of thermal discomfort are generally observed, hence calling for adaptative and mitigative measures to reduce outdoor air temperatures at the city scale (Heaviside et al., 2016; Salmond et al., 2016; Jungman et al., 2023).

To respond to these risks to public health, passive and active strategies have been proposed to cool down the urban indoor and outdoor environments, and to provide indoor sheltering for the most vulnerable. Commonly proposed urban passive cooling strategies, which should be considered as measures that directly lower the temperatures, include increased urban vegetation, roofs incorporating vegetation (known as green roofs), or the deployment of highly reflective roofs, known as cool roofs (Santamouris et al., 2017). Changes to roofs can reduce indoor temperatures or cooling needs in a building, but when deployed at scale can also reduce the outdoor air temperature and associated heat related mortality (Virk et al., 2014; H. Macintyre & Heaviside, 2019). Concerning active strategies, meaning measures that transform the incoming radiation, into energy for ex-

ample, or that mechanically change the temperatures, air conditioning (AC) is one of the most effective for protection against heat, although it can require large amounts of electrical power and increase outdoor temperatures (Salamanca et al., 2014; Stone Jr et al., 2021). Where passive strategies are unviable or insufficient, AC may be the only option, but it remains the primary solution in some high-income countries despite its problems, like in Phoenix, Arizona (Stone Jr et al., 2021). Lastly, while rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) panels are primarily considered as a source of electrical power, they can also be considered as a passive-active strategy for impacting outdoor and indoor air temperature by increasing the roofs' albedo and by transforming incoming solar radiation into electrical power that can be used to run the AC system (Salamanca et al., 2016; Ma et al., 2017). Debate on their effectiveness as cooling strategies is currently ongoing (Sailor et al., 2021) and calls for more local studies to understand their costs and benefits at different latitudes.

In general, the impact of these strategies has been quantified for a variety of cities across the world (e.g., Chicago (Sharma et al., 2016), Madrid (Salamanca et al., 2014) or Singapore (Yang & Bou-Zeid, 2019)) and physical mechanisms that lead to the cooling/heating of the cities are well understood (Nazarian et al., 2022). Nonetheless, city-specific quantification of these impacts should still be performed to inform the general audience. In addition, few studies have explored in detail how these interventions impact the surface energy balance (SEB) and how these alterations at the city scale can relate to local changes in air temperatures (Broadbent et al., 2020; Krayenhoff et al., 2021). Furthermore, impact studies of urban scale interventions are often challenged by the lack of geographical data on realistic extent at which each intervention could be applied. This means that it is often impossible to give a realistic estimate of the potential impact that interventions can have at a city-scale.

Large-scale controlled trials of urban interventions are, so far, rare, and much of the evidence for their effectiveness comes from modelling. Urban climate models (UCMs) embedded in regional climate models (RCMs), after proper model evaluation, can provide an accurate estimation of the impact on the of urban areas on local climate, as well as the impact of interventions (Krayenhoff et al., 2021). Indeed, most UCMs are coupled to a variety of intervention strategies (e.g., green roofs and solar panels (Zonato et al., 2021) or AC systems (Salamanca et al., 2010; Salamanca & Martilli, 2010)).

In this study, we use detailed urban climate modelling, as well as recent data on the actual coverage of passive(-active) interventions, to estimate the impact on outdoor temperature of several interventions during hot summer days within the Greater London Authority boundaries. By considering a set of scenarios that include both active and passive heat adaptation strategies, our study makes a comprehensive analysis of the impact of each strategy on the outdoor air temperature and the SEB of the Greater London area. Because we expect some of these strategies to not be applicable to all buildings, like green roofs or solar PV panels, we provide realistic scenarios to compare the hypothetical maximum with realistic implementation. We also discuss the potential energy costs and benefits of air conditioning and PV, and the advantages and disadvantages of vegetation-based strategies.

2 Methods

We ran a set of regional climate simulations with a complex three-dimensional urban scheme activated on the two hottest days of the summer of 2018. Our model is based on an existing set up, run over the whole summer of 2018 (Brousse et al., 2023) and is evaluated against a set of in situ observations of air temperature. Although our model is run over the whole of south-east England to accurately represent the interaction between local interventions and mesoscale atmospheric circulations, we focus our study on

118 the Greater London Authority (GLA) metropolitan area only, because our realistic in-
119 terventions are valid for that specific area.

120 2.1 Model configuration

121 We focus our study on the two hottest days of summer 2018, the 26th and the 27th
122 of July, as 2018 was the hottest summer on average for the United Kingdom (McCarthy
123 et al., 2019). Our RCM is run for 3 consecutive days, starting on the 25th of July 2018,
124 and considers that day as spin-up time. We use the Weather Research Forecast (WRF) v4.3
125 RCM to physically represent the potential impact of urban temperature reduction in-
126 terventions at a high spatio-temporal resolution of 1 km with hourly outputs over south-
127 east England; following the previous model domain of Brousse et al. (2023). The impact
128 of cities on the local climate is simulated by activating the Building Energy Parameter-
129 ization (BEP; Martilli et al. (2002)) model with its coupled Building Energy Model (BEM;
130 Salamanca et al. (2010); Salamanca and Martilli (2010)), hereafter referred as BEP-BEM.

131 We consider BEP-BEM to be optimal for our study as it is one of the most refined
132 models that permits the modelling of urban areas at meso-scale. It is a complex 3-dimensional
133 UCM that divides the urban environment and atmosphere into several key components
134 and layers. For instance, BEP-BEM allows the users to define building characteristics
135 at roof and wall levels and street characteristics separately and represents the building
136 impact on the urban boundary layer with a subgrid vertical resolution of 5 m. This is
137 particularly important for evaluation of rooftop interventions as Zonato et al. (2021) showed
138 that the impact of interventions is dependent on building height. Using BEP-BEM thereby
139 avoids over-simplification of the changes in urban properties induced by the interven-
140 tion – something that would happen in a bulk-level UCM, for example. It also subdivi-
141 des the RCM grid into an urban and a natural tile where surface fluxes are calculated
142 separately before being merged, hence allowing for an appropriate estimation of the im-
143 pact of changes in vegetation cover. In our control simulation, the natural tile is han-
144 dled by the Noah-MP land surface model (Niu et al., 2011) and is considered as a mix-
145 ture of cropland and grassland. Lastly, BEP-BEM offers a set of dynamic models for ac-
146 tive and passive strategies for cooling outdoor and indoor environments, including green
147 roofs, solar PV panels, and air conditioning (Salamanca et al., 2011; Zonato et al., 2021).

148 We use the same model dynamics and physics set up as (Brousse et al., 2023) as
149 these have shown good agreement with observations for the whole summer 2018. For the
150 urban canopy parameters and the land cover classification we use the defaults MODIS
151 land cover from WRF and categorize the urban pixels to Local Climate Zones (LCZ; Stewart
152 and Oke (2012)) following the WUDAPT-TO-WRF strategy (Brousse et al., 2016; De-
153 muzere et al., 2022) to provide the WRF model with spatially explicit urban morpho-
154 logical parameters. The building characteristics are provided per LCZ and are the same
155 than in Brousse et al. (2023).

156 2.2 Model evaluation

157 To evaluate the model outputs in parts of the urban environment deprived of of-
158 ficial weather data sources, we follow the same evaluation strategy as in Brousse et al.
159 (2023) by taking advantage of the dense network of personal weather stations (PWS)
160 in the city of London (Brousse et al., 2022). Our model is thereby evaluated against of-
161 ficial automatic weather stations (AWS) from the MIDAS Met Office network (Sunter,
162 2021; UKMO, 2021) and quality-checked crowd-sourced PWS from the Netatmo com-
163 pany (<https://netatmo.org>). More details on the data acquisition and on the ration-
164 ale defending the use of privately owned PWS for UCM evaluation can be found in Brousse
165 et al. (2023). All our crowd-sourced weather data has been quality-checked and filtered
166 using a common statistical method provided by the *Crowd-QC* package from Grassmann
167 et al. (2018); also see Napoly et al. (2018).

168 We evaluate our model with several statistical indicators including the squared Pear-
 169 son’s coefficient of correlation (r^2), Spearman’s coefficient of correlation, root mean squared
 170 error (RMSE), mean absolute error (MAE), and mean bias (MB). The evaluation is car-
 171 ried out over the whole domain to ensure that the model is performing well in all urban
 172 settings and to ensure that our choice for the GLA area is not biased towards higher model
 173 performances.

174 2.3 Temperature interventions

175 We define a set of 9 passive interventions that are theoretically applicable over the
 176 Greater London metropolitan area. Most of our interventions consist of roof interven-
 177 tions and each intervention is compared to a control run which consists of the same model
 178 set up as in Brousse et al. (2023), and which did not consider any heat intervention strat-
 179 egy. Therefore, the control run is simply representative of the impact of urban areas on
 180 the local climate while all subsequent scenarios estimate the impact of each intervention
 181 on that urban climate. We also simulate the effect of widespread use of active cooling
 182 in the form of air conditioning.

183 Our scenarios consist of: 1) the deployment of cool roofs by increasing the albedo
 184 of each urban class to 0.85 (CR_{100}); 2) the deployment of green roofs composed of se-
 185 dum vegetation in all urban classes by activating the green roof model from Zonato et
 186 al. (2021) with its default irrigation hours from 23.00 UTC to 01.00 UTC (GR_{100}); 3)
 187 the deployment of solar PV panels on all urban roofs by activating the solar PV model
 188 from (Zonato et al., 2021) in its default version (PV_{100}); 4) the installation of air con-
 189 ditioning systems in all buildings and at all floors by activating the air conditioning model
 190 embedded in the BEM model in its default version (Salamanca et al. (2010); Salamanca
 191 and Martilli (2010); AC_{100}); and 5) the change of the urban vegetation from cropland
 192 and grass land to urban deciduous trees as implemented in NOAH-MP (Niu et al. (2011),
 193 VG_{100}). These scenarios aim to represent the maximum impact that one intervention
 194 can have on the city’s temperatures and SEB. More information about each model can
 195 be found in the appendix Appendix A.

196 We also test the impact of certain scenarios that are based on more achievable or
 197 tailored interventions. These scenarios are: 1) the potential for solar PV deployment over
 198 roofs of existing buildings in the Greater London taking into account roof slope and over-
 199 shadowing derived from the London solar opportunity map (PV_{pot} ; Steadman et al. (2020));
 200 2) the potential for retrofit of green roofs on existing buildings in Greater London ob-
 201 tained through a detailed geographical information system analysis (C. Simpson et al.
 202 (2022); GR_{pot}); 3) the installation of cool roofs in compact and open mid-rise areas (Lo-
 203 cal Climate Zones 2 and 5) from the centre of London (CR_{mid}); 4) in open low rise ar-
 204 eas (Local Climate Zone 6; CR_{low}) from the residential suburbs of London; and 5) in com-
 205 mercial and industrial areas of London (Local Climate Zone 8; CR_{cid}).

206 Potential conjoint use of green and cool roofs with solar panels have been proposed
 207 to increase solar panel efficiency while reducing urban surface temperatures in particu-
 208 lar (Fleck et al., 2022; Schindler et al., 2018), but it was not possible to analyse this
 209 in our model. Sedum was modelled for the green roofs due to its increasing presence on
 210 new buildings in London (C. Simpson et al., 2022), but other plants such as turf may
 211 have a different impact.

212 To integrate the spatially-explicit variation in solar PV panels and green roofs cov-
 213 erage from the scenarios PV_{pot} and GR_{pot} , we adapted the code from Zonato et al. (2021)
 214 and added a field to the WRF geographical input files. These two scenarios also explain
 215 why our study focuses only on GLA area as these are bounded to its administrative bound-
 216 aries and are not applicable to the whole south-east of England which composes our WRF
 217 domain. Lastly, we expect the impacts to be more prominent in London due to its higher
 218 urban heat island intensity (Bassett et al., 2021; Brousse et al., 2022).

3 Results

During the two hottest summer days of 2018, our model configuration presents a warm bias estimated at $0.72\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ on average in urban PWS and of $1.76\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ amongst official AWS (Fig. B1). Such a difference may be explained by the fact that official AWS are often located in open fields like parks or airports, which further supports the use of PWS for model evaluation (Hammerberg et al., 2018; Brousse et al., 2023). Metrics estimating the model error are better on average across urban PWS compared to AWS, with average values of $2.39\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ compared to $2.84\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for RMSE, and of $1.94\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ compared to $2.33\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for MAE. The model seems however to be better correlated temporally at AWS locations with coefficients of 0.91 against 0.88 for Spearman’s r and of 0.84 against 0.81 for Pearson’s r^2 . We consider our model performance to be acceptable, especially considering the high level of confidence in the temporal evolution of the air temperature at 2 m (T_2) which is directly correlated to the SEB. We thereby assume that our model is trustworthy for each SEB component as we cannot evaluate them without access to flux tower measurements.

In general, we find that cool roofs are the more effective interventions to reduce the heat in the GLA boundaries with a 2-days average cooling of $\sim 1.2\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ going up to $\sim 2.0\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ in certain locations (Fig. 1 and 2). All cool roofs interventions contribute to a reduction of T_2 on average (Fig. 2) with major impacts found in the south and the east of GLA if deployed at 100 % (CR_{100} ; Fig. 1). Horizontal advection of cooling depends on the location where cool roofs are implemented. For instance, if cool roofs are implemented in more central and mid-rise areas of London, more open and low-rise residential areas appear to benefit from this cooling by $\sim 0.15\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ on average. Interestingly, implementing cool roofs on residential low-rise buildings only (CR_{low}) does not cool the central parts of the cities despite providing a substantial outdoor T_2 reduction by up to $\sim 2\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ in the south-east. Establishing cool roofs only on industrial and commercial areas (CR_{cid}) only results in a marginal heat reduction on average over London but does lead to a heat reduction of up to $\sim 1\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ in large industrial areas of east-London. Compared to cool roofs, we find more minor decreases in T_2 of $\sim 0.3\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ on average related to both the change in natural cover from a mixture of croplands and grasslands to deciduous trees (VG_{100}) and to the installation of solar panels over the whole city (PV_{100}). Stronger cooling effects are found in the east of London for these two scenarios. Lastly, despite a high spatial heterogeneity of the cooling provided by the remaining interventions (green roofs (GR_{100} and GR_{pot}); realistic retrofit potential of solar panels (PV_{pot}), none is found to be beneficial for T_2 reduction on average for the whole metropolitan area (Fig. 2). Using air conditioning for maintaining the indoor temperature of all London’s building stock to $21\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ (AC_{100}) induces a heating of central London by up to $\sim 1\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ and of $\sim 0.15\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ on average for the whole city.

By relating the change in T_2 of all urban pixels in the GLA area to their relative SEB components we find that the large decrease in T_2 induced by the full scale deployment of cool roofs (CR_{100}) is linked to an increase in albedo by ~ 0.3 and a reduction of sensible heat fluxes emitted by the city of $\sim 30\text{ }W\cdot m^{-2}$, on average. Notably, however, we observe an increase in incoming solar radiation when deploying cool roofs over the whole city (CR_{100}) and in open residential areas (CR_{low}) as well as when implementing solar panels over the whole city (PV_{100}); something that was also recently observed by Valencia et al. (2023). This could be related to a lower convection due to the cooler surfaces, although major changes in the average cloud cover in the whole atmospheric column are not perceived. Higher emissions of sensible heat fluxes by $\sim 5\text{ }W\cdot m^{-2}$ are found in both the air conditioning (AC_{100}) and the deciduous tree (VG_{100}) scenarios. While the former is expected as AC systems remove the accumulated indoor heat outside mostly in the form of sensible heat, the latter is counter intuitive as more vegetated areas are expected to mostly transform energy in the form of latent heat fluxes via evapotranspiration – something that is modelled with an average increase of latent heat fluxes




Figure 1. Average 2 m air temperature of the control run (T_2 ; top left panel) and the average difference of each intervention (ΔT_2). Grey contours are WRF urban pixels (classified as an urban LCZ).




Figure 2. Time-averaged impact of each intervention on each surface energy balance component and the respective change in air temperature at 2 m for all urban pixels (small dots). Average impact is represented by the large dots.

272 by $\sim 12 \text{ W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$. We however observe a decrease in surface albedo by 0.05 on average
 273 in parallel which could explain this phenomenon.

274 Despite an increase of T_2 induced by green roofs of less than $0.1 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ on average,
 275 hourly spatial averages of changes in T_2 show that if green roofs were implemented across
 276 the whole city (GR_{100}), temperatures could be decreased by ~ 0.5 to $\sim 0.8 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ during hot
 277 hours of the day (11.00 UTC to 14.00 UTC; Fig. 3 and Fig. C1 to C2). Nonetheless, tem-
 278 peratures would also be increased at times of daily minimum T_2 by $\sim 0.5 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ (03.00 UTC
 279 to 06.00 UTC, Fig. 3). This is consistent with findings by Zonato et al. (2021) and ex-
 280 plained by an increased release of latent fluxes during the day but a higher storage of
 281 heat fluxes at night due to green roofs' thermal mass. The current potential for green
 282 roofs in London (GR_{pot}) would not reduce the temperature by more than $0.1 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ on av-
 283 erage across the period. During the hotter hours of the day, the impact of cool roofs (CR_{100})
 284 can be 2.5 times and the one from cool roofs over open-low rises (CR_{low}) 2.0 times greater
 285 than the one of green roofs. Both these scenarios (CR_{100} and CR_{low}) also contribute to
 286 a constant reduction of temperature of at least $0.5 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ throughout the day. This is cor-
 287 related to a high reduction of emitted sensible heat fluxes and of the positive intakes of
 288 ground fluxes throughout daytime hours (Fig. C1 to C2). Notably, the temperature re-
 289 duction across the whole city induced by cool roofs over central mid-rises from London
 290 (CR_{mid}) reaches a peak at later hours, around 15.00 UTC, a few hours after the peak in
 291 reduction of sensible heat fluxes reached at noon. Higher temperature reduction by
 292 $\sim 0.8 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ is observed in the evening if vegetation is changed to deciduous trees (VG_{100}).
 293 During the day, no tangible impact is found in this case, as half of the urban pixels ob-
 294 serve an increase in temperature while the other half observes a decrease. This may be
 295 because higher levels of sensible heat fluxes are emitted; more latent heat fluxes are also
 296 emitted throughout the day. Both full scale and realistic solar panel implementation (PV_{100}




Figure 3. Cumulative distributions of change in air temperature at 2 m for different intervention scenarios. Distributions are of change relative to the reference scenario in average daily mean, daily minimum, and daily maximum 2 m air temperature across grid cells. Distributions are from 200 bin histograms, normalised to unity and based on modelled air temperature on 26th and the 27th of July 2018 in London. The horizontal dashed line indicates the median change. The vertical dashed line indicates zero change.

297 and PV_{pot}) behave similarly to cool roofs by decreasing the emitted sensible heat fluxes
 298 and reducing the intake of fluxes to the ground during daytime hours. The temperature
 299 reduction of up to ~ 1.0 °C, for the full-scale deployment, however, only happens dur-
 300 ing the late afternoon and the evening. At time of daily maximum temperatures, PV_{100}
 301 reduces the temperature in similar ways to GR_{100} (3 and Fig. C1 to C2).

302 **4 Discussion**

303 Using the WRF BEP-BEM mesoscale urban climate over the Greater London metropoli-
 304 tan area during the two hottest days of 2018, we performed one of the first comprehen-
 305 sive evaluations of the impact of building and street level interventions tailored at re-
 306 ducing outdoor and indoor heat on the outdoor temperature and the surface energy bal-
 307 ance in London.

308 We find that interventions such as cool roofs, green roofs, rooftop solar PV, and
 309 changing natural spaces to deciduous woodland can contribute to a cooling of outdoor
 310 temperatures at hyper-local or city scales (also see Fig. C3 to C8, while widespread use
 311 of air conditioning could lead to substantial increases in outdoor temperature in the cen-
 312 tre of London. On average, cool roofs would be the most effective way of reducing out-
 313 door temperature at the city scale, in line with other modelling studies (Sharma et al.,
 314 2016; Yang & Bou-Zeid, 2019; Tan et al., 2023). At the maximum, this temperature re-
 315 duction is between 3.2 °C and 2.8 °C at times when daily spatial average temperatures
 316 reached 33 °C and 37 °C, respectively (Fig. C2), similar to the cooling found in Phoenix
 317 and New York (Sinsel et al., 2021). In comparison, if green roofs or rooftop solar PV pan-
 318 els were deployed over all buildings in the Greater London area, the temperature reduc-
 319 tion would have never reached more than ~ 1.0 °C for both days; considering that overnight,
 320 green roofs would increase the average temperature due to their increased heat-storage
 321 capacity that increases heat release at night (Tan et al., 2023). Of note, our green roofs

322 are modelled with sedum vegetation as they are the most common in London; other de-
323 signs may lead to other effects as Zonato et al. (2021) found an increased reduction us-
324 ing grass-based green roofs. Conversely, we find that changing the modelled vegetation
325 type of urban natural spaces from grasslands/croplands to deciduous trees would reduce
326 outdoor temperatures only during the night and found mixed effects during the day, pos-
327 sibly due to an increase in the surface albedo which leads to an increased sensible heat
328 emission during the day. Latent heat would also increase as expected from more evap-
329 otranspiration and would be equivalent to the increase in latent heat from green roofs
330 deployed at full scale. Although cooling via evapotranspiration reduces air temperature,
331 it increases water vapor in the atmosphere; this could be beneficial for avoiding water
332 stress of vegetation but affect the heat stress from city's inhabitants and should be eval-
333 uated using a set of multiple heat stress metrics (C. H. Simpson et al., 2023).

334 City scale impacts of any intervention are reduced when applied to a smaller area
335 or fewer buildings. For cool roofs, we find that although major impacts are found when
336 applied over low-rises residential areas of London, already applying them over central
337 mid-rises of the city could reduce the temperature in surrounding residential areas. Be-
338 cause of the relatively small area covered by industrial areas in London, applying cool
339 roofs over them would only marginally contribute to a heat reduction of the city, con-
340 tradictory to results in Birmingham where commercial and industrial areas cover an im-
341 portant part of the city centre (H. Macintyre & Heaviside, 2019). They could also be con-
342 sidered less effective as industrial buildings already observe higher albedo than more res-
343 idential areas (Brousse et al., 2023). Cool roofs may act to reduce indoor temperatures
344 in summer, but also potentially in winter, thus increasing winter heating demand. There-
345 fore, it is important that they are installed in conjunction with insulation in homes (Taylor
346 et al., 2018). However, in winter, cool roofs have less of a cooling effect outdoor temper-
347 atures than they do in summer (H. L. Macintyre et al., 2021). While we find that full
348 application of rooftop solar PV leads to some cooling on average, realistic application,
349 constrained by existing building characteristics, is not enough to have an appreciable ef-
350 fect on the temperature. Similarly, full application of sedum green roofs can reduce day-
351 time temperatures, but the potential for retrofit of existing buildings with sedum green
352 roofs is not enough to produce a substantial cooling effect at the city scale.

353 Although air conditioning would increase the outdoor temperature, it could still
354 protect vulnerable populations from overheating indoors. Through our modelling exper-
355 iment, we find that if solar panels were implemented in a realistic manner on the rooftops
356 of existing buildings, the energy production, peaking at ~ 22.5 MW at time of higher solar
357 incidence (11.00 UTC) and with an average production of ~ 7 MWh, would cover the
358 energetic consumption induced by AC systems which never goes above ~ 9 MW during
359 the hottest hours (15.00 UTC to 17.00 UTC), averaging to ~ 4.5 MWh. Under the as-
360 sumption that deployment of solar panels is not constrained by existing buildings, elec-
361 tric power production is 75 % greater than the realistic retrofit scenario, and outdoor
362 average temperature is reduced by ~ 0.3 °C while temperature reduction is negligible in
363 the realistic case. This temperature reduction should be carefully interpreted as several
364 studies have found that solar panels could heat up the surrounding environment (Sailor
365 et al., 2021). Nonetheless, these local impacts may be dependent on many factors, in-
366 cluding the building height and the building plan area fraction (Zonato et al., 2021), or
367 the increase in rooftop albedo. In our case, we argue that the capture of solar radiation
368 by the solar PVs is sufficiently important to lower the expected intake of radiation by
369 the building and that most of it is transformed in the form of electric energy rather than
370 in sensible heat over the roof. In the evening and at night, the low thermal capacity of
371 solar PVs explains the higher cooling capacity of the urban environment. In any case,
372 our results call for more investigation on this specific topic as other studies, like (Tan
373 et al., 2023), found a small night-time increase in temperature over Chicago when im-
374 plementing solar PV over buildings' roofs. Hence mechanisms explaining solar PV ef-
375 ficiency in our model need to be further explored.

376 Several limitations apply to this study. First, we used only one UCM, and another
377 UCM may produce different results depending on its dynamics and physics (Krayenhoff
378 et al., 2021). Second, we focused our study only over two hot summer days due to com-
379 putational limitations. In general, performing such comprehensive analysis with multi-
380 ple scenarios comes at high computational costs, which often prevents the generalization
381 of the results to expected average seasonal impacts of these interventions or to other cities
382 at similar latitudes. Third, despite the fact that the 26th and the 27th of July were ex-
383 tremely hot days during the summer 2018 in the United Kingdom, full clear-sky condi-
384 tion is absent from our model simulations, which could, for instance, partially explain
385 why solar PV do not lead to a heating of the city during the day. Some of the results
386 observed in this study concerning the surface energy balance may therefore simply be
387 related to the overpass of clouds; although we did not find a particular difference in cloud
388 coverage between our control simulation and our sensitivity tests. Fourth, as discussed
389 above, our study only focuses on outdoor temperatures and does not consider the ben-
390 efits or the detriments caused by these interventions on other aspects (e.g., biodiversity,
391 indoor temperature, increase in relative humidity, wind circulation, etc.). Lastly, all our
392 estimated impacts should be interpreted cautiously as the average temperature differ-
393 ences resulting from the interventions are smaller than the model MAE with respect to
394 observations (Krayenhoff et al., 2021). Despite these limitations, we expect our results
395 to be at the least indicative of which interventions are capable of producing the great-
396 est cooling effect in London.

397 Notwithstanding, the outcomes of this study also have to be put in perspective against
398 the costs related to the deployment of each of these interventions which should be weighted
399 according to a cost-benefit analysis.

400 5 Conclusions

401 Adaptation to urban heat is of increasing priority. Our modelling study suggests
402 that widespread adoption of cool roofs could be efficient at reducing urban temperatures,
403 and therefore adverse health impacts, during hot spells. Rooftop solar PV may also pro-
404 vide a small amount of cooling as an additional benefit to power production; green roofs
405 appear less effective in reducing temperatures but have other environmental benefits. Fur-
406 thermore, relying on AC will lead to increased outdoor temperatures, despite improved
407 thermal comfort indoors. It is reasonable to think that there will be a mixture of adap-
408 tation measures implemented across the city of London, and their applicability and im-
409 pact should be further investigated. Our research is a first step towards this and will be
410 of interest to city planners and decision-makers within the built environment sector.

411 6 Open Research

412 The simulations done in this research were performed using the WRF model v4.4
413 (<https://github.com/wrf-model/WRF.git>). The related outputs presented in this re-
414 search and codes used to plot them are available following this DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.8333363

415 Acknowledgments

416 CH is supported by a NERC fellowship (NE/R01440X/1) and acknowledges funding for
417 the HEROIC project (216035/Z/19/Z) from the Wellcome Trust, which funds OB and
418 CS.

419 OB designed the study and led the conception of the manuscript with the support
420 of CH and CS. OB was responsible for the WRF modelling, the model evaluation and
421 the analysis. CS provided support in the integration of green roofs and solar PV inputs
422 into WRF. AZ implemented a spatially-explicit input of solar PV and green roofs cov-
423 erages in WRF. AZ and AM offered guidance in the set-up of the WRF model v4.4 and

424 in the analysis of the outputs. JT and MD provided support in the design of the study
425 and in the acquisition of knowledge about building interventions. All authors contributed
426 to the writing of the manuscript.

References

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

- Arbuthnott, K., Hajat, S., Heaviside, C., & Vardoulakis, S. (2016). Changes in population susceptibility to heat and cold over time: assessing adaptation to climate change. *Environmental Health*, *15*(1), 73–93.
- Bassett, R., Janes-Bassett, V., Phillipson, J., Young, P. J., & Blair, G. S. (2021). Climate driven trends in london’s urban heat island intensity reconstructed over 70 years using a generalized additive model. *Urban Climate*, *40*, 100990.
- Bougeault, P., & Lacarrere, P. (1989). Parameterization of orography-induced turbulence in a mesobeta-scale model. *Monthly weather review*, *117*(8), 1872–1890.
- Broadbent, A. M., Krayenhoff, E. S., & Georgescu, M. (2020). Efficacy of cool roofs at reducing pedestrian-level air temperature during projected 21st century heatwaves in atlanta, detroit, and phoenix (usa). *Environmental Research Letters*, *15*(8), 084007.
- Brousse, O., Martilli, A., Foley, M., Mills, G., & Bechtel, B. (2016). Wudapt, an efficient land use producing data tool for mesoscale models? integration of urban lcz in wrf over madrid. *Urban Climate*, *17*, 116–134.
- Brousse, O., Simpson, C., Kenway, O., Martilli, A., Krayenhoff, E. S., Zonato, A., & Heaviside, C. (2023). Spatially-explicit correction of simulated urban air temperatures using crowd-sourced data. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*.
- Brousse, O., Simpson, C., Walker, N., Fenner, D., Meier, F., Taylor, J., & Heaviside, C. (2022). Evidence of horizontal urban heat advection in london using six years of data from a citizen weather station network. *Environmental Research Letters*, *17*(4), 044041.
- De Munck, C., Lemonsu, A., Bouzouidja, R., Masson, V., & Claverie, R. (2013). The greenroof module (v7. 3) for modelling green roof hydrological and energetic performances within teb. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *6*(6), 1941–1960.
- Demuzere, M., Argüeso, D., Zonato, A., & Kittner, J. (2022). W2w: A python package that injects wudapt’s local climate zone information in wrf. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *7*(76), 4432.
- Fleck, R., Gill, R., Pettit, T., Torpy, F., & Irga, P. (2022). Bio-solar green roofs increase solar energy output: The sunny side of integrating sustainable technologies. *Building and Environment*, *226*, 109703.
- Gasparrini, A., Guo, Y., Hashizume, M., Lavigne, E., Zanobetti, A., Schwartz, J., . . . others (2015). Mortality risk attributable to high and low ambient temperature: a multicountry observational study. *The lancet*, *386*(9991), 369–375.
- Grassmann, T., Napoly, A., Meier, F., & Fenner, D. (2018). Quality control for crowdsourced data from cws.
- Hammerberg, K., Brousse, O., Martilli, A., & Mahdavi, A. (2018). Implications of employing detailed urban canopy parameters for mesoscale climate modelling: a comparison between wudapt and gis databases over vienna, austria. *International Journal of Climatology*, *38*, e1241–e1257.
- Heaviside, C., Vardoulakis, S., & Cai, X.-M. (2016). Attribution of mortality to the urban heat island during heatwaves in the west midlands, uk. *Environmental health*, *15*, 49–59.
- Iungman, T., Cirach, M., Marando, F., Barboza, E. P., Khomenko, S., Masselot, P., . . . others (2023). Cooling cities through urban green infrastructure: a health impact assessment of european cities. *The Lancet*, *401*(10376), 577–589.
- Jones, A., & Underwood, C. (2001). A thermal model for photovoltaic systems. *Solar energy*, *70*(4), 349–359.
- Krayenhoff, E. S., Broadbent, A. M., Zhao, L., Georgescu, M., Middel, A., Voogt, J. A., . . . Erell, E. (2021). Cooling hot cities: a systematic and critical review of the numerical modelling literature. *Environmental Research Letters*, *16*(5), 053007.

- 481 Ma, S., Goldstein, M., Pitman, A., Haghdadi, N., & MacGill, I. (2017). Pricing the
 482 urban cooling benefits of solar panel deployment in sydney, australia. *Scientific*
 483 *reports*, 7(1), 43938.
- 484 Macintyre, H., & Heaviside, C. (2019). Potential benefits of cool roofs in reducing
 485 heat-related mortality during heatwaves in a european city. *Environment inter-*
 486 *national*, 127, 430–441.
- 487 Macintyre, H. L., Heaviside, C., Cai, X., & Phalkey, R. (2021). Comparing
 488 temperature-related mortality impacts of cool roofs in winter and summer in a
 489 highly urbanized european region for present and future climate. *Environment*
 490 *international*, 154, 106606.
- 491 Martilli, A., Clappier, A., & Rotach, M. W. (2002). An urban surface exchange
 492 parameterisation for mesoscale models. *Boundary-layer meteorology*, 104, 261–
 493 304.
- 494 Masselot, P., Mistry, M., Vanoli, J., Schneider, R., Iungman, T., Garcia-Leon, D., ...
 495 others (2023). Excess mortality attributed to heat and cold: a health impact
 496 assessment study in 854 cities in europe. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 7(4),
 497 e271–e281.
- 498 McCarthy, M., Christidis, N., Dunstone, N., Fereday, D., Kay, G., Klein-Tank, A.,
 499 ... Stott, P. (2019). Drivers of the uk summer heatwave of 2018. *Weather*,
 500 74(11), 390–396.
- 501 Napoly, A., Grassmann, T., Meier, F., & Fenner, D. (2018). Development and appli-
 502 cation of a statistically-based quality control for crowdsourced air temperature
 503 data. *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 6, 118.
- 504 Nazarian, N., Krayenhoff, E., Bechtel, B., Hondula, D., Paolini, R., Vanos, J., ...
 505 others (2022). Integrated assessment of urban overheating impacts on human
 506 life. *Earth's Future*, 10(8), e2022EF002682.
- 507 Niu, G.-Y., Yang, Z.-L., Mitchell, K. E., Chen, F., Ek, M. B., Barlage, M., ... oth-
 508 ers (2011). The community noah land surface model with multiparameteriza-
 509 tion options (noah-mp): 1. model description and evaluation with local-scale
 510 measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116(D12).
- 511 Oke, T. R., Mills, G., Christen, A., & Voogt, J. A. (2017). *Urban climates*. Cam-
 512 bridge University Press.
- 513 Sailor, D., Anand, J., & King, R. (2021). Photovoltaics in the built environment: A
 514 critical review. *Energy and Buildings*, 253, 111479.
- 515 Salamanca, F., Georgescu, M., Mahalov, A., Moustauoui, M., & Martilli, A. (2016).
 516 Citywide impacts of cool roof and rooftop solar photovoltaic deployment on
 517 near-surface air temperature and cooling energy demand. *Boundary-layer*
 518 *meteorology*, 161, 203–221.
- 519 Salamanca, F., Georgescu, M., Mahalov, A., Moustauoui, M., & Wang, M. (2014).
 520 Anthropogenic heating of the urban environment due to air conditioning.
 521 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119(10), 5949–5965.
- 522 Salamanca, F., Krpo, A., Martilli, A., & Clappier, A. (2010). A new building energy
 523 model coupled with an urban canopy parameterization for urban climate simu-
 524 lations—part i. formulation, verification, and sensitivity analysis of the model.
 525 *Theoretical and applied climatology*, 99, 331–344.
- 526 Salamanca, F., & Martilli, A. (2010). A new building energy model coupled with
 527 an urban canopy parameterization for urban climate simulations—part ii.
 528 validation with one dimension off-line simulations. *Theoretical and Applied*
 529 *Climatology*, 99, 345–356.
- 530 Salamanca, F., Martilli, A., Tewari, M., & Chen, F. (2011). A study of the urban
 531 boundary layer using different urban parameterizations and high-resolution
 532 urban canopy parameters with wrf. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Clima-*
 533 *tology*, 50(5), 1107–1128.
- 534 Salmond, J. A., Tadaki, M., Vardoulakis, S., Arbuthnott, K., Coutts, A., Demuzere,
 535 M., ... others (2016). Health and climate related ecosystem services pro-

- 536 vided by street trees in the urban environment. *Environmental Health*, 15(1),
537 95–111.
- 538 Santamouris, M., Ding, L., Fiorito, F., Oldfield, P., Osmond, P., Paolini, R.,
539 ... Synnefa, A. (2017). Passive and active cooling for the outdoor built
540 environment—analysis and assessment of the cooling potential of mitigation
541 technologies using performance data from 220 large scale projects. *Solar En-*
542 *ergy*, 154, 14–33.
- 543 Scherba, A., Sailor, D. J., Rosenstiel, T. N., & Wamser, C. C. (2011). Modeling im-
544 pacts of roof reflectivity, integrated photovoltaic panels and green roof systems
545 on sensible heat flux into the urban environment. *Building and Environment*,
546 46(12), 2542–2551.
- 547 Schindler, B. Y., Blaustein, L., Lotan, R., Shalom, H., Kadas, G. J., & Seifan, M.
548 (2018). Green roof and photovoltaic panel integration: Effects on plant and
549 arthropod diversity and electricity production. *Journal of environmental*
550 *management*, 225, 288–299.
- 551 Sharma, A., Conry, P., Fernando, H., Hamlet, A. F., Hellmann, J., & Chen, F.
552 (2016). Green and cool roofs to mitigate urban heat island effects in the
553 chicago metropolitan area: Evaluation with a regional climate model. *Environ-*
554 *mental Research Letters*, 11(6), 064004.
- 555 Simpson, C., Brousse, O., & Heaviside, C. (2022). The potential of green roofs in
556 london. In *Egu general assembly conference abstracts* (pp. EGU22–7671).
- 557 Simpson, C. H., Brousse, O., Ebi, K. L., & Heaviside, C. (2023). Commonly used in-
558 dices disagree about the effect of moisture on heat stress. *npj Climate and At-*
559 *mospheric Science*, 6(1), 78.
- 560 Sinsel, T., Simon, H., Broadbent, A. M., Bruse, M., & Heusinger, J. (2021). Mod-
561 eling impacts of super cool roofs on air temperature at pedestrian level in
562 mesoscale and microscale climate models. *Urban Climate*, 40, 101001.
- 563 Steadman, P., Evans, S., Liddiard, R., Godoy-Shimizu, D., Ruyssevelt, P., &
564 Humphrey, D. (2020). Building stock energy modelling in the uk: the 3dstock
565 method and the london building stock model. *Buildings and Cities*, 1(1),
566 100–119.
- 567 Stewart, I. D., & Oke, T. R. (2012). Local climate zones for urban temperature
568 studies. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93(12), 1879–1900.
- 569 Stone Jr, B., Mallen, E., Rajput, M., Broadbent, A., Krayenhoff, E. S., Augenbroe,
570 G., & Georgescu, M. (2021). Climate change and infrastructure risk: Indoor
571 heat exposure during a concurrent heat wave and blackout event in phoenix,
572 arizona. *Urban Climate*, 36, 100787.
- 573 Sunter, M. (2021). Midas data user guide for uk land observations, v20210705.
- 574 Tan, H., Kotamarthi, R., Wang, J., Qian, Y., & Chakraborty, T. (2023). Impact
575 of different roofing mitigation strategies on near-surface temperature and en-
576 ergy consumption over the chicago metropolitan area during a heatwave event.
577 *Science of The Total Environment*, 860, 160508.
- 578 Taylor, J., Symonds, P., Wilkinson, P., Heaviside, C., Macintyre, H., Davies, M., ...
579 Hutchinson, E. (2018). Estimating the influence of housing energy efficiency
580 and overheating adaptations on heat-related mortality in the west midlands,
581 uk. *Atmosphere*, 9(5), 190.
- 582 UKMO. (2021). *Midas open: Uk hourly weather observation data, v202107. cen-*
583 *tre for environmental data analysis, 08 september 2021*. (data retrieved online,
584 <https://doi.org/10.5285/3bd7221d4844435dad2fa030f26ab5fd>)
- 585 Valencia, J. F. M., Henao, J., & Saher, R. (2023). *The effect of removal of all non-*
586 *functional turf in las vegas: tradeoffs between water conservation, excessive*
587 *heat, and storminess* (Tech. Rep.). Copernicus Meetings.
- 588 Virk, G., Jansz, A., Mavrogianni, A., Mylona, A., Stocker, J., & Davies, M. (2014).
589 The effectiveness of retrofitted green and cool roofs at reducing overheating in
590 a naturally ventilated office in london: Direct and indirect effects in current

- 591 and future climates. *Indoor and Built Environment*, 23(3), 504–520.
- 592 Yang, J., & Bou-Zeid, E. (2019). Scale dependence of the benefits and efficiency of
593 green and cool roofs. *Landscape and urban planning*, 185, 127–140.
- 594 Zonato, A., Martilli, A., Gutierrez, E., Chen, F., He, C., Barlage, M., . . . Giovan-
595 nini, L. (2021). Exploring the effects of rooftop mitigation strategies on urban
596 temperatures and energy consumption. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
597 *Atmospheres*, 126(21), e2021JD035002.