ASSESSING NOISE AND OVERHEATING IN DWELLINGS: ALIGNING ACOUSTIC AND THERMAL MODELS FOR PARTIALLY OPEN WINDOWS

Jack Harvie-Clark   Apex Acoustics Ltd, Design Works, William St, Gateshead, UK
Nick Dobinson   Apex Acoustics Ltd, Design Works, William St, Gateshead, UK
Nick Conlan   Apex Acoustics Ltd, Derby Rd, Long Eaton, UK
James Healey   Peninsular Acoustics Ltd, Custard factory 2, Gibb St, Birmingham, UK
Jonathan Howell   Peninsular Acoustics Ltd, Longmore Lane, Liverpool, UK

ABSTRACT

A Building Regulation to limit overheating in dwellings came into force in England in June 2022. This requires that the provisions to mitigate overheating are usable by the occupants. The internal noise limits while using opening windows for ventilative cooling at night are 40 dBA L_{night} and 55 dB L_{AMAX} (10th highest). A clarification to the guidance indicates that windows may be modelled as partially open; this enables justification of natural ventilation at night in noisier locations than if windows must be modelled as fully open, as originally indicated in Approved Document O.
The thermal assessment relies on the CIBSE TM59 method, with the adaptive thermal comfort model when using opening windows. The ventilation performance of open windows is described in the thermal model with an "Equivalent Area" (EA). A simple acoustic model for a partially open window is considered for its accuracy, based on either an Acoustic Open Area (AcOA), or the EA. The application of the EA for the acoustic assessment overcomes the need to calculate window opening angles, and greatly simplifies a consistent understanding between acoustic and thermal modellers.

Keywords: Noise, Overheating, Opening windows, Residential, Thermal comfort, Acoustic comfort

1   INTRODUCTION

The English government has introduced a new Building Regulation [1] to mitigate overheating in new residential buildings. This is part of the government's response to adapting to climate change [2]. Approved Document O (ADO) [3] describes the Regulation. When the Regulation came into force in June 2022, the government published a series of FAQs on its website [4] (ADO-FAQ). These ADO-FAQs modify the guidance given in ADO in materially significant ways, as is described in this paper. There is also guidance on the application of ADO produced by the Future Homes Hub [5], along with calculation tools.

ADO describes how windows cannot be assumed to be open during the night time period if internal noise levels exceed guideline values. This means that an acoustic assessment and an overheating assessment are both required to assess the indoor environmental quality (IEQ) conditions simultaneously. It is (surprisingly!) challenging to align assumptions regarding acoustic models and thermal models of a partially open window. This paper describes these challenges, to assist the discussion between and amongst building acoustic and thermal modellers.

2   BACKGROUND

2.1   Noise level guidelines

The WHO's Guidelines for Community Noise (WHO GCN) [6] indicate internal noise level guidelines. BS 8233 [7] reiterates the 30 dBA L_{Aeq} guideline, but omits the 45 dB $L_{AF,max}$ guideline. ProPG: Planning and Noise (2017) [8] reintroduces the 45 dB $L_{AF,max}$ guideline in its notes, and approaches

the concept of opening windows for thermal comfort and internal noise levels. The gap in guidance resulted in 85 % of new developments having overheating assessments assuming that the windows were open, while noise assessments simultaneously assumed that the windows were closed [9]. This was an untenable position, and new industry guidance was developed to address this gap

2.2   The AVO Guide

The Acoustics, Ventilation, Overheating – Residential Design Guide [10] (AVO Guide) was published in January 2020. This was the first industry publication to propose alternative (relaxed) indoor ambient noise guidelines in residential buildings when using opening windows to mitigate overheating, based on a concept of "adaptive acoustic comfort" [11]. A joint statement has been published [12], that provides endorsement for the ProPG and AVO Guide by the CIEH.

2.3   Noise Policy Statement for England

The English Government's policy on noise is described in the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) [13]. This describes how noise should be taken into account. The second aim of the Noise Policy Statement for England is:
Mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life from environmental, neighbour and neighbourhood noise within the context of Government policy on sustainable development.
A note in the NPSE clarifies the meaning of this statement. In developing the guidance in the AVO Guide, the authors recognised this policy aim. In the light of our sustainability crisis, the authors sought to avoid the need for construction and operation of mechanical systems to mitigate overheating as far as possible; it was considered that some adverse impacts from noise could be acceptable.

2.4   Open area terminology

Jones *et al* [14] provide a set of descriptions that can be used unambiguously to describe façade openings. For example, six different methods of attributing a value of "free area" to an open window are presented by Sharpe *et al* [15]. "Free area" remains an ambiguous term without consistent definition, despite its widespread use. The Equivalent Area (EA) is a description of flow performance. It is the area of a circular hole in an orifice plate that passes the same volumetric air flow as the device in question, for the same pressure difference – hence the name, *Equivalent*. It is an important quantity, because this is the property used most commonly in overheating models to attribute airflow characteristics to the façade elements. Appendix D of ADO refers to a tool to calculate EA [16].

2.5   Approved Document O (England) 2021

There are two methods described to demonstrate compliance. The first is referred to as the "Simplified Method", although according to Susie Diamond [17], it is "far from simple". The alternative method is dynamic thermal modelling. The Future Homes Hub has produced a guide to designing to comply with Approved Document O [18]. That guide refers to the (currently Draft) "Guide to Demonstrating Compliance with the Noise Requirements of Approved Document O" (GDC-ADO) [19].

2.6   The Simplified Method

The Simplified Method describes in tables the constraints to glazed areas to limit solar gain. These areas are a function of the room size, geographical location, largest glazed façade orientation, and whether there is cross-ventilation or not. Similarly, it describes requirements for what it describes as a "minimum free area". However, there is considerable confusion over the use of the term "minimum free area" within ADO, such as para. 1.12:
Openings should be designed to achieve the free areas in paragraphs 1.10 and 1.11 [of ADO]. The equivalent area of the opening should meet or exceed the free area of the opening.
The intended meaning is only confirmed in the ADO-FAQs # 8 [4], which clarify that everywhere ADO says "minimum free area", the reader can understand this to mean "minimum equivalent area".

2.7   Dynamic thermal modelling

If the Simplified Method cannot be used, then compliance must be demonstrated using dynamic thermal modelling. ADO refers to the CIBSE TM59 [20] method, but adds additional constraints to how that methodology is applied. The relevant aspects here are the indication in ADO that:
All of the following limits on CIBSE's TM59, section 3.3, apply:
- *At night (11pm to 8am), openings should be modelled as fully open if … the following apply.*
- *…The internal temperature exceeds 23°C at 11pm*

However, the guidance of ADO FAQ #14 supersedes the guidance in ADO, by indicating that a strategy involving the *..opening windows a smaller amount at night*…is possible.

This note may facilitate designers demonstrating compliance with ADO by using natural ventilation with opening windows in many more situations that would otherwise have been possible.

2.8   Acoustic constraints

One of the requirements indicated in ADO for the "reasonable enjoyment of the residence" concerns noise levels. ADO indicates that:
… the overheating mitigation strategy should take account of the likelihood that windows will be closed during sleeping hours (11pm to 7am).
Windows are likely to be closed during sleeping hours if noise within bedrooms exceeds the following limits.
a. 40 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$, averaged over 8 hours (between 11pm and 7am).
b. 55 dB L_{AFmax}, more than 10 times a night (between 11pm and 7am).

3   SOUND INSULATION OF FAÇADE OPENINGS

3.1   Calculation of façade sound insulation

In order to determine the internal noise levels from external sources it is necessary to determine the façade sound insulation provided by a partially open window. For many years, this has been the subject of much debate amongst the acoustics community. For many practitioners, the "10 – 15 dB" quoted by the WHO GCN is the answer to this question. This rule of thumb takes no account of the extent of window opening, or any of the other factors that may affect the façade level difference.
There are three methods for assessing the sound insulation of a partially open window:
- Field measurements of an equivalent installation
- Laboratory measurements applied in-situ
- Theoretical assessment

All of these approaches have complications, as discussed below.

3.2   Field measurements of opening windows

Before considering the evaluation of façade openings, it is instructive to consider the reliability of the model for the global façade sound insulation from the performance of elements, ISO 12354-3 [21], and comparison with measurements according to ISO 16283-3 [22]. Scrosati *et al* [23] concluded that the correlation between the noise level descriptor, L_{den} (outdoor and indoor, measured over 25 days) and façade sound insulation descriptor, $D_{2m, nT}$, measured with a loudspeaker according to ISO 16283-3, is not reliable. Further they found that the single number quantity including the low adaptation term appropriate for road traffic noise, $D_{2m, nT, 50}$ measured directly differs by 8 or 9 dB from the value calculated using the correlation, and measured values of L_{den} indoor and outdoor. The loudspeaker measurements in this case had been made in a round robin test, and are therefore the benchmark of representative loudspeaker façade tests.
The question of measuring the façade sound insulation of partially open windows is considered by Søndergaard *et al* [24. They note that ISO 16283-3 declares in its scope that:
"The element methods aim to estimate the sound reduction index of a façade element, for example, a window. The most accurate element method uses a loudspeaker as an artificial sound source. Other less accurate element methods use available traffic noise"

However, the standard is probably primarily meant for closed windows, and not for open windows. Care should be taken if using the loudspeaker method for partially open windows, since the results are highly dependent on the window opening position compared to the loudspeaker position. They also investigate the possibility of using a moving loudspeaker as a sound source.

Nunes *et al* [25] have undertaken wider measurements of various window configurations. These are discussed in more detail later in this paper. There are clearly a range of issues with the measurement of façade sound insulation, and particularly so with open windows.

In practice, representative field measurements of any description are rarely available at the design stage. In practice, the assessment is typically required before particular window types are specified. Therefore the use of appropriate field measurements is seldom a suitable strategy for planning compliance by design. There is insufficient data presented by Nunes to compare with the measurements and predictions considered here.

There are a range of studies of the in-situ performance of opening windows, notably Locher *et al* [26]. This study takes account of windows being closed, open in the tilted position, or open in the turned position – the area of opening is not explicitly identified. Comparison is also made with previous studies, including one by Ryan *et al* [27]. Ryan also presents window open areas and room volumes, along with external and internal level differences and standardized level differences (i.e. the internal level corrected to a reference reverberation time, in this case 0.35 secs). This enables re-calculation of the results as presented further below.

The very large uncertainties in measuring the field sound insulation performance of open windows means that it would be very difficult to validate a design for open windows on completion of a building/

3.3   Laboratory measurements of open windows

Standardised laboratory measurements are conducted to ISO 10140-2 [28]. However, the largest laboratory study of partially open windows is reported in NANR116 [29], in which the measurements were not made according to ISO 10140-2, but rather from an anechoic chamber with a directional sound source, into a reverberant room. As noted in that study, the insulation rating specified from a test methodology needs to be appropriate to the intended application, but this also makes comparisons with other data more difficult. The values reported for the level difference or normalised element level difference, $D_{n,e}$ would be different compared with values measured according to BS EN ISO 10140.

Nunes *et al* [25] investigated the acoustic performance of open windows, comparing the free field and diffuse field sound reduction for the same proprietary window that was tested in a laboratory. The proprietary window presented different results between freefield and diffuse field conditions, with a higher performance in freefield conditions. The authors suggested that openable windows should not be tested in diffuse (standard laboratory) conditions. The application of various types of laboratory data in any specific situation should be considered carefully. Laboratory measurements tend to underestimate the sound insulation compared to field measurements of partially open windows. Field measurements showed consistently higher insulation ratings across octave bands. In addition, theoretical calculations based just on open area (e.g. 10log(N), where N is the "open area") overpredict the reduction in insulation with increasing open area. Empirical equations based on their field data gave better predictions. Sound insulation is shown to improve with increasing angle away from normal incidence, both horizontally and vertically.

3.4   Theoretical assessment of façade sound insulation

The appropriate Standard for calculating the sound insulation of a building façade against outdoor sound is BS EN ISO 12354-3. The informative Annex D of that standard suggests that for unsilenced air inlets, like openings or louvres, a global indication is given by treating the element as an opening with negligible sound reduction. This results in an element normalized level difference as shown in Eqn 1.

$$D_{n,e} = -10. lg \left(\frac{S_{open}}{A_0} \right) \qquad \text{Eqn 1}$$

Where: S_{open} is the area of the opening, in square metres

A_0 is the reference equivalent sound absorption area, 10 m^2.

The proposal in GDC-ADO is to use the "area of the opening" of a partially open window to determine the appropriate sound insulation. However, the "area of the opening" of a partially open window is not well defined in the GDC-ADO. As we have seen, the term "free area" is used widely but without definition.

3.5   Acoustic open area, AcOA

The GDC-ADO proposes that an "acoustic open area" (AcOA) is considered for a partially open window. This is derived by considering a partially open window light as a flat rectangular plane, within a two-dimensional plane façade. This disregards the depth of the window opening light frame and its overlap with the surrounding window frame, and the geometry of the interaction between the opening light and the reveals, if significant.
The AcOA is conceived as the lesser of two potential areas:

- The sum of the rectangular area at the base (of a top-hung window) and the two triangular areas formed on each side of the opening light;
- The width * height (w * h) of the opening in which the opening light sits.

The potential AcOA is shown shaded in Figure 1, illustrated for a side-hung window. The dimension "z" is given by simple geometry as shown in Eqn 2.

$$z = 2.w.sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)$$ Eqn 2

Where α is the opening angle.
The area of top shaded triangle is given by (0.5 * base * height), which is 0.5 * w * w.sin(α). Therefore the area of both triangles, top and bottom, reduces to w^2.sin(α).

Figure 1: Concept of "acoustic open area" shown shaded, with the window opening light opening out of the page.

The total AcOA is given by the lesser of areas from Eqn 3 or Eqn 4:

$$AcOA \leq w^2.sin\left(\alpha\right) + z.h$$ Eqn 3

$$AcOA \leq w.h$$ Eqn 4

For a given room volume, the partial internal level due to a partially open window can be calculated using Eqn 1, using the methods described by J Harvie-Clark [30], which is consistent with the details described above.

4   POTENTIAL ACCURACY OF ACOUSTIC OPEN AREA

Where there is data available for window openings and associated sound insulation, the measured values may be compared with the predicted values using the AcOA. Three existing published data sets are used in this way:
- Proprietary window with laboratory tests
- NANR 116 laboratory tests
- Field measurements by Ryan *et al*

An alternative measurand that is also considered is the use of the Equivalent Area, EA, to calculate the sound insulation in the same way as for the AcOA. There are many practical advantages to using this model if it is sufficiently robust. Preliminary measurements are used to evaluate the use of AcOA and EA.

4.1   Proprietary window laboratory tests

The tests [31] present a window with an opening light 1.1 * 0.3 m (w * h) open to different dimensions. The simple assumptions of the AcOA model are used to determine the AcOA and calculated element-normalised level difference. Comparison with the reported values is shown in Figure 2. This shows very good agreement between measurements and calculated values – to the limit of precision of the reported $D_{n,e,w} + C_{tr}$ values.


Figure 2: Proprietary window level differences

4.2   NANR 116 laboratory tests

As noted, the tests detailed in NANR116 deviate from standard ISO 10140-2 test methods, in order to attempt to provide data that is more representative of field conditions. The summary of the report is that opening sizes can be broadly represented by the sound insulation levels shown in Table 1. The corresponding insulation values calculated using the AcOA approach would be 23, 20, 17 dB for 0.05, 0.1, 0.2 m^2 respectively. At larger open areas, the discrepancy between calculated and inferred values is reduced, and the open areas required to mitigate overheating are typically larger than these values.

Table 1: NANR116 summary of insulation

Opening size / m^2	$D_{n,e,w} + C_{tr}$
0.05	18
0.1	17
0.2	15

To review in greater depth, the AcOA calculated and measured level differences are reviewed for the representative range of window types, as shown in Figure 3. The measured values for 0.1 m^2 AcOA (solid blue bars) may be compared with 20 dB (dashed blue line), and the values for 0.2 m^2 AcOA (solid green bars) may be compared with the value of 17 dB (dashed green line). Also included, shown hatched, are the values calculated on the EA for each window arrangement. Calculating the insulation based on the EA rather than the geometrically measured AcOA has many advantages.

Figure 3: NANR116 measured and calculated level differences. Solid bars are measured values (NB not to ISO 10140). Hatched bars are calculated based on EA. Dashed lines represent the AcOA calculated performance for 0.2 m2 (blue) and 0.1 m2 (green) ventilation areas.

4.3   Field measurements by Ryan *et al*

Ryan notes there were no Standards for making these sound measurements; he reports that the external measurements were made in front of the façade at ground level, and a 3 dB correction was applied to account for this, without any more detail. The method used is the same as the AcOA method (following EN 12354-3: 2000), to a different reference reverberation time than is typically used in the UK (0.35s, c.f. 0.5s). These calculated results are not presented by Ryan *et al*, although based on the data presented it can be calculated as shown in Figure 4, with a reference reverberation time of 0.5 s; this figure also includes the Australian method in AS 3671 (1989). Figure 4 indicates that the AcOA method generally over-predicts the insulation achieved, whereas in the commentary, Ryan indicates that "*in general the calculated level internally was above the levels that the field measurement achieved*". If this were so, the AcOA calculation method would be prudent, although other evidence presented here suggests the opposite.

Ryan also indicates that "*the results of this investigation do illustrate that it is unadvisable to use this simple method to determine the noise reduction achieved by a facade with an open window subject to road traffic noise*". However, no alternative method is proposed.

Figure 4: Measurements by Ryan *et al*, with the AcOA insulation calculated.

5   PRELIMINARY FIELD MEASUREMENTS

5.1   Methodology

The site selection comprises dwellings that are exposed to steady continuous road traffic noise travelling perpendicular to the façade. The measurements have sought to determine the normalized element level difference, $D_{n,e,w}$ + C_{tr} assuming that the open window is the only significant source of external noise ingress. Measurements were taken in a first floor bedroom comprising a single window with one openable pane. An external $L_{eq,30s}$ measurement over the one-third octave bands 50 Hz to 5 kHz was taken (> 50 vehicles passing within 30s) using a fixed microphone 1 m from the facade to represent $L_{1,1m}$, based on the element road traffic method set out in [22]. Immediately after the external measurement, the window was opened by stepped amounts as measured by the gap between the frame and the window casement and in each case internal measurements of $L_{eq,30s}$ were taken using a manual scanning technique, in general accordance with [22]. While consecutive measurements contribute to uncertainty, the uncertainty has not been evaluated here; further measurements will use simultaneous recordings. Reverberation time measurements with the window closed were made in accordance with BS EN ISO 3382-2. Background noise readings were also taken over the same duration using the same internal noise level sampling technique, with the windows closed.

Photo 1: Site 1 Window   Photo 2: Site 2 Window Open

Table 2: Summary of Room Parameters

Site	Room Dimensions W*D*H / m	Facade Area	Openable Pane H*W / m	Hanging & Opening
1	1.7 x 3.0 x 2.4	5.1 m2	0.35 x 0.76	Top Hung, Outwards
2	5.3 x 2.8 x 2.4	14.8 m2	0.80 x 1.12	Side Hung, Inwards

5.2   Results

The measurement data is evaluated by calculating the standardized level difference in accordance with [22], standardized to a room reverberation time of 0.5s. The calculated $D_{n,e,w}$ + C_{tr} is based on Eqn 1, using the methods described by Harvie-Clark [30]. The calculated level difference based on AcOA is based on Eqns 3 & 4; when based on EA, the EA is calculated according to [16].

Table 3: Results for Site 1

Opening Distance (mm)	Opening Angle (degrees)	AcOA (m^2)	EA (m^2)	$D_{n,e,w}$ + C_{tr} (dB) based on		
				Meas'd	Calc AcOA	Calc. EA
300	59	0.27	0.21	13	16	17
100	17	0.11	0.11	15	20	20
50	8	0.06	0.06	15	23	22

Table 4: Results for Site 2

Opening Distance (mm)	Opening Angle (degrees)	AcOA (m^2)	EA (m^2)	$D_{n,e,w}$ + C_{tr} (dB) based on		
				Meas'd	Calc AcOA	Calc EA
400	30	0.78	0.57	6	11	12
350	26	0.68	0.53	9	12	13
300	22	0.58	0.48	7	12	13
250	18	0.48	0.43	8	13	14
200	15	0.39	0.36	7	14	14
150	11	0.29	0.29	11	15	15
100	7	0.19	0.21	11	17	17

5.3   Discussion

The field measurements show the same pattern as the calculated values of $D_{n,e,w}$ + C_{tr}, based on either the AcOA or the EA. However, the calculated performance is consistently about 5 dB lower (lower sound insulation means more sound is transmitted, i.e. higher values of $D_{n,e}$) higher than achieved in these measurements. The over-estimation of actual sound insulation performance is seen with measured and calculated values in Figure 5. It can be seen that the calculated values tend towards the measured values for higher values of AcOA / EA. There is considerable uncertainty with the use of either EA or AcOA to calculate the internal levels from external sound levels, but the difference between AcOA and EA-calculated levels is equivalent – around 5 dB.

Figure 5: Measured and calculated values compared, based on both AcOA and EA

6   MODELLING OVERHEATING RISK

According to Petrou *et al* [32], Tian *et al* [33] explains that building performance simulation uncertainty can be classified into two broad categories: Model form; and Parameter uncertainties. Empirical validation work has demonstrated how the combination of both types could lead to significant discrepancies between the model and actual indoor environment, according to Strachan *et al* [34]. Petrou *et al* focus on the magnitude of possible parameter uncertainties associated with the modellers' algorithm choice.

In the thermal model, a façade opening permits air exchange between inside and outside. The complexity of this in practice is described by Sharpe *et al* [15], who describe 15–25 % prediction errors of free area models commonly used in practice. The options available to modellers are complex; default practices are adopted that are generally considered to be "good practice" [35].

Petrou *et al* demonstrated [36] that the choice of building simulation tool, with default algorithm options, significantly affected the prediction of overheating risk. Wind-driven ventilation and surface convection algorithms were the main sources of the observed discrepancies. The choice of algorithm within each building simulation tool was investigated by Petrou. The selection of non-default algorithms within each model also had a very significant impact on the results. Roberts *et al* [37] compared predictions and measurements of overheating risk in synthetically occupied test houses. It is understood that TM59 is currently under revision, especially with the updated science around tolerable night time temperatures in bedrooms according to Lomas and Li [38].

6.1   Discussion: "all models are wrong…

.. some are useful", according to George Box [39]. While it is important that the assumptions between the acoustic and thermal models are consistent, excessive precision is unnecessary and counter-productive if it is inaccessible to most practitioners. The façade sound insulation performance that may be achieved depends on the type of incoming sound field (degree of diffusivity), angle of incident sound, arrangement of opening light, reveal depth, opening type, and internal room conditions. Most

of these factors are not known or even knowable with current technology. Ryan *et al* indicate that there are additional unknowns when considering L_{max} sounds. Based on wide experimental data by Scrosati *et al* [37,38], façade sound insulation is not recommended to correlate external and internal sound level descriptors.

6.2   AcOA equated with EA

The use of the AcOA is based on an engineering concept of the façade opening and ISO 12354-3. If this same assessment is based on the EA, rather than the AcOA, there may be some additional uncertainty introduced in some assessments. The proprietary window laboratory tests have a calculated EA that matches almost exactly the AcOA, therefore there is no loss of accuracy, although we have seen that diffuse field laboratory tests do not represent field performance very well. The NANR116 data indicates that using EA in this way makes a variable small difference to the predictions – sometimes they are more accurate, sometimes less.

However, there is a very significant advantage in calculating façade sound insulation based on EA to integrate with the thermal model. It greatly facilitates the exchange of model attributes with the overheating modeler. Indeed, thermal modelers may often default to treating an open area as an EA in any case, following modeling guidance. The most significant advantage is that in the design process to assess thermal and acoustic compliance with guidelines, both disciplines simply use the same numbers. It is not necessary to know about the window dimensions and angle of opening – all the details of the façade are bypassed. Many modelers and other practitioners find the description of AcOA difficult, and especially so to translate into the intended EA. The combined assessment of thermal and acoustic compliance is complicated – basing the sound insulation on the EA simplifies the process, and reduces the risk of greater discrepancies between acoustic modeling assumptions and thermal modeling assumptions.

7   CONCLUSION AND FURTHER WORK

There is a great deal of uncertainty in the prediction of the façade sound insulation of a partially open window. Many advances in acoustic measurements, modeling, laboratory tests, and standardization of these new methods would be required to significantly reduce this uncertainty. The industry will need to judge if this is a priority, or if simple methods are considered sufficiently robust. A risk of this approach is that practical details that could improve the sound insulation – for example, a side hung window opening away from the main noise source, rather than towards it – is not accounted for, and hence has no value in the design, whereas it could make a noticeable difference in practice. It is suggested that the accuracy of the application of Acoustic Open Area, AcOA or Equivalent Area, EA on which to base the calculation of façade sound insulation according to ISO 12354-3 is evaluated in more depth. As there is a need to undertake calculations in the mean time, the use of AcOA or EA is suggested for this purpose.

8   ACRONYMS

AcOA	Acoustic Open Area
ADO	Approved Document O, Reference 3
ADO-FAQ	ADO Frequently-asked-questions, Reference 4
ANC	Association of Noise Consultants
AVO Guide	Acoustics, Ventilation, Overheating: Residential Design Guide, Reference 10
CIBSE TM59	Design methodology for the assessment of overheating risk, Reference 20
CIEH	Chartered Institute of Environmental Health
EA	Equivalent Area
GDC-ADO	Guide to Demonstrating Compliance with noise requirements of ADO, Reference 19
IOA	Institute of Acoustics
WHO GCN	World Health Organisation Guidelines for Community Noise, Reference 6

9   ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

10   REFERENCES

1.   Part O of Schedule 1 to Building Regulations 2010
2.   Progress in adapting to climate change. 2023 Report to Parliament. Climate Change Committee.
3.   Approved Document O, 2021 Edition
4.   https://www.gov.uk/guidance/approved-document-o-overheating-frequently-asked-questions
5.   https://www.futurehomes.org.uk/avoid-overheating
6.   World Health Organisation, Guidelines for Community Noise, 1999
7.   BS 8233: 2014, Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings
8.   ProPG: Planning & Noise, May 2017
9.   Conlan, N; Harvie-Clark, J; Using Planning Conditions to Improve Indoor Environmental Quality (IEQ) of New Residential Developments. Proc IOA Vol. 40. Pt. 1. 2018.
10.   Acoustics, Ventilation, Overheating: Residential Design Guide, IOA & ANC, 2020
11.   Harvie-Clark J, Chilton A, Conlan N, Trew D. Assessing noise with provisions for ventilation and overheating in dwellings. BSERC. 2019
12.   Joint statement regarding ProPG (Professional Practice Guidance: Planning & Noise) and AVO (Acoustics, Ventilation & Overheating) Guide.
13.   Noise policy statement for England, DEFRA,UK
14.   Jones, B. M., Cook, M. J., Fitzgerald, S. D., & Iddon, C. R. (2016). A review of ventilation opening area terminology. Energy and Buildings, 118, 249-258.
15.   Sharpe, P., Jones, B., Wilson, R., Iddon, C., What we think we know about the aerodynamic performance of windows, Energy and Buildings, 2021
16.   Discharge coefficient calculator .gov.uk (free)
17.   Inkling blog Part 1, Part 2
18.   https://www.futurehomes.org.uk/avoid-overheating
19.   Draft Guide to Demonstrating Compliance with the Noise Requirements of Approved Document O.
20.   TM59, Design methodology for the assessment of overheating risk in homes, CIBSE 2017
21.   BS EN ISO 12354-3 Building acoustics - Estimation of acoustic performance… Part 3: Airborne sound.
22.   ISO 16283-3:2016 Acoustics - Field measurement of sound insulation… - Part 3: Façade sound insulation.
23.   Chiara Scrosati, Fabio Scamoni, Michele Depalma, Matteo Ghellere. Façade sound insulation as protection to outdoor noise. Proc ICA, Aachen, 2019.
24.   Lars Sommer Søndergaard, Rune Egedal, Rasmus Stahlfest Holck Skov, Birgit Rasmussen. Applicability of ISO 16283-3 for field measurement of sound insulation of partially open windows. Proc Inter-noise 2022, Glasgow, UK.
25.   Nunes, Z., Wilson, B. and Rickard, M., 2010. An assessment of the acoustic performance of open windows, in line with ventilation requirements for natural ventilation. INTER-NOISE. 2010, Lisbon, Portugal.

26. Locher, B.*et al*. [Differences between Outdoor and Indoor Sound Levels for Open, Tilted, and Closed Windows](). Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2018

27. Ryan, M., Lanchester, M., Pugh, S., [Noise Reduction through Facades with Open Windows](). # 37, Proc ACOUSTICS 2011. Nov 2011 Gold Coast, Australia

28. [ISO 10140-2:2021]() Acoustics - Lab measurement of sound insulation.. Pt 2: airborne sound insulation

29. NANR116 [Open-Closed Window Research Report]()

30. Harvie-Clark, J. [Practical Acoustic Design – the Apex Method](), Proc. IOA Vol. 36. Pt.3 2014,

31. Test report: Laboratory sound insulation of a Velfac 200 window fitted with a WindowMaster window operator closed and at various openings. Report # 219391, 2004, BRE for WindowMaster Controls

32. Petrou, G, *et al*. [What are the Implications of Building Simulation Algorithm Choice on Indoor Overheating Risk Assessment]()? Proc 4th Building Simulation and Optimization Conference 2018

33. Tian, W., *et al*. [A review of uncertainty analysis in building energy assessment](). Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews 93, 285–301. 2018.

34. Strachan, P., K. Svehla, I. Heusler, and M. Kersken (2016, July). [Whole model empirical validation on a full-scale building](). J Building Perf. Simulation

35. Woolf, D. Application of best practice building simulation for performance with compliance. 2019

36. Petrou G, Mavrogianni A, *et al*. [Can the choice of building performance simulation tool significantly alter the level of predicted indoor overheating risk in London flats?]() BSERT. 2019;40(1):30-46

37. Roberts BM, Diamond S, *et al*. [Predictions of summertime overheating: Comparison of dynamic thermal models and measurements in synthetically occupied test houses](). BSERT. 2019;40(4):512-552.

38. Lomas KJ, Li M. [An overheating criterion for bedrooms in temperate climates: Derivation and application](). Building Services Engineering Research and Technology. 2023; 44(5):485-517.

39. [All_models_are_]()wrong… George Box, Wikipedia