Detection of sea-breeze events around London using a fuzzy-logic algorithm

Article

Published Version

Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0 (CC-BY)

Open Access

Coceal, O. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0705-6755, Bohnenstengel, S. I. and Kotthaus, S. (2018) Detection of sea-breeze events around London using a fuzzy-logic algorithm. Atmospheric Science Letters, 19 (9). e846. ISSN 1530-261X doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/asl.846 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/77774/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asl.846

Publisher: Wiley for Royal Meteorological Society

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR
Central Archive at the University of Reading
Reading's research outputs online
Detection of sea-breeze events around London using a fuzzy-logic algorithm

Omduth Coceal1 | Sylvia I. Bohnenstengel2 | Simone Kotthaus3,4

1National Centre for Atmospheric Science (NCAS), Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, UK
2UK Met Office, MetOffice@Reading, Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, UK
3Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, UK
4Ecole Polytechnique, Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL), France

Correspondence
Omduth Coceal, Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, PO Box 243, Reading RG6 6BB, UK.
Email: o.coceal@reading.ac.uk

Funding information
National Centre for Atmospheric Science, Grant/Award Number: R8/H12/83/002; Natural Environment Research Council, Grant/Award Number: NE/H00324X/1

We present an algorithm for detecting sea breezes based on fuzzy logic, using changes in variables commonly measured at meteorological stations. The method is applied to 1 year’s worth of UK Met Office data (2012) measured at several stations around London, UK. Results indicate about a dozen potential events over the year, when matched against corresponding detections at a coastal reference site (Gravesend). In some cases the time lags between corresponding events detected at different stations can be used to characterize the average propagation speed of the sea-breeze front. Advantages and disadvantages of the method are discussed.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Sea-breeze fronts can propagate considerable distances inland (Simpson, 1994). Yet the incidence and effects of sea breezes in inland cities such as London, UK, are not well documented. Sea breezes can affect air quality (e.g., Papanastasious and Melas, 2009) and meteorological conditions (Grimmond et al., 2004) over coastal cities. Marine intrusions were even found to have implications for urban areas located further inland; for example, Chemel and Sokhi (2012) suggest they might alter urban heat island patterns for London. Therefore, detection of sea breezes could inform the prediction of local weather and air quality.

Several methods have been proposed for detecting sea breezes from single-station time series measurements of meteorological variables, which have been successfully applied to coastal sites (e.g., Borne et al., 1998; Alpert and Rabinovich-Hadar, 2003; Plant and Keith, 2007). However, the proposed algorithms have often necessitated somewhat ad hoc decisions on threshold values characterizing changes in the relevant variables. These particular choices may not be applicable to stations further inland, where the influence of the sea-breeze passage is likely weakened by drag and terrain effects, especially over a city. Recent studies have exploited advanced measurement capability such as Doppler weather radar (Suresh, 2007) and satellite observations (Lensky and Dayan, 2012), but these may not always be available.

In this paper we employ a detection algorithm based on fuzzy logic that can in principle be applied consistently for inland as well as coastal stations, using only time series as routinely measured at surface weather stations. We then illustrate the application of the method using a year’s worth of data measured at several stations in and around the Greater London area; the results offer some insight into the incidence of sea-breeze events at those locations.
2  |  SITES AND DATA

The data set consists of surface observations at 1-min resolution over a whole year (2012) from UK Met Office surface sites (UK Met Office, 2006, 2018) at four locations around Greater London (St James’ Park, Heathrow, Northolt and Kenley), one “rural” location (Farnborough) and a coastal reference site (Gravesend; Table I and Figure 1). This period has been chosen to coincide with major field campaigns in the ClearfLo (Clean Air for London) project (Bohnenstengel et al., 2015), when extensive measurements of air quality and boundary layer characteristics were made in London. One-minute average data for the following quantities are available: temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, wind direction and gust. Only at St James’ Park the data set is limited to temperature and relative humidity.

Figure 2 shows the wind speed observed at Heathrow on a case study day (July 25, 2012), revealing rapid and generally large turbulent fluctuations at the native 1-min resolution. As the sea-breeze detection is based on changes in the observed quantities (section 3), these small-scale fluctuations need to be removed by performing a running average over an interval larger than the small-scale turbulence but not so large as to smooth out larger-scale variations. Tests with different averaging intervals (not shown) found averaging windows of 20 or 30 min to be most suitable. A running average over an interval of 30 min is used in this study.

| Date           | Gravesend | Kenley | St James Park | Northolt | Heathrow | Farnborough | Total stations |
|----------------|-----------|--------|---------------|----------|----------|-------------|----------------|
| March 15, 2012 | 1543      | 1725   | 1626          | 1657     | 1802     | 1919        | 5              |
|                | 1842      |        |               |          |          |             |                |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             | 1918           |
| March 20, 2012 | 1408      | 1607   | 1647          | 1704     |          |             | 4              |
| March 22, 2012 | 1513      | 1301   | 1623          | 1727     | 1441     | 1646        | 6              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             | 1702           |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             | 1746           |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             | 1801           |
| April 11, 2012 | 1318      | 1304   | 1707          | 1654     |          |             | 4              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             |                |
| May 28, 2012   | 1301      | 1944   | 1841          |          |          |             | 3              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             |                |
| June 19, 2012  | 1539      | 1937   |               |          |          |             | 2              |
| June 28, 2012  | 1425      | 1607   | 1740          | 1703     |          |             | 4              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             | 1724           |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             | 1945           |
| July 25, 2012  | 1411      | 1732   | 1825          | 1843     |          |             | 4              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             |                |
| August 10, 2012| 1503      | 1738   | 1805          | 1911     | 1920     | 1818        | 6              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             |                |
| August 18, 2012| 1315      | 1635   |               |          |          |             | 2              |
| September 7, 2012| 1531    | 1858   | 1644          | 1950     | 1944     |             | 5              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             |                |
| September 8, 2012| 1454   | 1644   | 1736          | 1702     |          |             | 4              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             |                |
| September 13, 2012| 1427  | 1844   | 1414          | 1842     |          |             | 4              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             |                |
| September 15, 2012| 1521  | 1754   | 1753          | 1830     | 1928     |             | 5              |
| September 17, 2012| 1349  | 1705   | 1303          | 1830     | 1659     |             | 5              |
| September 18, 2012| 1527  | 1400   | 1402          | 1751     | 1313     | 1939        | 6              |
|                |           |        |               |          |          |             |                |
| September 25, 2012| 1601  | 1706   |               |          |          |             |                |
METHODOLOGY

The methodology is adapted from a fuzzy-logic approach employed by Huang and Mills (2006a; 2006b) for detecting wind change timing from single station observations. Huang and Mills (2006a) describe their method as objective because it provides automated algorithmic detection, as opposed to human inspection of time series and surface charts which is subjective and time-consuming. Here we present a simpler fuzzy-logic algorithm, supplemented by additional constraints to make the method applicable to the detection of sea breezes. The passage of a sea-breeze front is generally accompanied by a change in wind direction, an increase in wind speed, gustiness and (sometimes) relative humidity and a decrease in temperature (e.g., Plant and Keith, 2007). The basic idea is simple and consists of the following steps: (a) Combine computed rates of change in all or a subset of these quantities (depending on data availability) into a single suitably defined fuzzy function. (b) Detect maxima of this fuzzy function above a certain threshold to reveal the timing of strong correlated changes in these quantities.

A simple fuzzy function $y = f(x)$ is defined which takes a constant value $y_1$ when the independent variable $x$ is below a threshold $x_1$, another constant value $y_2$ when $x$ is above a higher threshold $x_2$, and a value linearly interpolated between $y_1$ and $y_2$ when $x$ is between $x_1$ and $x_2$.

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} y_1, & x \leq x_1 \\ y_1 + \frac{y_2 - y_1}{x_2 - x_1} (x - x_1), & x_1 < x < x_2 \\ y_2, & x \geq x_2 \end{cases}$$

In the following, the variable $x$ will denote the rate of change of one of these five quantities: wind direction, wind speed, gust, relative humidity (optionally) and temperature.

FIGURE 1 Map showing locations of measurement sites.
LHR = Heathrow; MGE = Gravesend; MKA = Kenley; MNH = Northolt; MSF = Farnborough; SJP = St James’ Park

3 | METHODOLOGY

FIGURE 2 Wind speed at Heathrow station on July 25, 2012 at 1-min resolution (stars) and running average (solid line) over (a) 10, (b) 30 and (c) 60 min
The values of $x_1$, $x_2$, $y_1$ and $y_2$ need to be chosen for each quantity and in principle many choices are possible. It is desirable to set these values in such a way that the method is generic and not tailored to site-specific or variable-specific characteristics. With this in mind, the constant values are set to $y_1 = 0$ and $y_2 = 1$ for all quantities, so that values of $f(x)$ are confined to the range $[0, 1]$. The thresholds for the rate of change in quantity $x$ are based on minimum ($x_{\text{min}}$) and maximum ($x_{\text{max}}$) values across all stations over the total time interval considered. For wind direction thresholds are chosen to be $x_1 = x_{\text{min}} + (x_{\text{max}} - x_{\text{min}})/3$, $x_2 = x_{\text{max}} - (x_{\text{max}} - x_{\text{min}})/3$, so that the range of observed wind directions is split into three equal segments, with the lower and upper thresholds being a third above the minimum and a third below the maximum, respectively. For the other meteorological variables (rates of change of wind speed, gust and humidity and the negative rate of change of temperature) $x_1 = 0$, $x_2 = x_{\text{max}}/2$, because only a positive value for these quantities corresponds to a non-zero likelihood of a sea breeze. The precise values of $x_1$ and $x_2$ do not matter. The method works by capturing a large correlated change in the variables through an increase in the value of the fuzzy function; again, the absolute value of the fuzzy variable is not important.

At each time step at 1-min resolution the function $f(x)$ is computed for each quantity after performing a 30-min running average (section 2). The rate of change of each quantity is calculated over a specified time interval, chosen to be 10 min here. The precise choice of the time interval is not crucial because it is only required to detect a large correlated change in the variables and the absolute value of the fuzzy variable is largely immaterial; other time intervals have been tested which revealed this setting not to have a major impact. The values of $f(x)$ for the different variables can then be combined into a single average value, for example, using a weighted mean. Here, equal weights are chosen for each quantity simply because we do not posit any a priori reason to give any variable more weighting than another. The resulting time series of this mean fuzzy function contains a lot of fluctuations; however, simultaneously large rates of change for several quantities result in well-defined “spikes.” To reduce the effect of background fluctuations the time series of the fuzzy function may in turn be smoothed using a moving average (this is not performed here). As these spikes mark clear outliers, they can be isolated from background fluctuations using a simple threshold. Here, a value of 0.7 was found appropriate. This value may need to be adjusted, depending on the sites considered and the local meteorology, to optimize the detection efficiency. As the fuzzy function often exceeds the set threshold for several consecutive time intervals, the maximum of the fuzzy function was used to determine the time of frontal passage. If more than one spike exceeded the threshold within an hour, then the detections were taken to correspond to a single event (given that the data was averaged over 30 min) and only the first peak of the fuzzy function was used.

Optional additional criteria can also be applied to remove false positives not associated with sea breezes, for example, if the wind direction is outside a certain sector, or if the events occur outside of a certain time interval (e.g., at night), or if it was raining at the given site at the given time. In the analysis reported in the next section, days during which widespread rain was recorded were excluded. An additional constraint was to restrict the search to between the hours of 1200 and 2000 UTC, because no sea breezes are expected in London outside of that time interval.

## 4 Results

The algorithm was applied to observations from all sites around Greater London (section 2) between March and October 2012 inclusive. To exclude potential false positives due to local variability, only days on which a detection took place at Gravesend before 1600 were selected. The reasoning for this constraint is that if a sea breeze reaches the inland stations (even from the south) then it must have occurred all around the coast. Hence, one should be detected at Gravesend too. After applying this constraint, events were detected during around a dozen days for Greater London in 2012, corresponding to 16 detected in Gravesend. In 30% of cases a detection was made at one or more of the other stations but not at Gravesend. Only six events were detected at Farnborough, with five corresponding to a southerly wind direction and one (on March 22, 2012) corresponding to a westerly.

The times corresponding to the maximum of the fuzzy function for the events detected at each station are shown in Table 1. It should be noted that the method worked well even for St James’ Park, where only two meteorological variables (temperature and relative humidity) were available to compute the fuzzy function—a similar number of days resulted as for the other London stations. The dates on which events were detected did not always coincide across all stations. On 3 days there were detections at fewer than three stations. Discarding those gives a total of 13 days. There were several cases where events were detected twice or three times at the same station on the same day. This could be due to a sea-breeze front propagating west, followed by a later one propagating north.

If the detections correspond to the passage of a sea-breeze front, this should be reflected in their time-ordering. In general, one would expect a detection to be made at Gravesend well before the other stations. Kenley should be next, followed by either St James’ Park or Heathrow, depending on the direction of the sea-breeze front. One would also expect times of detections at Heathrow and Northolt to be fairly close to each other. The rural station at Farnborough should be last for an easterly front propagation;
indeed, it might not register a detection at all given that it is so far inland and downwind of London. On the other hand, we might expect a detection at Farnborough around the same time as at Kenley for a southerly front propagation. Several of the candidate days broadly satisfy these expectations. The detection algorithm therefore gives a plausible shortlist of possible sea breeze candidates, which can then be investigated in more detail on a case-by-case basis.

As an example, on July 25, 2012 detections occur at Kenley, Northolt and Heathrow in an order consistent with the easterly propagation of a sea-breeze front. The fuzzy function is illustrated for that day, together with time series of five variables observed at Heathrow (Figure 3). The fuzzy function exceeds the threshold of 0.7 between approximately 1830–1900 (Figure 3f) when the temperature is decreasing (Figure 3a) while relative humidity (Figure 3b), wind speed (Figure 3c) and gustiness (Figure 3e) show a marked increase. In this case, the change in wind direction is small, of the order of a few degrees (Figure 3d); a larger increase occurs about half-an-hour later.

Based on an easterly wind direction (as recorded at Gravesend) the average speed of propagation from Gravesend to Heathrow is found to be approximately 3.4 m/s, which is consistent with textbook values for the speed of sea-breeze fronts (Simpson, 1994). Inspection of hourly spatial plots produced in simulations using the UK Met Office Unified Model over the UK at 1.5 km resolution reveal temperature and wind vector patterns consistent with a sea breeze around the southeastern coast of England (not shown).

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

An algorithm for the detection of sea-breeze fronts based on commonly available meteorological surface observations is proposed. Combining the temporal rate of change of multiple variables such as air temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, wind direction and gustiness, a fuzzy function is computed that enables the identification of front passage based on one single threshold. The simplicity of the algorithm allows its applicability to data collected at different study areas.

The proposed method was applied to detect sea-breeze events in and around Greater London, UK, in 2012 based on six measurement stations. About a dozen potential sea breeze dates were identified at the inland sites, corresponding to 16 detected at a coastal reference site (Gravesend). Automated, rapid detection of sea-breeze events is considered beneficial for the analysis of air quality measurements in urban areas located at or close to coastlines such as

![FIGURE 3](image-url) (a) Air temperature, (b) relative humidity, (c) wind speed, (d) wind direction and (e) gustiness observed at Heathrow on July 25, 2012; (f) fuzzy function combining rates of change of all meteorological variables. Time of peak fuzzy function exceeding a threshold of 0.7 marked by horizontal line in (f) is indicated in (a–e) by vertical dashed lines.
the case study area of London used here. Knowing about these fronts passing over the city and the associated change in air mass helps to interpret both observations and modelling fields and might assist the selection of case studies for more detailed investigations (Bohnenstengel et al., 2015).

The main advantages of the fuzzy-logic method are: its simplicity; the use of readily available time series data; it does not rely on prescribed empirical thresholds for different variables; it can be applied uniformly at multiple stations, even when there are different availabilities of data. Disadvantages include: additional constraints need to be imposed to apply the method to the detection of sea breezes; there is some ambiguity in how thresholds are fixed; this includes the thresholding of the fuzzy variable upon which a detection depends.

This method could be adapted to detect wind changes due to other types of meteorological phenomena too. Hence, it might prove useful for example in wind energy applications, where improved knowledge of causes of power production variability helps to increase confidence in potentially costly anticipatory decisions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
ClearfLo was funded by NERC under Grant NE/H00324X/1 (lead proposal) and was coordinated by the National Centre for Atmospheric Science (NCAS). O.C. is funded by NCAS under Grant No. R8/H12/83/002. Thanks to the BADC and the Met Office for provision of the meteorological data. The authors acknowledge useful discussions with a number of colleagues at the University of Reading.

ORCID
Omduth Coceal https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0705-6755

REFERENCES
Alpert, P. and Rabinovich-Hadar, M. (2003) Pre- and post-sunrise frontal lines—a meso-γ-scale analysis over South Israel. Journal of Atmospheric Science, 60, 2994–3008.

Bohnenstengel, S.I., Belcher, S.E., Aiken, A., Allan, J.D., Allen, G., Bacak, A., Bannan, T.J., Barlow, J.F., Beddows, D.C.S., Bloss, W.J., Booth, A.M., Chemel, C., Coceal, O., di Marco, C.F., Dubey, M.K., Faloon, K.H., Fleming, Z.L., Furger, M., Gietl, J.K., Graves, R.R., Green, D.C., Grimmond, C.S.B., Halios, C.H., Hamilton, J.F., Harrison, R.M., Heal, M.R., Heard, D.E., Helfter, C., Herndon, S.C., Holmes, R.E., Hopkins, J.R., Jones, A.M., Kelly, F.J., Kotthaus, S., Langford, B., Lee, J.D., Leigh, R.J., Lewis, A.C., Lidster, R.T., Lopez-Hilfiker, F.D., McQuaid, J.B., Mohr, C., Monks, P.S., Nemitz, E., Ng, N.L., Percival, C.J., Prévôt, A.S.H., Ricketts, H. M.A., Sokhi, R., Stone, D., Thornton, J.A., Treper, A.H., Valach, A.C., Visser, S., Whalley, L.K., Williams, L.R., Xu, L., Young, D.E. and Zotter, P. (2015) Meteorology, air quality, and health in London: the ClearfLo project. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 96, 779–804.

Borne, K., Chen, D. and Nunez, M. (1998) A method for finding sea breeze days under stable conditions and its application to the Swedish west coast. International Journal of Climatology, 18, 901–914.

Chemel, C. and Sokhi, R.S. (2012) Response of London’s urban heat island to a marine air intrusion in an easterly wind regime. Boundary-Layer Meteorology, 144, 65–81.

Grimmond, C.S.B., Salmon, J.A., Oke, T.R., Offerle, B. and Lemonsu, A. (2004) Flux and turbulence measurements at a dense urban site in Marseille: heat, mass (water, carbon dioxide) and momentum. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 109, 101–119.

Huang, X. and Mills, G.A. (2006a) Objective identification of wind change timing from single station observations. Part 1: methodology and comparison with subjective wind change timings. Australian Meteorological Magazine, 55, 261–274.

Huang, X. and Mills, G.A. (2006b) Objective identification of wind change timing from single station observations. Part 2: towards the concept of a wind change climatology. Australian Meteorological Magazine, 55, 275–288.

Lensky, I.M. and Dayan, U. (2012) Continuous detection and characterization of the sea breeze in clear sky conditions using Meteosat second generation. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 12, 6505–6513.

Papanastasious, D.K. and Melas, D. (2009) Climatology and impact on air quality of sea breeze in an urban coastal environment. International Journal of Climatology, 29, 305–313.

Plant, R.S. and Keith, G.J. (2007) Occurrence of Kelvin-Helmholtz billows in sea-breeze circulations. Boundary-Layer Meteorology, 122, 1–15.

Simpson, J.E. (1994) Sea Breeze and Local Winds. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 234 pp.

Suresh, R. (2007) Observation of sea breeze front and its induced convection over Chennai in southern peninsular India using Doppler weather radar. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 164, 1511–1525.

UK Met Office. (2006, 2018) MIDAS Land Surface Stations data (1853-current). British Atmospheric Data Centre. Available at: http://badc.nerc.ac.uk/data/ukmo-midas.

How to cite this article: Coceal O, Bohnenstengel SI, Kotthaus S. Detection of sea-breeze events around London using a fuzzy-logic algorithm. Atmos Sci Lett. 2018;19:e846. https://doi.org/10.1002/asl.846