in which the different combinations of solar radiation and air speed result in PET values which fall within a 90% acceptability. This was done so, in order to produce graphs which would have a double entry, solar radiation and air speed, and therefore, understanding the comfort limits offered by a space. The resulting comfort graphs are here shown for all nine time periods in Figure 5.

The graph corresponding to the morning time frame of the warm period (upper right) will be used as an example. Supossing a scenario which presents a global solar radiation of 400W and 3 m/s, it may be distinguished that 10-20% of all of these hours, the hypothetical person will be with a PET value within the 90% acceptability band. This does not mean that these combinations would be uncomfortable 80-90% of the time, but it does mean that overall, a place which offers more wind protection will be more desirable at this moment. Additionally, it can be seen that the cool period presents the widest ranges of comfort. This could be misleading however, as this is mainly due to the effect of higher clothing which has a stronger effect under colder conditions rather than a reliance on the external conditions. Finally, the more slanted the lines are, the higher the effect of solar radiation in the given period and vice versa. Therefore, it may be concluded that thermally speaking, clothing takes precedence over the effects of solar radiation and air velocities during the cool period, yet wind protection is more highly desirable.

CONCLUSION

With the use of the comfort graphs presented one may predict through simulation which outdoor spaces would tend to be more comfortable than others for sedentary activities, within the Buenos Aires climatic context. It is clear that there is no such thing as an optimal combination for any period. Therefore, it is argued that the approach to achieving outdoor comfort should not focus on providing one ideal sensation, but rather offer several within close walking distances. The correct approach would therefore consist of providing a number of varieties with the appropriate combinations at the times when the outdoors has the highest potential to attract people, allowing the users of these spaces to find their own comfort.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the Architectural Association who has given me the bursary in order to pursue my M.Arch. studies at the Sustainable Environmental Design course (SED). I met the most open minded teachers and companions there, in particular the director, and my tutor Simos Yannas.

REFERENCES

De Dear, R., Bragger, G., & Cooper, D. (1997). Developing an Addaptive Model of Thermal Comfort. Sydney: Macquire Research.

Fanger, P. O. (1970). Thermal Comfort. Copenhagen: Danish Technical Press.

Hope, P. (1998). The Physiological Equivalent Temperature - A Universal Index for the Biometereological assessment of the Thermal Environment. Munchen: Ludwig - Maximilians University.

Katschner, L., Steemers, K., & Yannas, S. (2000). Urban Climate Maps as Tools for Calculations of Thermal Conditions in Outdoor Spaces. London: James and James.

Littlefair, P. j. (2000). Environmental Site Layout Planning: Solar Access, microclimate and passive cooling in Urban areas. London: Building Research Establishment.

Matzarakis, A., & Mayer, H. (1996). Another Kind of Environmental Stress: Thermal Stress. Dessau-Roßlau: WHO - Collaborating centre for air quality management and air pollution control.

Matzarakis, A., & Rutz, F. (2006). RayMan: A tool for Research and Education in Applied Climatology. Conference on Meteorology-Climatology-Atmospheric Physics. Athens.

Nichol, F., & Humphreys, M. (2002). Adaptive thermal comfort and sustainable thermal standards for buildings. Energy and Buildings.

Nikolopoulou, M. (2002). Designing Open Spaces in the Urban Environment: A Bioclimatic Approach. Canterbury: Centre for Renewable Energy Sourcer.

Szokolay, S. (2008). Introduction to Architectural Science: The Basis of Sustainable Design. Oxford: Elsevier.