



Numerical Study of Wall-Mounted Finite Span Wings

Jesse Lee Coombs

Faculty of Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Sciences
School of Mechanical Engineering
The University of Adelaide

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in engineering.

March 2017

*Supervisors: Associate Professor Anthony C. Zander,
Associate Professor Con J. Doolan,
Dr. Danielle J. Moreau,
Dr. Laura A. Brooks*

Copyright 2012-2017 Jesse Lee Coombs

*Submission date: November 7, 2016
Amendment date: March 31, 2017*

*School of Mechanical Engineering
The University of Adelaide, 5055
South Australia, Australia*

*Typeset by the author using L^AT_EX
Printed in Australia.*

All rights reserved. No part of this report may be used or reproduced in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system without prior written permission of the university, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

Contents

List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xii
Abstract	xiii
Declaration	xiv
Acknowledgements	xv
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Publications	4
2 Literature Review	5
2.1 Overview of Wall-Mounted Finite Span Wing Flow Features	5
2.1.1 Horseshoe Vortex	5
2.1.2 Tip Vortex	6
2.1.3 Corner Vortex and Separation	11
2.1.4 Aspect Ratio and Boundary Layer Effects on Wall-Mounted Finite Span Wing Flow Structure	11
2.1.5 Junction Flows Subject To Pressure Gradients	12
2.2 CFD Modelling of Wall-Mounted Finite Span Wing Flows	12
2.3 Wall-Mounted Finite Span Wing Flow Noise Components	16
2.4 Turbulent Boundary Layer Trailing Edge Noise and Modelling	17
2.4.1 Empirical and Semi-Empirical Methods	17
2.4.2 Prediction via Direct Simulation to the Far Field	18
2.4.3 Hybrid Methods	19
2.4.4 2D RSNM	20
2.5 Tip Noise and Modelling	21
2.6 Leading Edge Noise and Modelling	22
2.7 Research Gaps	22
2.8 Thesis Aims	23
3 Methodologies	24
3.1 Introduction and Justification	24
3.2 Flow Modelling	24
3.2.1 Governing Equations	24
3.2.2 Reynolds Averaged Based Methods	25
3.2.3 Discretisation and Solution	26
3.2.4 Boundary Conditions and Wall Functions	29
3.3 Noise Modelling	30
3.4 BPM Tip Noise	30
3.5 BPM TE Noise	32
3.6 Herr TE Noise Model	33
3.6.1 Model Formulation	33
3.6.2 Implementation Verification	33
3.6.3 Extension of Surface Pressure Spectrum Methods to Account for Span- wise Variation in Geometric and Flow Properties	34
3.6.4 Extension Validation	35
3.7 LE Noise Model Method	36

3.7.1	Theory of Amiet	36
3.7.2	Validation	37
3.8	RSNM Detailed Description, 3D Adaptation, and Implementation	37
3.8.1	2D RSNM Detailed Description	37
3.8.2	Turbulent Velocity Cross-Spectrum of the Original 2D RSNM Model	40
3.8.3	3D RSNM Adaptation	41
3.8.4	Implementation	45
4	Turbulence Model Verification and Validation	47
4.1	Study Aims	47
4.2	Background	47
4.3	Geometry and Boundary Locations	47
4.4	Boundary Conditions	51
4.4.1	Inlet Boundary Conditions	51
4.4.2	Wing and Floor Boundary Conditions	54
4.4.3	Symmetry Plane Boundary Conditions	54
4.4.4	Outlet Boundary Conditions	54
4.4.5	Roof Boundary Conditions	54
4.5	Grid Generation and Independence	54
4.6	Residual Control	55
4.7	Turbulence Models	55
4.8	Results	56
4.8.1	General Results - Pressure	56
4.8.2	General Results - Upstream Separation	57
4.8.3	General Results - Upstream Turbulent Kinetic Energy	57
4.8.4	$k - \epsilon$ Model	58
4.8.5	Discussion of Other Model Results	67
4.8.6	Effect of Symmetry Plane - Non-symmetric Case Comparison	67
4.8.7	Semi-Infinite Wing Height Effect	74
4.8.8	Compute Times	78
4.9	Conclusions and Summary	79
5	2D to 3D Test Cases	80
5.1	Introduction and Background	80
5.2	Details and Methodologies	80
5.3	FP12 Case Grid Independence Study	85
5.4	FP12 Case Validation Against Literature Results	86
5.5	NACA0012 Case Grid Independence Study	88
5.6	DU96 Case Grid Independence Study	88
5.7	DU96 Case Validation Against Literature Results	93
5.8	3D RSNM Results	93
5.9	Conclusions	97
6	University of Adelaide Anechoic Wind Tunnel Case	108
6.1	Introduction	108
6.2	Methodology	108
6.2.1	Experimental Details	108
6.3	Modelling Details	109
6.3.1	Boundary Locations and Conditions	110
6.3.2	Grid Generation	112
6.3.3	Residual Control and Numerical Methods	112

6.4	Results and Analysis	113
6.4.1	Grid Independence Results	113
6.4.2	Flow Visualisation and Structure	113
6.4.3	Tip Flow Topology	123
6.4.4	Pressure Fields	127
6.4.5	Comparison of Simulated and Experimental Velocity Fields	127
6.4.6	3D RSNM TE Specifications and Results	135
6.4.7	Amiet Based LE Noise Model Specifications and Results	135
6.5	Conclusions and Summary	139
7	Virginia Tech Cases	140
7.1	Introduction	140
7.2	Methodology	140
7.2.1	Experimental Details	140
7.3	Modelling Details	141
7.3.1	Inlet Boundary Positions and Conditions	141
7.3.2	Zero Angle of Attack Boundary Conditions	142
7.3.3	Non-Zero Angle of Attack Boundary Conditions	142
7.3.4	Grid Generation	142
7.3.5	Residual Control and Numerical Methods	142
7.4	Results and Analysis	144
7.4.1	Discussion and Analysis of the Moreau et al. (2015) Results	144
7.4.2	Grid Independence Results	145
7.4.3	Vortex Size Based Isolated Tip Noise Model	149
7.4.4	3D RSNM TE Specifications and Results	152
7.4.5	Amiet Based LE Noise Model Specifications and Results	161
7.4.6	Noise Modelling Comparison	164
7.5	Conclusions and Summary	164
8	Summary of Conclusions, and Recommendations for Future Work	167
8.1	Summary of Conclusions	167
8.2	Future Work	168
	References	170
	Appendices	180
A	Turbulence Model Validation and Comparison Results Figures	180
B	Noise Modelling Verification and Validation Results Figures	222
C	Turbulence Models: Formulation and Performance	227
C.1	The Boussinesq Hypothesis	228
C.2	Model Classifications	228
C.3	One Equation Models	229
C.3.1	Spalart-Allmaras	229
C.4	Two Equation Models	229
C.4.1	(Standard) $k-\epsilon$	229
C.4.2	(Standard) $k-\omega$	230
C.4.3	Re-normalisation Group Theory (RNG) $k-\epsilon$	232
C.4.4	Shear-Stress Transport (SST) $k-\omega$	232

C.4.5	Realisable $k-\epsilon$	233
C.5	Stress-Transport Models	235
C.5.1	Launder-Reece-Rodi (LRR)	235
C.5.2	Launder Gibson with Wall-Reflection Terms	235
D	Turbulence Models: Wall Function Details	237
E	Richardson Extrapolation	240

List of Figures

1.1	Schematic overview of a wall-mounted finite span wing flow, including horseshoe vortex, corner and tip vorticies.	3
2.1	Round ended airfoil at non-zero AOA vortex formation process diagram.	8
2.2	Flat-ended airfoil at non-zero AOA vortex formation process diagram.	10
2.3	Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment diagram, adapted from Fleming et al. (1993)	13
3.1	Diagram of arbitrary control volumes (with centroids P and N)	27
3.2	Face area vector decomposition for a non-orthogonal cell	28
3.3	Diagram showing coordinate system, TE flow, and observer location	35
3.4	LE noise model method implementation validation	38
3.5	Cylindrical coordinate system centred at the trailing edge. Adapted from (Albarracin et al., 2012a)	39
3.6	Explanation of original RSNM model breakdown	44
4.1	Computational Domain (adapted from (Paciorri et al., 2005))	49
4.2	Comparison Planes (adapted from (Paciorri et al., 2005))	49
4.3	Surfaces for Boundary Conditions (adapted from (Paciorri et al., 2005))	50
4.4	Functional Representation Curve Fit.	52
4.5	$Y/T = 0.13279$ plane comparison of the very fine mesh Realisable $k-\epsilon$ model solution and experimental wing pressure coefficient	56
4.6	Plot of turbulent kinetic energy maximum amplitude and positional accuracy.	59
4.7	$k - \epsilon$ model very-fine grid flat plate pressure coefficient plot.	61
4.8	$k - \epsilon$ model upwind symmetry plane velocity vector plot compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	62
4.9	$k - \epsilon$ model grid dependence of upstream symmetry plane velocity profiles.	63
4.10	$k - \epsilon$ model plane 05 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	64
4.11	$k - \epsilon$ model plane 10 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	65
4.12	$k - \epsilon$ model turbulent kinetic energy contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	66
4.13	Symmetry effect investigaton flat plate pressure coefficient contour plots.	69
4.14	Symmetry effect investigaton upwind symmetry plane velocity vector plots.	70
4.15	Symmetry effect investigaton plane 05 velocity contour plots	71
4.16	Symmetry effect investigaton plane 10 velocity contour plots.	72
4.17	Symmetry effect investigaton turbulent kinetic energy contour plots.	73
4.18	Height variation investigation upstream symmetry plane velocity vector plots.	75
4.19	Height variation investigation upstream symmetry plane velocity profile plots.	76
4.20	Height variation investigation upstream symmetry plane turbulent kinetic energy contour plots.	77
4.21	Coarsest Grid Solution Speed Comparison	78
5.1	Schematic diagram of flat plate model geometry. Image adapted from Moreau et al. (2011).	81
5.2	Slicing process visualisation	81
5.3	FP12 case mesh topology	82
5.4	FP12 case coarse mesh LE closeup	82
5.5	NACA0012 case mesh topology	83
5.6	NACA0012 case coarse mesh LE closeup diagram	83
5.7	DU96 case mesh topology	84

5.8	DU96 case coarse mesh LE closeup diagram	84
5.9	FP12 case plate surface pressure coefficient	87
5.10	FP12 case comparison of velocity profiles at $\frac{X}{C} = 1.00$ for different mesh solutions with experimental data	89
5.11	FP12 case comparison of fine mesh velocity profile to those of the literature at $\frac{X}{C} = 1.00$	90
5.12	FP12 case comparison of turbulence intensity profiles for different mesh solutions with experimental data at $\frac{X}{C} = 1.00$	90
5.13	FP12 case comparison of fine mesh turbulence intensity profiles to those of the literature at $\frac{X}{C} = 1.00$	91
5.14	NACA0012 case comparison of velocity profiles for different mesh solutions at $\frac{X}{C} = 1$	92
5.15	NACA0012 case comparison of turbulence intensity velocity profiles for different mesh solutions at $\frac{X}{C} = 1$	92
5.16	NACA0012 case comparison of aerofoil surface pressure coefficient for different mesh solutions	94
5.17	DU96 case comparison of aerofoil surface pressure coefficient for different mesh solutions	94
5.18	DU96 case comparison drag coefficient with nearest experimental measurements	95
5.19	DU96 case comparison of simulated near trailing edge velocity profile at $Re_c = 2,165,000$ with experimental measurements at $Re_c = 1,570,000$	96
5.20	DU96 case comparison of near trailing edge turbulence intensity profile at $Re_c = 2,165,000$ with experimental measurements at $Re_c = 1,570,000$	96
5.21	FP12 case baseline RSNM TE noise prediction	98
5.22	NACA0012 case baseline RSNM TE noise prediction	99
5.23	DU96 case baseline RSNM TE noise prediction	100
5.24	FP12 RSNM TE noise prediction with expectation value correction	101
5.25	NACA0012 RSNM TE noise prediction with expectation value correction	102
5.26	DU96 RSNM TE noise prediction with expectation value correction	103
5.27	FP12 RSNM TE noise prediction with expectation value correction and optimised $C_{l_z} = 7$	104
5.28	NACA0012 RSNM TE noise prediction with expectation value correction and optimised $C_{l_z} = 2$	105
5.29	NACA0012 case comparison of optimised 3D RSNM TE, with alternative noise modelling methods	106
6.1	Moreau and Doolan (2013) experimental set-up, adapted from Moreau and Doolan (2013)	109
6.2	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case sample locations for comparison with Moreau and Doolan (2013) experimental results	110
6.3	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case computational domain	111
6.4	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case coarse mesh example	112
6.5	Comparison of midspan pressure coefficient for different mesh solutions	114
6.6	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case flow visualisation of isocontours of Q coloured by flow velocity magnitude	115
6.7	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case wing and flat plate static pressure coefficient visualisation	116
6.8	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case visualisation of U_x in the wing symmetry plane	116
6.9	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case visualisation of U_z in the wing symmetry plane	117

6.10	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case visualisation of U_x in the maximum thickness plane	117
6.11	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case visualisation of U_y in the maximum thickness plane	118
6.12	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case visualisation of U_z in the maximum thickness plane	118
6.13	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case visualisation of U_x in a plane 1mm downstream of the TE	119
6.14	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case visualisation of U_y in a plane 1mm downstream of the TE	120
6.15	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case visualisation of U_z in a plane 1mm downstream of the TE	121
6.16	Visualisation of the magnitude of vorticity in a plane 1mm downstream of the TE	121
6.17	Comparison of University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case fine mesh normalised axial velocity one quarter chord downstream of the TE with experimental results of Giuni and Green (2013) in chord normalised coordinates	122
6.18	Comparison of University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case fine mesh normalised x-plane vorticity one quarter chord downstream of the TE with experimental results of Giuni and Green (2013) in chord normalised coordinates	122
6.19	University of Adelaide anechoic Wind Tunnel Case $x = 0.017$ vorticity magnitude	124
6.20	University of Adelaide anechoic Wind Tunnel Case $x = 0.035$ vorticity magnitude	124
6.21	University of Adelaide anechoic Wind Tunnel Case $x = 0.05$ vorticity magnitude	125
6.22	University of Adelaide Anechoic Wind Tunnel Case $x = 0.07$ vorticity magnitude	125
6.23	Flat ended airfoil at zero AOA vortex formation process diagram a) Vortex development plane definition diagram b-g) Vortex representative planes as labelled	126
6.24	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case wing port side static pressure coefficient visualisation	127
6.25	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case flat plate static pressure coefficient visualisation	128
6.26	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case symmetry plane velocity profile comparison	129
6.27	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case symmetry plane velocity profile comparison showing sample distance dependence	129
6.28	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case symmetry plane turbulence kinetic energy profiles	130
6.29	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case 39mm plane velocity profile comparison	130
6.30	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case 39mm plane velocity sample downstream distance dependence plot	131
6.31	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case 39mm plane turbulence intensity profile comparison	132
6.32	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case 64mm plane velocity profile comparison	132
6.33	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case 64mm plane turbulence intensity profile comparison	133
6.34	69mm plane velocity profile comparison	133
6.35	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case 69mm plane turbulence intensity profile comparison	134

6.36	University of Adelaide Anechoic Wind Tunnel Case 3DRSNM-TE coarse mesh smallest sample region optimisation of C_{l_z} value comparison against BPM prediction	136
6.37	University of Adelaide Anechoic Wind Tunnel Case 3DRSNM-TE mesh and sample region dependence and comparison	137
6.38	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case leading edge noise prediction	138
7.1	Virginia Tech cases computational domain	141
7.2	Virginia Tech cases computational boundaries diagram	143
7.3	Virginia Tech case aspect ratio = 1 coarse mesh visualisation	144
7.4	Moreau et al. (2015) sound map results for aspect ratio 3, $U_{ref} = 60$ m/s, zero AOA wing (adapted from Moreau et al. (2015))	146
7.5	Integrated one-twelfth-octave band total airfoil, as well as isolated trailing edge, leading edge, junction and tip spectra for the wall-mounted airfoil with aspect ratio 3 at $U_{ref} = 60$ m/s and zero AOA (taken from Moreau et al. (2015))	147
7.6	Integration regions a) Airfoil, b) Trailing and leading edges, c) Junction and tip, adapted from Moreau et al. (2015)	148
7.7	Virginia Tech cases trailing edge tip vortex swirl velocity profiles	149
7.8	Isolated tip noise model compared against experimental levels for $AR = 3$, $AOA = 12$ degrees, $U = 60[m/s]$ case	150
7.9	Isolated tip noise model compared against experimental levels for $AR = 2$, $AOA = 12$ degrees, $U = 60[m/s]$ case	150
7.10	Isolated tip noise model compared against experimental levels for $AR = 1$, $AOA = 12$ degrees, $U = 60[m/s]$ case	151
7.11	Isolated tip noise model compared against experimental levels for $AR = 3$, $AOA = 8$ degrees, $U = 40[m/s]$ case	151
7.12	Isolated tip noise model compared against experimental levels for $AR = 3$, $AOA = 12$, $U = 40[m/s]$ case	151
7.13	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, zero angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction variation of C_{l_z} value effect comparison	152
7.14	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, zero angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE coarse mesh and sample region dependence and comparison	153
7.15	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, zero angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE moderate mesh and sample region dependence and comparison	153
7.16	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, zero angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE fine mesh and sample region dependence and comparison	154
7.17	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, 6 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	154
7.18	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, 12 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	154
7.19	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 2, 0 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	155
7.20	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 2, 6 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	155
7.21	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 2, 12 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	155
7.22	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 3, 0 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	156
7.23	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 3, 6 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	156

7.24	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 3, 12 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	156
7.25	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, zero angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction variation of C_{l_z} value effect comparison	157
7.26	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, zero angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE coarse mesh and sample region dependence and comparison	158
7.27	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, zero angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE coarse mesh and sample region dependence and comparison	158
7.28	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, 6 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	158
7.29	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, 12 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	159
7.30	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 2, 0 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	159
7.31	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 2, 6 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	159
7.32	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 2, 12 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	160
7.33	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 3, 0 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	160
7.34	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 3, 6 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	160
7.35	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 3, 12 degree angle of attack case, 3DRSNM-TE resulting noise prediction	161
7.36	Virginia Tech $AR = 1$, $AOA = 0$ case leading edge noise prediction	162
7.37	Virginia Tech $AR = 1$, $AOA = 0$ case experimentally measured noise components and total noise	162
7.38	Virginia Tech $AR = 1$, $AOA = 0$ case leading edge noise prediction	162
7.39	Virginia Tech $AR = 2$, $AOA = 0$ case leading edge noise prediction	163
7.40	Virginia Tech $AR = 2$, $AOA = 0$ case leading edge noise prediction	163
7.41	Virginia Tech cases $AR = 2$, $AOA = 12$, developed noise models compared against those of literature	165
7.42	Virginia Tech cases $AR = 2$, $AOA = 12$, combined developed noise models compared against those of literature	166
A.1	RNG $k - \epsilon$ model very-fine grid flat plate pressure coefficient plot.	181
A.2	RNG $k - \epsilon$ model upwind symmetry plane velocity vector plot compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	182
A.3	RNG $k - \epsilon$ model grid dependence of upstream symmetry plane velocity profiles.	183
A.4	RNG $k - \epsilon$ model plane 05 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	184
A.5	RNG $k - \epsilon$ model plane 10 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	185
A.6	RNG $k - \epsilon$ model turbulent kinetic energy contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	186
A.7	Realisable $k - \epsilon$ model very-fine grid flat plate pressure coefficient plot.	187
A.8	Realisable $k - \epsilon$ model upwind symmetry plane velocity vector plot compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	188
A.9	Realisable $k - \epsilon$ model grid dependence of upstream symmetry plane velocity profiles.	189

A.10	Realisable $k - \epsilon$ model plane 05 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	190
A.11	Realisable $k - \epsilon$ model plane 10 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	191
A.12	Realisable $k - \epsilon$ model turbulent kinetic energy contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	192
A.13	$k - \omega$ model very-fine grid flat plate pressure coefficient plot.	193
A.14	$k - \omega$ model upwind symmetry plane velocity vector plot compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	194
A.15	$k - \omega$ model grid dependence of upstream symmetry plane velocity profiles.	195
A.16	$k - \omega$ model plane 05 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	196
A.17	$k - \omega$ model plane 10 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	197
A.18	$k - \omega$ model turbulent kinetic energy contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	198
A.19	$k - \omega$ SST model very-fine grid flat plate pressure coefficient plot.	199
A.20	$k - \omega$ SST model upwind symmetry plane velocity vector plot compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	200
A.21	$k - \omega$ model grid dependence of upstream symmetry plane velocity profiles.	201
A.22	$k - \omega$ SST model plane 05 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	202
A.23	$k - \omega$ SST model plane 10 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	203
A.24	$k - \omega$ SST model turbulent kinetic energy contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	204
A.25	$k - \omega$ SST model very-fine grid flat plate pressure coefficient plot.	205
A.26	LRR model upwind symmetry plane velocity vector plot compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	206
A.27	LRR model grid dependence of upstream symmetry plane velocity profiles.	207
A.28	LRR model plane 05 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	208
A.29	LRR model plane 10 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	209
A.30	LRR model turbulent kinetic energy contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	210
A.31	Launder Gibson model very-fine grid flat plate pressure coefficient plot.	211
A.32	Launder Gibson model upwind symmetry plane velocity vector plot compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	212
A.33	Launder Gibson model grid dependence of upstream symmetry plane velocity profiles.	213
A.34	Launder Gibson model plane 05 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	214
A.35	Launder Gibson model plane 10 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	215
A.36	Launder Gibson model turbulent kinetic energy contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	216
A.37	Spalart-Allmaras model very-fine grid flat plate pressure coefficient plot.	217
A.38	Spalart-Allmaras model upwind symmetry plane velocity vector plot compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	218

A.39	Spalart-Allmaras model grid dependence of upstream symmetry plane velocity profiles.	219
A.40	Spalart-Allmaras model plane 05 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	220
A.41	Spalart-Allmaras model plane 10 velocity contour plots compared with Devenport and Simpson (1990) experiment.	221
B.1	BPM tip noise implementation verification	223
B.2	BPM TE noise model implementation verification	224
B.3	Equation 3.35 implementation verification	224
B.4	Herr method farfield spectra implementation verification	225
B.5	Herr extension method farfield spectra implementation validation	226

List of Tables

2.1	Tip flow literature operating conditions summary	7
2.2	Tip vortex formation process knowledge	9
2.3	CFD modelling of wing-in-junction flows literature operating conditions summary	14
2.4	Summary of literature case operating conditions and simulated crossflow extent .	19
3.1	Herr TE noise model validation data taken from Herr et al. (2010)	33
3.2	OASPL comparison for extension validation case	36
4.1	Comparison of the ERCOFTAC suggested boundary distances and those implemented in the present study	48
4.2	Inlet Velocity Profile Data	51
4.3	Freestream Turbulent Parameters Estimation	53
4.4	Grid Composition Information	55
4.5	Freestream Turbulent Parameters Residuals	55
4.6	Model pressure coefficient error	57
4.7	Model pressure coefficient error	57
4.8	Comparison of literature turbulent kinetic energy maximum amplitude and location	58
5.1	Test Case Summary	80
5.2	FP12 case boundary layer heights and trailing edge wall shear stresses for different mesh solutions	87
5.3	FP12 case grid convergence and independence results	87
5.4	FP12 case plate surface pressure coefficient extrema	89
5.5	NACA0012 case boundary layer heights for different mesh solutions	89
5.6	NACA0012 case pressure coefficient and force results	89
5.7	NACA0012 case grid convergence and independence study results	91
5.8	DU96 case airfoil surface pressure coefficient extrema	95
5.9	DU96 case forces acting on aerofoil	95
5.10	DU96 case grid convergence and independence results	95
6.1	Test Case Summary	108
6.2	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case mesh y^+ statistics	112
6.3	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case boundary layer heights comparison	113
6.4	University of Adelaide anechoic wind tunnel case forces on the wing	114
6.5	Midspan pressure coefficient extrema and location	114
7.1	Mesh y^+ statistics	144
7.2	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, zero angle of attack case, boundary layer heights comparison	147
7.3	Virginia Tech aspect ratio 1, zero angle of attack case, forces on the wing	149

7.4	Virginia Tech cases trailing edge tip vortex size	149
-----	---	-----

Abstract

The extensive use of hydrofoils and airfoils in applications including domestic and military, air, water, and land vehicles, as well as air-conditioning and wind turbines, means that their design for minimally noisy and maximum aerodynamic performance, is not only an important issue for defence, but one with broader economic, health and environmental ramifications.

Wall-mounted finite span wing flows occur when a boundary layer developing on a surface encounters a hydrofoil or airfoil attached to that surface. Although fundamental to various engineering fields, there is a lack of insight into the underlying physics of these flows. Particularly important is the noise created by the complex flow structures associated with them.

The main objective of this work is to investigate the noise and associated flow structures of wall-mounted finite span wings and to develop noise prediction methods for these flows. A number of recent wall-mounted finite span wing experiments (Moreau et al., 2015; Moreau and Doolan, 2013) involving flat ended finite length wings attached to flat plates are simulated using three-dimensional Reynolds Averaged Navier Stokes (RANS) based methods, which provide greater insight into the complete flow structure than is available from the original experiments. The flow structures are observed and compared with experimental measurements. A flow topology model is developed to describe the observed tip vortex formation process for the zero angle of attack condition. Existing leading and trailing edge noise models that are suitable for predicting the noise from 2D airfoils are extended to be applicable for 3D airfoil applications, allowing spanwise variations in geometric and flow properties to be taken into account. Additionally, an isolated tip noise model is developed based on the size of the tip vortex obtained from RANS flow simulations. The developed noise models have been validated against experimental measurements and have been shown to agree well and thus provide a means for prediction of the noise produced by wall-mounted finite span wing flows. The increased understanding of the wall-mounted finite span wing flow structures and the increased capacity of the developed wall-mounted finite span wing flow noise modelling is expected to have applications in the design of airfoils and hydrofoils with improved aerodynamic and aeroacoustic performance.

Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree. I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works. I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted.

Jesse Coombs

Acknowledgements

Thanks to my family, especially my mother, for all the many forms of support that I have been gifted.

I am indebted to my supervisors, Associate Professor Con J. Doolan, Associate Professor Anthony C. Zander, Dr. Laura A. Brooks, and Dr. Danielle J. Moreau, whose guidance, patience, and kindness, have been invaluable.

I am grateful also to Mr. Cristobal Albarracin Gonzalez, for his assistance, generally, and especially during the 3D-RSNM implementation phase.

My thanks to eResearch SA for use of the supercomputer facilities, as well as Andrew Hill and all the other eResearch SA staff for their instruction and assistance in making use of those facilities.