Estimation of missing building height in OpenStreetMap data: a French case study using GeoClimate 0.0.1

Jérémy Bernard[1,3], Erwan Bocher[2], Elisabeth Le Saux Wiederhold[3], François Leconte[4], and Valéry Masson[5]

[1]University of Gothenburg, Department of Earth Sciences, Sweden
[2]CNRS, Lab-STICC, UMR 6285, Vannes, France
[3]Université Bretagne Sud, Lab-STICC, UMR 6285, Vannes, France
[4]Université de Lorraine, INRAE, LERMaB, F88000, Epinal, France
[5]Météo-France and CNRS, CNRM, UMR3589, Toulouse 31057, France

Correspondence: Jérémy Bernard (jeremy.bernard@zaclys.net)

Abstract. Information describing the elements of urban landscape is a required input data to study numerous physical processes (e.g climate, noise, air pollution). However, the accessibility and quality of urban data is heterogeneous across the world. As an example, a major open-source geographical data project (OpenStreetMap) demonstrates incomplete data regarding key urban properties such as building height. The present study implements and evaluates a statistical approach which models the missing values of building height in OpenStreetMap. A Random Forest method is applied to estimate building height based on building's closest environment. 62 geographical indicators are calculated with the GeoClimate tool and used as independent variables. A training data set of 14 French communes is selected, and the reference building height is provided by the BDTopo IGN. An optimized Random Forest algorithm is proposed, and outputs are compared with an evaluation dataset. At building scale for all cities, at least 50% of the buildings have their height estimated with an error being less than 4 m (the city median building height ranges from 4.5 m to 18 m). Two communes (Paris and Meudon) demonstrate building height results out of the main trend due to their specific urban fabric. Putting aside these two communes and when building height is averaged at regular grid scale (100m × 100m), the median absolute error is 1.6 m and at least 75% of the cells of any city have an error lower than 3.2 m. This level of magnitude is quite reasonable when compared to the accuracy of the reference data (at least 50% of the buildings have an height uncertainty equal to 5 m). This work offers insights about the estimation of missing urban data using statistical method and contributes to the use of open-source data set based on open-source software. The software used to produce the data is freely available at https://zenodo.org/record/6372337 and the data set can be freely accessed at https://zenodo.org/record/6855063.

1 Introduction

The topography - defined as the spatial distribution of natural and artificial land use features - has a significant influence over the microclimate. This is clearly visible in urban areas where the great heterogeneity of forms, materials and land uses, induces a high variability of temperature, wind speed and humidity (Oke, 2002). Thus an in-depth knowledge about the topography of

a location would lead to understand better and to model more accurately its climate but also other physical processes such as noise propagation and air pollution (Tang and Wang, 2007; Bocher et al., 2019).

There is currently no standard geographical data to study the urban climate worldwide. However, urban data tend to increase both under closed licence and open-source. A key open-source data approach is the OpenStreetMap (OSM) [1] project. Data from the latter have several features: they are expected to be available worldwide and the most important objects needed for urban climate studies (building footprints, isolated tree locations, water, vegetation and impervious patches) are available, well located and described using a great diversity of tags (Mocnik et al., 2017). Moreover, OSM has a free tagging system that allows users to improve the current tags (key, value) with their own information (an OSM user can describe a building object with the tags such as the following: "building"= "house", "height"="10", "building:levels":"2").

However, information concerning ~~the vertical dimension is rarely available~~ building height is not available worldwide neither in OSM nor any other database (Masson et al., 2020). Lao et al. (2018) reported that less than 3% of the buildings globally have an height value and less than 4% have a number of levels value. For the city of Paris (where this information is known as quite well informed), the values are only 0.1% and 51.2%, respectively. This is a major shortcoming since the urban climate is often characterized by spatial indicators based on the third dimension:

- the Sky View Factor (SVF), which is calculated according to terrain level variations, building and tree locations and heights, is related to effective albedo (Bernabé et al., 2015), strongly correlated to temperature (Lindberg, 2007) and wind speed (Johansson et al., 2016),

- the building height variability within an area affects the vertical and horizontal wind speed (Hanna and Britter, 2010),

- the roughness length of an area, often calculated using facade density, is used to estimate the urban canopy wind speed vertical profile (Hanna and Britter, 2010).

The objective of this study is to develop a method to estimate the height of a building from its topographical context using only data available in OSM. Modelling building footprints and their height value have been largely covered by remote sensing. It can cover large areas at once quite efficiently and the resulting data sets can be updated quite easily with a repetitive coverage. Different techniques for building height extraction have been developed, based on photogrammetric processing (Fradkin et al., 1999; Zeng et al., 2014), analysis of point clouds from airborne light detection and ranging (Sohn et al., 2008; Shan and Toth, 2018), shadow detection (Song et al., 2013; Shao et al., 2011) and more recently deep learning approach (Cao and Huang, 2021).

In the mean time, the recent and global movement on open data, specifically for vector topographic databases such as OSM, offers new opportunities to estimate the building height. The geography of a territory, the pattern of the topographic elements are criteria that can be used as a proxy to identify the urban forms and therefore the distribution of the building heights. ~~However, the literature concerning such method is scarce: at our knowledge, only~~ Biljecki et al. (2017) have used building footprints and their corresponding attributes to derived the building height for the city of Rotterdam, Netherlands.

---

[1] www.openstreetmap.org

They have tested several random forest models using as independent variables building properties characterizing its geometry footprint (size, shape and number of neighbors), other attributes (use, age and number of levels), and informations concerning the inhabitants (the number and their level of income). Milojevic-Dupont et al. (2020) have proposed a random forest approach to estimate building height using 152 features. These independent variables are related to buildings (e.g. footprint geometry), streets (e.g. closest street, closest intersection), street-based blocks (e.g. number of blocks in a given radius), and city (e.g. total city area). For the base case, the training dataset includes the building heights of the Netherlands, the region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia in Italy and five French urban areas, and the validation dataset includes the building heights of the state of Brandenburg in Germany.

A major limitation of these studies are the obstacles of reproducibility for experts and practitioners. Indeed, the algorithms are not fully available. Moreover, input dataset requires many preprocessing steps, since the format and the access differ between city models (e.g. French 3D city models in Milojevic-Dupont et al., 2020). The method presented in the next sections ~~use the same type of approach but using only~~ uses random forest approach and can be easily reproduced using the GeoClimate software without any preprocessing step since it is based exclusively on OSM data. ~~However,~~ The main spatial indicators used by the urban climate communities are also calculated using reference and estimated building heights. Compared to each other, they give to urban climate researchers a good level of magnitude of the impact of the estimated height on these indicators. OSM data do not contain as much detailed information about buildings as Biljecki et al. (2017) had (number of levels, age, number of inhabitants) but other informations describing the environment of the buildings will be used (roads, vegetation, rail, etc.).

In order to make OSM data available to urban climate researchers, the GeoClimate tool has been developed (Bocher et al., 2021b, a). It is an easy way (**i**) to download most of the information needed for urban climate studies, (**ii**) to estimate building height from the topographical context, (**iii**) to calculate spatial indicators (such as SVF, building height variability or roughness length) useful as input for parametric climate models. This paper focuses on the second item, namely how to estimate building height in OSM when the information is missing. First, the data and the methodology used to estimate the building height is presented (Sect. 2) and second the accuracy of these estimations is analysed (Sect. 3).

2   Data and Method

This study presents a method to estimate values of building height when the information is missing in OSM. The height of a building is determined according to a regression based statistical model (e.g. Random Forest model) using a set of spatial indicators as independent variables, including the building's shape, the building's relation to its neighbours and the organization and morphology of the building's environment. The true building height values come from the BDTopo V2.2 (BDT) provided by the French National Geographic Institute (IGN). These values are defined as reference height. Two data sets have been considered for this study, namely a training data set to build the Random Forest algorithm and a validation data set to compare the outputs of the optimized Random Forest algorithm with reference heights. The overall methodology is illustrated in Figure 1 and consists in the following steps:

1. Building characterization: each building and its environment (limited to the Topographical Spatial Units (TSU) it belongs to - defined section 2.2.1) are characterized by spatial indicators (building area, number of buildings neighbors, vegetation fraction, etc.). These indicators are the independent variables of the statistical model.

90

2. Building height attribution: the reference building heights (BDT building heights) are attributed to each OSM building according to their footprints. The resulting height in the OSM dataset is the dependent variable of the statistical model.

3. Statistical analysis: the Random Forest model is built based on the training data set. In this step, parameters that maximise the performance of the Random Forest model are identified.

4. Performance evaluation: outputs of the optimized Random Forest model are evaluated against the reference heights of

95

the validation data set.

Each step is described further in Sect. 2.2.

Figure 1. Overall methodology - the use of dashed arrows means that only the training data set is used

2.1 Study area

Building organization and height may differ a lot throughout the world, limiting the ability to model the height of a building based on the characteristics of its environment. Thus, although the method can be used to estimate the height of any building

100

in the world, the application area of this preliminary work is limited to the French territory. The training and evaluation areas are selected to cover:

– all types of ~~commune~~ communes (from small villages to large conurbations). ~~Thus the dataset contains communes belonging to~~

– a large part of France (Figure 2), increasing the probability to have cultural / historical differences inducing urbanistic

105

heterogeneities,

- the main geographical constraints for construction (nearby mountains - Annecy, La Thuile, Corbonod - and nearby sea - La Rochelle).

To fullfill the first need, the communes have been chosen to cover each of the four French commune types defined by the French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE, 2020): main urban area, secondary urban area, peripheral urban area, rural area. According to the French 2020 census data, the types are defined based on the following communes characteristics: number of inhabitants, density of population, number of employees, population flow between households and workplaces. They are used to define the urban attraction cluster. The definitions of each type is given in Table 1.

Commune type	Definition
Main urban area	Commune centre of the urban attraction cluster
Secondary urban area	Other commune of the urban attraction cluster
Peripheral urban area	Commune in the attraction area of the urban cluster
Rural area	Commune outside from any urban attraction area

Table 1. The four commune types defined by INSEE (2020)

The training and the evaluation data sets contain respectively 14 and 8 communes. The location of each commune is shown Figure 2 while further information concerning each territory is given Table 2 and Table 3 (respectively for training and evaluation data sets).

Figure 2. Location of the 22 communes used as training or evaluation data. ©OpenStreetMap contributors 2021. Distributed under the Open Data Commons Open Database License (ODbL) v1.0.

Commune type	Commune name	Inhabitants (2017)	Number of buildings*	INSEE code
Main urban area	Paris	2187526	15964	75056
	(6th, 11th and 18th districts)	(40525, 145903, 193665)		(75106, 75111,
	Toulouse	479553	103368	31555
	Nantes	309346	57550	44109
	Annecy	126924	21153	74010
	Avignon	91921	29113	84007
	La Rochelle	75735	31194	17300
Main peripheral urban area	Nanterre	95105	10851	92050
	Meudon	45352	5430	92048
	Blagnac	24517	9286	31069
Secondary peripheral urban area	La Haie Fouassiere	4659	2323	44070
	Gratentour	4158	2938	31230
	Staffelfelden	3959	2254	68321
	Bourgneuf	1275	782	17059
	Lathuile	1016	732	74147

(*) only building having an height value higher than 3 m in the BDT (cf Sect. 2.2.2) have been conserved for this evaluation
Table 2. Information and statistics about the training data set

~~Urban class~~ Commune type	Commune name	Inhabitant (2017)	Number of buildings*	INSEE code
Main urban area	Rennes	216815	30527	35238
	Dijon	156920	23044	21231
Main peripheral urban area	Charnay-lès-Macon	7376	3574	71105
	Saint-Nicolas de Redon	3179	2515	44185
Secondary peripheral urban area	Allaire	3854	2744	56001
	Pont-de-Veyle	1625	729	1306
Rural area	Corbonod	1264	1115	1118
	Saint-Ganton	424	469	35268

(*) only building having an height value higher than 3 m in the BDT (cf Sect. 2.2.2) have been conserved for this evaluation
Table 3. Information and statistics about the validation data set

Figure 3. Example of Topographical Spatial Unit calculation

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 Building characterization

Data from OSM is used to characterize the building and its environment: building footprint, vegetation footprint and type, water footprint, impervious footprint, rail and road footprint. The free and open-source GeoClimate software (Bocher et al., 2021b, a) is used to compute the spatial indicators at three different scales:

120

- building scale,

- block scale: it is defined as the aggregation of all buildings touching each other,

- Topographical Spatial Unit (TSU) scale: it is defined according to roads and rails central lines, commune boundaries, water and vegetation boundaries when their area is respectively higher than 2500 and 10000 m^2 (Figure 3).

125   Each building is described by a total of 62 spatial indicators (note that all characteristics are calculated only in two dimensions since most OSM data do not have height information). Four types of indicators are used (cf. Table 4) and the list of all indicators is given in Annex A. Indicators values calculated at block and TSU scales are then attributed to each building (a building within a given block or TSU embeds the indicator values of the block and the TSU it belongs to).

Indicators type	Scale of application			Examples of indicators
	building	block	TSU	
Type and use	x			building type, building use
Form and size	x	x	x	area, form factor, fraction of courtyard, etc.
Spatial relations	x			minimum distance to an other building, fraction of wall shared with other buildings, minimum distance to road, etc.
Planar density			x	building fraction, vegetation fraction, etc.
Aggregated statistics from lower scale		x	x	mean building area, standard deviation building form factor, etc.

Table 4. Types of spatial indicators used to define the main characteristics of each unit scale

2.2.2 Reference building heights attribution

In order to train and evaluate the statistical model, a reference height used as true value shoud be assigned to each OSM buildings. Most of the OSM buildings do not have any information concerning their height. The few buildings with height information could have been considered as training and evaluation data set, however these buildings are sparse and not representative of common buildings (since most of them are filled by OSM users because they are well-known buildings with specificities). Therefore, the training and evaluation data set are created only with OSM buildings having no height. The reference height is set using the BDT data. However, a single building in OSM may match with several buildings in the BDT (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Example of overlap between OSM and BDT buildings

Thus, the height of an OSM building used as reference ($H_{osm,true}$) is calculated from the height of all intersected BDT buildings according to Eq. (1). This equation is applied for both the training and the validation data sets.

$$H_{osm,true} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i \cdot H_{BDT_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i} \tag{1}$$

with A_i the area of the intersection between an OSM building and a BDT building i, and H_{BDT_i} the height of the BDT building i intersecting the OSM building.

In the example presented in Figure 4, if BDT building 1 is much taller than the others (BDT building 2 and 3), this information is lost (smoothed by the averaging) and could then lead to a bias in the learning process. To keep a track of this potential bias, a simple index is proposed to characterize the proportion of intersection between a BDT building and an OSM building. This index, called uniqueness value (UV), is defined in Eq. (2):

$$UV = \frac{max_{i \in 1..n} A_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i} \tag{2}$$

The uniqueness value considers only the BDT building that demonstrates the largest intersection area with a given OSM building. The higher the UV, the more unique the BDT building intersecting the OSM building. UV is not impacted by the fraction of OSM building shared with other BDT buildings. If only one BDT building overlaps only a small fraction of an OSM building, the uniqueness value will be 1.

2.2.3 Design and optimization of the Random Forest statistical model

For the statistical analysis, the OSM building height (reference height $H_{osm,true}$) is defined as the dependent variable while spatial indicators are defined as independent variables. Only the training data set (cf. Table 2) is used for this step. To obtain an optimal model, the methodology illustrated in Figure 5 is applied.

Figure 5. Method to train and optimize the Random Forest model. Only the training data set is used at this step.

The Random Forest (RF) approach is chosen for several reasons: (**i**) it is simple to implement, (**ii**) it deals with quantitative and qualitative variables and (**iii**) it is appropriate when using large number of variables (Hastie et al., 2001). In order to limit overfitting and high correlation between trees, all combinations of the following RF regressor parameters are investigated:

- number of trees: 100, 350, 500, 650 (note that preliminary analysis showed lower accuracy when the number of trees was lower than 100 and no significant improvement when greater than 650),

- minimum size node (minimum fraction of sample used to create a new node): 0.0001, 0.001, 0.005, 0.01% (the whole sample size includes 345418 individuals - note that preliminary analysis showed decreasing performance over 0.01 %),

- maximum variables per tree (maximum fraction of variables used in a tree): 20, 35, 50% (of a total of 62 variables - note that preliminary analysis showed decreasing performance when the fraction was lower than 20% and no significant improvement over 40%),

- maximum leaf nodes (maximum number of leaves in a tree): 300, 500, 800, 1100 (note that preliminary analysis showed no significant improvement over 1100 while increasing the complexity and thus potentially the overfitting).

For a default combination of 500 trees, 0.001% of minimum size node and 30% of maximum variables per tree, the effect of UV on the accuracy is studied, keeping only buildings having a UV above 30, 70, 90 and 95%.

70% of the training data is randomly drawn to construct the RF. The accuracy is calculated using the remaining 30% of the data. This process is performed ten times for each combination C_i and uniqueness value UVi. The scikit-learn Python algorithm is used for this investigation.

The optimized combination C_{opt} and uniqueness value UV_{opt} leading to the lowest Mean Absolute Error (MAE) are used to construct the final RF model used in Geoclimate. For this purpose, the entire training dataset is used as input of the Smile library algorithm (since Geoclimate is Java-based).

2.2.4 Performance evaluation

The optimized RF model obtained at the previous step is run over the 8 communes of the validation data set to calculate the missing height values of the OSM buildings. For each building, the heights estimated with the optimized RF model ($\hat{H}_{OSM,model}$) are then compared to the reference height ($H_{OSM,true}$). The model error Err_{model} is defined for heights estimated by the Random Forest model:

$$Err_{model} = \hat{H}_{OSM,model} - H_{OSM,true} \tag{3}$$

The building height values filled by the OSM users ($\hat{H}_{OSM,user}$) are also compared to the reference height ~~(actually if the user fills~~. If the user filled only the number of storey ~~a simple rule is used to calculate~~ the building height ~~). The model error Err_{model} and the~~ is simply calculated multiplying the storey number by 3 m. Even thought the storey height may vary quite a

lot between construction age and building type (see (Biljecki et al., 2017) - Figure 5), 3 m seems a reasonable value according
to the one observed in the literature (ranging from 2.8 and 3.5 m – see (Biljecki et al., 2017) section 2.2.1). The ~~users error~~
Err_{user} ~~are defined respectively for heights estimated by the Random Forest model (Eq. (3)) and heights estimated by the~~ is
defined for heights filled by the users (Eq. (4))~~:~~

$$Err_{model} = \hat{H}_{OSM,model} - H_{OSM,true}$$

$$Err_{user} = \hat{H}_{OSM,user} - H_{OSM,true} \tag{4}$$

In parametric urban climate models, parameters such as building height are aggregated within each square cell of a regular
grid. Therefore, four indicators are calculated for a grid of 100 m width square: the mean and standard deviation building
height, the roughness length (as defined by Hanna and Britter (2010)) and the SVF (as defined in Bernard et al. (2018)).

3 Results and discussions

The data set produced by the methodology described in section 2.2 can be freely downloaded at https://zenodo.org/record/6855063
(**?**). In this section, cells having no building having their height estimated are not considered for the statistic calculations.

3.1 Optimized configuration of Random Forest characteristics

Very little accuracy difference is observed between all combinations described in Sect. 2.2.3. For all studied configurations, the
median RMSE ranges between 2.05 m and 2.2 m. The minimum size node and the number of trees (when greater than 100) have
the least significant impact on the accuracy. The highest accuracy is reached when the maximum variables per tree is 50% and
the maximum leaf nodes is 1100. Thus, the RF scenario chosen for Geoclimate has 350 trees, 40 % of maximum variables per
tree (based on previous results showing little difference between 40% and 50%) to minimize the correlation between trees, 0.01
% of minimum size node and 1100 maximum leaf node to minimize the potential over-fitting (Hastie et al., 2001). Since the
maximum tree depth obtained in Python for this configuration is 33, this value is also applied to the Geoclimate RF algorithm.
The uniqueness value has an unexpected effect on the accuracy: the MAE decreases when UV value increases up to 70% and
increases for UV values above 90%, while it could be expected to continue decreasing. However, the difference is slight (0.05
m - 2.5 %) and may be explained by the size of the sample which is larger (+23%) for the 70% scenario than for the 95%
(having respectively 345418 and 281081 individuals). Therefore, the data used to train the Geoclimate model is created with
$UV = 70\%$.

3.2 General building height accuracy

For all cities, more than 50% of the buildings have an estimated height being within a +/- 3.97 m (3.22 m if the 18th Paris
district is excluded) interval around the true building height (Figure 6a). At cell scale (Figure 6b), the same statistic is +/- 4.61

m (2.74 m if the 18th Paris district is excluded). If cities demonstrating a specific behaviour are not considered (Paris and Meudon), the median absolute error at cell scale is always lower than 1.6 m and 75% of the buildings or cells of any city have an error lower than 3.2 m. This error is equivalent to one building floor's height and could appear quite high. However, it seems quite reasonable when compared with the accuracy of the reference data (i.e. the height uncertainty of more than half of the BDT data set is +/- 5 m). Note that we have tested a previous version of the model (independent variables have been updated since then) on several cities far from the ones presented in this manuscript and the error was almost similar.

215

Figure 6. Median absolute error versus median true value for (**a**) building height (**b**) RSU average building height (**c**) RSU standard deviation building height (**d**) RSU mean ground sky view factor and (**e**) RSU effective terrain roughness length. The cross and the dot are the medians while the whiskers are 1st and 3rd quartiles.

Indicator	Urban class	Training			Validation		
		Median Absolute Error	Median	Median Relative Absolute Error*	Median Absolute Error	Median	Median Relative Absolute Error*
Building height (m)	Main urban	2.13	10.65	0.21	1.45	6.50	**0.23**
	Main peripheral	1.61	6.91	**0.24**	0.93	5.00	**0.17**
	Secondary peripheral	1.14	5.41	0.23	1.19	5.50	**0.23**
	Rural	-	-	-	1.24	5.50	**0.23**
RSU average Building height (m)	Main urban	1.93	10.58	0.19	1.41	7.00	**0.20**
	Main peripheral	1.61	7.20	0.22	0.75	5.31	**0.13**
	Secondary peripheral	1.04	5.43	0.20	1.12	5.47	**0.21**
	Rural	-	-	-	1.32	5.42	**0.26**
RSU standard deviation Building height (m)	Main urban	0.38	0.75	0.70	0.35	0.62	0.67
	Main peripheral	0.54	1.10	**0.62**	0.23	0.45	0.73
	Secondary peripheral	0.26	0.37	0.71	0.23	0.36	0.76
	Rural	-	-	-	0.08	0.00	0.76
RSU mean Ground SVF	Main urban	0.03	0.78	0.17	**0.02**	0.86	0.20
	Main peripheral	0.03	0.86	0.21	0.01	0.95	0.26
	Secondary peripheral	0.01	0.95	0.26	0.01	0.94	0.28
	Rural	-	-	-	0.01	0.97	0.37
RSU effective Terrain roughness length	Main urban	0.23	1.40	**0.20**	0.17	0.90	**0.23**
	Main peripheral	0.19	0.94	**0.24**	0.07	0.52	**0.20**
	Secondary peripheral	0.11	0.55	**0.27**	0.11	0.47	**0.32**
	Rural	-	-	-	0.07	0.17	**0.48**

(*) contrarily to the other indicators, the reference value used for MRAE is not the SVF of the grid cell but 1-SVF of the grid cell

Table 5. Summary of the main statistics for each combination of {indicator, commune type, data set type}.

Surprisingly, the worst results are obtained with communes belonging to the training data set (the Median Relative Absolute Error - MRAE - is 24% for *main peripheral* communes - Table 5). Overall, there is almost no accuracy decrease when the model is applied to the validation data set (Figure 6). No city type shows a specific pattern: even the rural areas which are not included in the training data set do not show a ~~higher error~~ clearly higher error (MRAE=23%) than the overall trend (MRAE=22% on average). However, a specific behavior is observed for the city of Meudon and for the 18th Paris district which have a higher error than the main trend (Figure 6b). A part of the explanation can be found in their uncommon urban fabric which makes them more difficult to estimate by the RF model:

- Meudon has a quite low median height (Figure 6b) while a high building height variability within a 100m square (Figure 6c),

- the 18th Paris district has the highest average building roof height at grid scale (Figure 6b) but also the highest sky view factor of the three Paris districts (Figure 6d) while the lowest would be expected.

3.3 Accuracy of standard spatial indicators

The building height estimation is slightly improved when averaged at RSU scale (MRAE decreases from about 3% for all communes types except rural areas). The variability of height within a cell is very roughly calculated ~~with~~ using the estimated height: for more than 50% of the cells, the ~~relative error~~ MRAE on the standard deviation of the building height is higher than ~~50% (Figure 6e~~ 62% (Table 5). This behavior is quite understandable since the RF model smooths the values of the estimated height: it cannot reproduce entirely the complexity of the initial data set. ~~For more than 50% of the cells, the roughness length relative error is about 20~~ The roughness length MRAE is about 25%. This error is slightly higher for ~~low roughness length and for the specific cases of~~ secondary peripheral and rural communes (respectively 29.5% and 48% - Table 5) while Meudon and the 18th Paris district show higher value than the MAE trend (Figure 6e). The sky view factor ~~seems the indicator the least affected by the building height estimations: for~~ is quite accurately calculated: more than 50% of the cells ~~, the relative error (calculated with a SVF value of 1 as reference value) is almost always lower than 20% and sometimes reaches 10% - note that 75% of the cells~~ have an absolute error lower ~~than 0.07~~ or equal to 0.02 (Table 5). The effect of the building height error is probably limited because the sky view factor is a 3-dimensional indicator: it also accounts for the horizontal footprint of the building which is the same between the estimated and observed data.

3.4 Limitations of the model for high-rise buildings

The accuracy differs a lot between low-rise and high-rise buildings. For all types of city, the building height is often overestimated for buildings smaller than 5 m and often underestimated for the taller ones (Figure 7). The bias for high-rise buildings can be quite high but it does not affect the general accuracy of the model since most of the buildings are low-rise (cf Figure 7: 80% of the buildings are lower than 10 m - even in main cities). A better estimation of the high-rise buildings may be achieved using a training data set containing an equal number of buildings for all levels. This would allow a better representation of the spatial heterogeneity of the third dimension. However, this would most probably affect the accuracy of the estimation for low-rise building. Indeed, in France, low-rise building are much more numerous than the high-rise ones.

As previously observed, there is almost no accuracy decrease between the training and the validation estimations, even for high buildings. Only a slight difference can be observed for main urban cities: above 15 m, the training data set performs better than the validation one (almost 3 m difference - Table 6).

Figure 7. On the top: building height errors (Err_{model} and Err_{user}) versus reference building height ($H_{OSM,true}$) for each type of city. The dot represent the median while the whiskers are the 1st and 3rd quartiles. On the bottom: cumulated distribution of reference building height ($H_{OSM,true}$) for each type of city. The interval used for the reference building height (the abscissa) are based on the following values: 0, 5, 7.5, 10, 12.5, 15, 20, 30, 50 m (values above 50 m are not considered since their number is negligible and they affect the reading).

Commune Type	Reference building height Range (m)	Training dataset			Validation dataset			OSM dataset		
		Proportions	Median Error (m)	Median Relative Error	Proportions	Median Error (m)	Median Relative Error	Proportions	Median Error (m)	Median Relative Error
Main Urban	0-5	0.19	1.10	0.25	0.16	1.28	0.28	0.05	**4.00**	0.80
	5-10	0.44	-0.30	-0.05	0.48	-0.23	-0.04	0.15	2.10	0.33
	10-12.5	0.16	-1.62	-0.19	0.17	-1.80	-0.22	0.11	2.00	0.20
	12.5-15	0.09	-2.08	-0.18	0.09	-2.37	-0.21	0.11	1.01	0.09
	15-20	0.05	**-3.66**	-0.27	0.05	**-4.35**	-0.32	0.10	2.00	0.1
	20-30	0.05	**-5.08**	-0.30	0.05	**-7.45**	-0.43	0.25	2.00	0.12
	30-40	0.02	**-9.69**	-0.42	0.01	**-12.43**	-0.53	0.23	1.00	0.04
	40-50	<0.01	**-23.48**	-0.69	<0.01	**-26.86**	-0.73	0.02	1.00	0.0
Main Peripheral	0-5	0.18	0.93	0.21	0.26	0.90	0.19	0.04	**2.00**	0.50
	5-10	0.47	-0.58	-0.09	0.63	-0.32	-0.05	0.23	2.00	0.29
	10-12.5	0.18	-2.48	-0.29	0.08	-1.89	-0.22	0.19	1.00	0.12
	12.5-15	0.09	-4.33	-0.38	0.02	-3.46	-0.31	0.11	1.00	0.09
	15-20	0.04	-6.05	-0.44	0.01	-5.25	-0.40	0.09	1.11	0.08
	20-30	0.03	-8.55	-0.50	<0.01	-8.79	-0.54	0.16	1.00	0.06
	30-40	0.01	-14.58	-0.63	<0.01	-14.16	-0.66	0.10	0.01	0.00
	40-50	<0.01	-26.37	-0.74	-	-	-	0.08	3.66	0.09
Secondary Peripheral	0-5	0.36	0.94	0.22	0.30	1.36	0.31	0.32	**5.00**	1.2
	5-10	0.55	-0.84	-0.14	0.61	-0.06	-0.01	0.55	2.00	0.29
	10-12.5	0.07	-2.89	-0.35	0.06	-1.77	-0.21	0.08	0.00	0.00
	12.5-15	0.02	-5.25	-0.47	0.02	-3.48	-0.31	0.05	3.00	0.2
	15-20	<0.01	-6.89	-0.53	<0.01	-6.37	-0.42	-	-	-
	20-30	<0.01	-9.12	-0.47	<0.01	-7.43	-0.47	-	-	-
	30-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	40-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural	0-5	-	-	-	0.24	1.13	0.24	-	-	-
	5-10	-	-	-	0.62	-0.41	-0.07	-	-	-
	10-12.5	-	-	-	0.12	-2.61	-0.32	-	-	-
	12.5-15	-	-	-	0.02	-4.85	-0.47	-	-	-
	15-20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	20-30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	30-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	40-50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 6. Summary of the building height estimation error by commune type, building height range and data set type.

255   This difference is attributed to Paris buildings data set: the two curves almost coincide if the latter is excluded. The reason is that Paris buildings are quite accurately calculated and represent a large part of the training data set (43.2% of the buildings higher than 15 m). The urban fabric (very dense block of buildings with courtyard) and the building heights are quite homogeneous in Paris, thus being well taken into account by the model. In most of other cities, a large amount of the high-rise buildings are isolated buildings (cf Figure 8 for an example with the city of Nantes). These buildings have probably very little shape or

260   environment differences with smaller isolated buildings and are probably less numerous. Therefore, most of these buildings are seen as low-rise by the model.

Figure 8. Buildings taller than 15 m for which the height underestimation is higher than 30%. ©OpenStreetMap contributors 2021. Distributed under the Open Data Commons Open Database License (ODbL) v1.0.

    It is interesting to notice that the buildings already having a building height value in OSM (or at least a number of floors value) are most of the time slightly higher than the BDT ones (Figure 7). This is particularly the case for low-rise buildings (lower than 5 m - Table 6) and it may be explained by the fact that the BDT heights are taken at the lowest part of the roof. The

265   OSM data can take into account the roof height, which is most of the time equal to zero for tall buildings but non negligible for small buildings. The difference between height derived from OSM user filling and the reference data (BDT) is quite low for any building height. This result may be used to improve the model performance: when estimating the height of a given building, the random forest may take into account the height of a nearby building filled by an OSM user as an extra independant variable.

3.5 Spatial distribution of the building height at city scale

270 While most of the buildings higher than 15 m are underestimated, the model allows to represent well the spatial patterns of the third dimension: at grid scale, the average building height maps of estimated and reference values look quite similar (Figure 9 - Annex B for other cities). While the model slightly smooths the values, the city center, first ring and second ring are quite easily distinguishable. Note that this is not the case for cities having a more homogeneous spatial distribution of the building height values (e.g. Annecy which is constrained by the topography - cf Figure B1 in Annex B).

Figure 9. Results for the city of Nantes at grid cell (**a**) reference building height, (**b**) estimated building height, (**c**) absolute building height error and **d**) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For case (**a**), (**b**) and (**c**), only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

275 For most of the city pixels, the absolute error is under 2.5 m and only a small proportion of cells have an error higher than 5 m (Figure 9). This absolute error magnitude is within the accuracy of the reference building data set. Indeed, according to the data supplier (IGN) information (based on a 7,299,422 buildings sample), 8.2% of the buildings have an accuracy of 1 m, 13.5% an accuracy of 2.5 m, 68.8% an accuracy of 5 m while 9.5% have no accuracy information.

4   Conclusions

280 There is a need for a world-wide database of morphological indicators useful for many physical process interests (eg. parametric urban climate models, noise modelling, urban planning). The GeoClimate tool aims to tackle this issue using the OpenStreetMap data. However, most of the OSM buildings do not have any information concerning their height while it is a crucial parameter for urban climate studies. A Random Forest model has been integrated within Geoclimate to estimate the height of a building based on spatial indicators describing its shape, its relations to other buildings and the 2D characteristics of its close
285 environment.

This article presents the method to build and evaluate this model. The buildings from 14 French communes have been used to train the model while the evaluation was based on 8 French communes. Attention was paid to have as many types of territories as possible in the samples (based on the French definitions): main urban, main peripheral, secondary peripheral and rural.

The Random Forest model was tuned according to four parameters: the number of trees (best 350), the minimum size node
290 (best 0.01%), the maximum variables per tree (best 40%), the maximum leaf per tree (best 1100). The reference heights used for the training of our OSM buildings were based on a data set (French BDTopo - BDT) where buildings could not fit exactly with the OSM ones. Thus, the matching between each OSM building footprints and BDT buildings footprints has been quantified using the uniqueness value indicator. The latter equals to 1 if only one building from the BDT was used to feed the OSM building height, lower to 1 otherwise, best suited for the Random Forest model when values higher than 0.7.

295 Two communes (Paris and Meudon) demonstrate a specific behavior from the analysis. Appart of these, the median absolute error at cell scale was always lower than 1.6 m and 75% of the buildings or cells of any city had an error lower than 3.2 m. This level of magnitude is similar than the BDT data used for the training: 68.8% of the buildings heights demonstrate an uncertainty of 5 m.

Geographical indicators commonly used in urban climate studies have also been calculated at 100 m grid cell according to
300 the estimated building height. While the building height variability (standard deviation within a grid) is strongly affected by the building height estimation error (50% of the cells have more than 50% error in building height standard deviation value), the roughness length and sky view factor have a relative error of about 20% for 50% of the cells.

One of the major limitations of the model at the French scale is when applied to tall (>15 m) isolated buildings. However, it does not affect the recognition of the general patterns of a city: most of the high-rise buildings located in the center of cities
305 are quite well modeled although slightly underestimated.

~~In our opinion, while~~ Care should be taken for territories having limited OSM data available (which is not the case in this study since all cities used in this work have a higher building fraction in OSM than in BDT). In this case the first step before

applying our work would be to contribute to OSM and fill the gap in the study area. In our opinion, aside this issue, the data set resulting from the optimized Random Forest ~~model is far from being perfect, it~~ could be useful for climate analysis (even thought the model is far from being perfect). We recommend a prior evaluation of what could be the effect of using the output of the RF model compared with the reference data usually employed by urban climate researchers. While we do not expect major differences when applied with parametric urban climate models at city scale, the spatial error might be quite high at neighborhood scale. Thus, for researchers and practitioners willing to use Geoclimate at a finer scale (for example to automatically download land-type and land-use information for explicit modelling purpose), we recommend to contribute to the OSM project first. Specify the height of the most important buildings of their studying area in OSM can be done before running Geoclimate. At the end of the day, they contribute to the improvement of the OSM data and they can freely take benefit from the Geoclimate tool. Concerning the building height modelling, the work may be continued by:

- identifying the model sensitivity to lack of OSM information (for example removing some or all of the roads, vegetation and water data),

- evaluating the accuracy of the estimations using other reference data sets: in France it could be performed using more accurate reference data and in other countries with any existing reference data,

- improving the statistical modelling: (**i**) selecting a data set having a uniform distribution of building height as described Sect. 3.4, (**ii**) using the height from OSM buildings that already have this information as an additional independent variable (e.g. the average building height at RSU scale may be used), (**iii**) investigate other supervised methods, (**iii̶iv**) in the training data, get rid of OSM buildings having less than a certain fraction of BDT buildings covering them, (**v**) find more appropriate building properties which can be used as independent variables (e.g. the height of the nearby buildings filled by OSM users) (**v̶vi**) identify a subset of the most appropriate variables in order to limit the adverse effects of noisy variables.

Code and data availability. The major part of this work can be reproduced directly using the Software GeoClimate version 0.0.1 (the source code and executable file of this software version are permanently available on Zenodo at https://zenodo.org/record/6372337) and the scripts and data available on Zenodo at https://zenodo.org/record/6855063. GeoClimate downloads OpenStreetMap data using the overpass API from the end point https://overpass-api.de/api, estimates building height when missing and calculates geographical indicators. The resulting data set presented in this paper have been obtained using the OpenStreetMap data between June and September 2021. It can be freely accessed at https://zenodo.org/record/6855063. The French BDTopo (version 2.2) is used only for training and evaluation purpose. It is a proprietary dataset provided by the French National Geographic Institute (IGN) and is available upon request. Thus it is unfortunately not possible to make this dataset freely accessible. This was one of the major motivation to perform this work, ie to create a methodology to automatically create a topographic dataset containing buildings with estimated height.

Appendix A: List of all spatial indicators used as independent variables

A1 Building scale

Indicator name	Indicator type			Name of the indicator in
	Type and use	Form and size	Spatial relations	the GeoClimate documentation (version 0.0.1)
BUILD_TYPE	x			None (this is an input of GeoClimate)
BUILD_MAIN_USE	x			None (this is an input of GeoClimate)
BUILD_PERIMETER		x		PERIMETER
BUILD_AREA		x		AREA
BUILD_TOTAL_FACADE_LENGTH		x		TOTAL_FACADE_LENGTH
BUILD_COMMON_WALL_FRACTION			x	COMMON_WALL_FRACTION
BUILD_NUMBER_BUILDING_NEIGHBOR			x	NUMBER_BUILDING_NEIGHBOR
BUILD_AREA_CONCAVITY		x		AREA_CONCAVITY
BUILD_FORM_FACTOR		x		FORM_FACTOR
BUILD_PERIMETER_CONVEXITY		x		PERIMETER_CONVEXITY
BUILD_MINIMUM_BUILDING_SPACING			x	MINIMUM_BUILDING_SPACING
BUILD_ROAD_DISTANCE			x	ROAD_DISTANCE
BUILD_LIKELIHOOD_LARGE_BUILDING		x		LIKELIHOOD_LARGE_BUILDING

Indicator name	Indicator type		Name of the method in
	Form and size	Aggregated statistics from lower scale	the GeoClimate documentation (version 0.0.1)
BLOCK_BUILDING_DIRECTION_UNIQUENESS	x		BUILDING_DIRECTION_UNIQUENESS
BLOCK_AREA	x		AREA
BLOCK_BUILDING_DIRECTION_EQUALITY	x		BUILDING_DIRECTION_EQUALITY
BLOCK_HOLE_AREA_DENSITY	x		HOLE_AREA_DENSITY
BLOCK_CLOSINGNESS	x		CLOSINGNESS
BUILD_AVG_PERIMETER		x	None (average from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_PERIMETER		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_AVG_AREA		x	None (average from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_AREA		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_TOTAL_FACADE_LENGTH		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_COMMON_WALL_FRACTION		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_NUMBER_BUILDING_NEIGHBOR		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_AVG_AREA_CONCAVITY		x	None (average from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_AREA_CONCAVITY		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_AVG_FORM_FACTOR		x	None (average from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_FORM_FACTOR		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_AVG_PERIMETER_CONVEXITY		x	None (average from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_PERIMETER_CONVEXITY		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_MINIMUM_BUILDING_SPACING		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_AVG_ROAD_DISTANCE		x	None (average from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_ROAD_DISTANCE		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)
BUILD_AVG_LIKELIHOOD_LARGE_BUILDING		x	None (average from lower scale)
BUILD_STD_LIKELIHOOD_LARGE_BUILDING		x	None (standard deviation from lower scale)

A3 TSU scale

Indicator name	Indicator type			Name of the method in
	Form and size	Planar density	Aggregated statistics from lower scale	the GeoClimate documentation (version 0.0.1)
RSU_HIGH_VEGETATION_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_HIGH_VEGETATION_WATER_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_HIGH_VEGETATION_BUILDING_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_HIGH_VEGETATION_LOW_VEGETATION_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_HIGH_VEGETATION_ROAD_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_HIGH_VEGETATION_IMPERVIOUS_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_WATER_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_BUILDING_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_LOW_VEGETATION_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_ROAD_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_IMPERVIOUS_FRACTION		x		AREA_FRACTION_x
RSU_VEGETATION_FRACTION_URB		x		VEGETATION_FRACTION_URB
RSU_LOW_VEGETATION_FRACTION_URB		x		LOW_VEGETATION_FRACTION_URB
RSU_HIGH_VEGETATION_IMPERVIOUS_FRACTION_URB		x		HIGH_VEGETATION_IMPERVIOUS_FRACTION_URB
RSU_HIGH_VEGETATION_PERVIOUS_FRACTION_URB		x		HIGH_VEGETATION_PERVIOUS_FRACTION_URB
RSU_ROAD_FRACTION_URB		x		ROAD_FRACTION_URB
RSU_IMPERVIOUS_FRACTION_URB		x		IMPERVIOUS_FRACTION_URB
RSU_AREA	x			AREA
RSU_GROUND_LINEAR_ROAD_DENSITY		x		GROUND_LINEAR_ROAD_DENSITY
RSU_AVG_NUMBER_BUILDING_NEIGHBOR			x	AVG_NUMBER_BUILDING_NEIGHBOR
RSU_AVG_MINIMUM_BUILDING_SPACING			x	AVG_MINIMUM_BUILDING_SPACING
RSU_BUILDING_NUMBER_DENSITY		x		BUILDING_NUMBER_DENSITY
RSU_BUILDING_TOTAL_FRACTION		x		BUILDING_TOTAL_FRACTION
RSU_BUILDING_DIRECTION_EQUALITY			x	BUILDING_DIRECTION_EQUALITY
RSU_BUILDING_DIRECTION_UNIQUENESS			x	BUILDING_DIRECTION_UNIQUENESS

Appendix B: Results for all cities

Author contributions. Conceptualization: JB, EB, VM / Data curation: JB, EB, ELS / Formal analysis: JB, EB, ELS, FL / Funding acquisition: EB, ELS / Investigation: JB, EB / Methodology: JB, EB / Project administration: JB, EB / Resources: EB / Software: EB, JB, ELS, FL / Supervision: JB, EB / Validation: EB, JB, ELS, FL / Visualization: JB, EB / Writing - original draft preparation: JB, EB / Writing - review and editing: JB, EB, FL, ELS, VM

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Figure B1. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B2. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B3. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B4. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B5. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B6. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B7. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B8. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B9. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B10. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B11. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B12. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B13. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B14. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B15. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B16. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B17. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B18. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B19. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B20. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B21. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B22. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Figure B23. Results for the commune at grid cell (upper left panel) reference building height, (upper right panel) estimated building height, (lower left paner) absolute building height error and (lower right panel) fraction of OSM buildings having height information. For all panels except the lower right, only cells having buildings and at least 90% of their buildings with no height value in OSM are displayed.

Acknowledgements. The method presented in this paper has been integrated in the GeoClimate tool and developed within the following research projects:

350
- URCLIM (2017-2021), part of ERA4CS, a project initiated by JPI Climate and co-funded by the European Union under grant agreement No 690462

- CENSE (2017-2021), funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR) under grant agreement No Projet-ANR-16-CE22-0012

- SLIM (2020-2021), a Copernicus project C3S_432 Provisions to Environmental Fore- casting Applications (Lot 2)

References

355   Bernabé, A., Musy, M., Andrieu, H., and Calmet, I.: Radiative properties of the urban fabric derived from surface form analysis: A simplified solar balance model, Solar Energy, 122, 156–168, 2015.

Bernard, J., Bocher, E., Petit, G., and Palominos, S.: Sky View Factor Calculation in Urban Context: Computational Performance and Accuracy Analysis of Two Open and Free GIS Tools, Climate, 6, https://doi.org/10.3390/cli6030060, 2018.

Biljecki, F., Ledoux, H., and Stoter, J.: Generating 3D city models without elevation data, Computers, Environment and Urban Systems, 64,
360   1–18, 2017.

Bocher, Bernard, Wiederhold, L. S., Leconte, Petit, Palominos, and Noûs: GeoClimate: a Geospatial processing toolbox for environmental and climate studies, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5534680, the GeoClimate library has been also developed within research project PAENDORA (2017 -2021), funded by ADEME. Code source and documentation are available at https://github.com/orbisgis/geoclimate/releases/tag/0.0.1, 2021a.

365   Bocher, E., Guillaume, G., Picaut, J., Petit, G., and Fortin, N.: NoiseModelling: An Open Source GIS Based Tool to Produce Environmental Noise Maps, ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information, 8, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi8030130, 2019.

Bocher, E., Bernard, J., Wiederhold, E. L. S., Leconte, F., Petit, G., Palominos, S., and Noûs, C.: GeoClimate: a Geospatial processing toolbox for environmental and climate studies, Journal of Open Source Software, 6, 3541, https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03541, 2021b.

Cao, Y. and Huang, X.: A deep learning method for building height estimation using high-resolution multi-view imagery over urban areas:
370   A case study of 42 Chinese cities, Remote Sensing of Environment, 264, 112 590, 2021.

Fradkin, M., Roux, M., Maître, H., and Leloglu, U. M.: Surface reconstruction from multiple aerial images in dense urban areas, in: Proceedings. 1999 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (Cat. No PR00149), vol. 2, pp. 262–267, IEEE, 1999.

Hanna, S. R. and Britter, R. E.: Wind flow and vapor cloud dispersion at industrial and urban sites, vol. 7, John Wiley and Sons, 2010.

375   Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Friedman, J.: Data mining, inference, and prediction, The elements of statistical learning Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.

INSEE: Method for determining functional areas in 2020, 2020.

Johansson, L., Onomura, S., Lindberg, F., and Seaquist, J.: Towards the modelling of pedestrian wind speed using high-resolution digital surface models and statistical methods, Theoretical and applied climatology, 124, 189–203, 2016.

380   Lao, J., Bocher, E., Petit, G., PALOMINOS, S., Le Saux, E., and Masson, V.: Is OpenStreetMap suitable for urban climate studies ?, in: OGRS2018, Open Source Geospatial Research and Education Symposium, LUGANO, Switzerland, https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01898612, 2018.

Lindberg, F.: Modelling the urban climate using a local governmental geo-database, Meteorological Applications, 14, 263–273, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/met.29, 2007.

385   Masson, V., Heldens, W., Bocher, E., Bonhomme, M., Bucher, B., Burmeister, C., de Munck, C., Esch, T., Hidalgo, J., Kanani-Sühring, F., Kwok, Y.-T., Lemonsu, A., Lévy, J.-P., Maronga, B., Pavlik, D., Petit, G., See, L., Schoetter, R., Tornay, N., Votsis, A., and Zeidler, J.: City-descriptive input data for urban climate models: Model requirements, data sources and challenges, Urban Climate, 31, 100 536, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2019.100536, 2020.

Milojevic-Dupont, N., Hans, N., Kaack, L. H., Zumwald, M., Andrieux, F., de Barros Soares, D., Lohrey, S., Pichler, P.-P., and Creutzig, F.:
390   Learning from urban form to predict building heights, PLOS ONE, 15, e0242 010, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242010, 2020.

Mocnik, F.-B., Zipf, A., and Raifer, M.: The OpenStreetMap folksonomy and its evolution, Geo-spatial Information Science, 20, 219–230, 2017.

Oke, T. R.: Boundary layer climates, Routledge, 2002.

Shan, J. and Toth, C. K.: Topographic laser ranging and scanning: principles and processing, CRC press, 2018.

395 Shao, Y., Taff, G. N., and Walsh, S. J.: Shadow detection and building-height estimation using IKONOS data, International journal of remote sensing, 32, 6929–6944, 2011.

Sohn, G., Huang, X., and Tao, V.: Using a binary space partitioning tree for reconstructing polyhedral building models from airborne lidar data, Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing, 74, 1425–1438, 2008.

Song, H., Huang, B., and Zhang, K.: Shadow detection and reconstruction in high-resolution satellite images via morphological filtering and

400 example-based learning, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing, 52, 2545–2554, 2013.

Tang, U. and Wang, Z.: Influences of urban forms on traffic-induced noise and air pollution: Results from a modelling system, Environmental Modelling and Software, 22, 1750–1764, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2007.02.003, 2007.

Zeng, C., Wang, J., Zhan, W., Shi, P., and Gambles, A.: An elevation difference model for building height extraction from stereo-image-derived DSMs, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 35, 7614–7630, 2014.