

The Impact of Physical Planning Policy on Household
Energy Use and Greenhouse Emissions

Peter Rickwood¹
University of Technology, Sydney
Faculty of Design, Architecture, and Building

Submitted for the award of Doctor of Philosophy

October 26, 2009

¹peter.rickwood@gmail.com

Thesis originality

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

(Peter Rickwood)

Thanks

Thanks foremost to Beth, for giving up so much to give me the opportunity to do my doctorate, and for caring for both myself and our two children, Jack and Lily, while I undertook this thesis. Thanks also to Jack and Lily for accepting my occasional absences during the last few months writing up, even when they couldn't really understand why dad was not around as much. Thanks to my supervisor, Garry Glazebrook, for his supervision, his encouragement, and his advice; our interactions were always edifying. Thanks also to Glen Searle, my co-supervisor, for his advice and encouragement, and for invaluable feedback on much of my writing. Thanks to Beth, Damien Giurco, Michelle Zeibots, Danny Rickwood, and Pete Gammie for their input and advice on various matters relating to this thesis. Thanks to Professor Malcolm Sambridge particularly for advice and assistance with some of the mathematics in Chapter 5. Thanks are owed to my mum and dad, for their love and support, and for letting me save time commuting to and from university by setting up a home office of sorts in their spare room for much of the duration of this thesis. Heinz Schandl at CSIRO provided administrative support, and was always helpful and friendly. Kerry Shaz, Grace Corpuz, and Annette Hay from the NSW Ministry of Transport were all helpful in providing data and advice for my analysis. Bee Thompson from the Independent Pricing and Regulatory tribunal was similarly obliging in providing data relating to in-dwelling energy use. Peter Maganov from Randwick City Council went out of his way to be helpful, and provided useful data on in-dwelling energy use. Pat Fensham and Rod Simpson were both of great help in providing their input and advice on various matters relating to the Sydney MetroStrategy. Thanks finally to Bev and Alejandra for being such generous (in time, spirit, and chocolate!) thesis companions in the post-graduate lab at UTS.

This thesis was supported by funds provided by UTS, the Australian government, and CSIRO, without which I could have never justified giving up full-time employment.

Publications related to this thesis

Four peer-reviewed papers have been published (or accepted) that summarize some of the research carried out for this doctorate, with one additional paper currently in review. This thesis draws heavily on these published accounts.

Published Rickwood, P., Giurco, D., Glazebrook, G., Kazaglis, A., Thomas, L., Zeibots, M., Boydell, S., White, S., Caprarelli, G., and McDougal, J. (2007). Integrating population, land-use, transport, water and energy-use models to improve the sustainability of urban systems. *2007 State of Australian Cities Conference*.

Published Rickwood, P., Glazebrook, G., and Searle, G. (2008). Urban structure and energy – a review. *Urban Policy and Research*, 26(1):57–81.

Published Rickwood, P. and Glazebrook, G. (2009). Urban structure and commuting in Australian cities. *Urban Policy and Research*, 27(2).

Published Rickwood, P. (2009). Residential operational energy use. *Urban Policy and Research*, 27(2).

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Cities and sustainability	1
1.2	The land-use policy and energy debate	3
1.3	Key motivating question	4
1.4	A note on measures of energy use	4
1.4.1	Energy and greenhouse gases	6
1.5	Thesis questions, scope & framework for analysis	7
1.5.1	Energy use: restricted to residential transport-related and residential dwelling-related energy	7
1.5.2	Planning policy: restricted to physical land-use and transport policies	8
1.5.3	Specific thesis questions	8
1.6	The Contribution of this thesis	14
1.6.1	Contribution 1: specific analysis of the link between dwelling type and energy use	15
1.6.2	Contribution 2: specific analyses of factors influencing urban household travel	15
1.6.3	Contribution 3: development of a model for integrated metropolitan-scale analysis	15
1.6.4	Contribution 4: developing a novel model of housing choice that can be easily calibrated using census data	17
1.6.5	Contribution 5: application of the integrated model to estimating combined transport/dwelling-related energy use in Sydney	17
1.7	Structure of this thesis	18
1.8	Thesis setting – Sydney, Australia	20
2	Review of Literature	23
2.1	Scope of the literature review	25
2.2	Introduction	25
2.3	Housing	27
2.3.1	Embodied energy in residential buildings	28
2.3.2	In-dwelling energy consumption	30
2.3.3	Design	33
2.3.4	Behaviour	35
2.3.5	Summary	36

2.4	Transport	36
2.4.1	The effect of urban form	37
2.4.2	Alternate views	38
2.4.3	Summary of transport-related energy use	41
2.5	Discussion	44
3	Detailed Analysis – Dwelling-related Energy Use	47
3.1	Introduction	49
3.2	Dwelling-related energy use	49
3.2.1	In-dwelling energy use	49
3.2.2	Embodied energy in dwellings	54
3.2.3	Summary	57
3.3	Study of residential in-dwelling energy use in Sydney	59
3.3.1	Introduction	59
3.3.2	Prior related work	59
3.3.3	Method	63
3.3.4	Data	63
3.3.5	Analysis and results	65
3.3.6	Discussion	70
3.3.7	Conclusions	74
3.4	Chapter summary	76
4	Detailed Analysis – Urban Travel and Energy	79
4.1	Introduction	81
4.2	Urban structure and commuting in Australian cities	85
4.2.1	Introduction	85
4.2.2	Review	85
4.2.3	Data	86
4.2.4	Analysis and results	89
4.2.5	Discussion	98
4.3	A disaggregate analysis of commuter mode choice in Sydney	101
4.3.1	Data	101
4.3.2	Method	106
4.3.3	Analysis and results	107
4.3.4	Discussion	109
4.4	A computational study of activity distribution and travel behaviour	111
4.4.1	Synthetic analysis of a circular city	111
4.4.2	Discussion	124
4.5	Chapter summary	127
5	Detailed analysis – Housing Choice	129
5.1	Introduction	132
5.2	Existing work	133
5.3	Heterogenous preferences without prices	134

5.3.1	Homogenous preferences, completely observable choices	134
5.3.2	Heterogeneity of preferences	135
5.3.3	Partially observed choices	136
5.3.4	A practical approximate likelihood maximiser	138
5.4	Applying the technique – synthetic data	140
5.5	Applying the technique – real data	144
5.5.1	Data	145
5.5.2	Results	147
5.6	Limitations	152
5.7	Concluding discussion	153
5.8	A note on the calculation of residential location satisfaction	155
5.9	Addendum: Limitations of the housing choice model	155
5.10	Chapter summary	157
6	Approaches to Urban Analysis and Modelling	159
6.1	Modelling the impact of planning policy	161
6.2	Existing approaches: Analytical	161
6.3	Existing approaches: Computational	163
6.3.1	Urban modelling: Economic and engineering traditions	164
6.3.2	Land-use models	166
6.3.3	Transport models	167
6.3.4	Integrated land-Use/transport models	168
6.4	A detour on approaches to modelling	169
6.4.1	Requirements of a model	169
6.4.2	Tangled up in utility and rationality	170
6.5	Modelling approach taken in this thesis	171
6.5.1	Model complexity/applicability tradeoff	172
6.5.2	Models as oracles, or models as exploratory tools	173
7	Development of the Integrated Model	177
7.1	Introduction	179
7.2	Residential location model	180
7.2.1	Predicting residential location preferences in 2031	185
7.2.2	Supporting method 1: Regression	189
7.2.3	Supporting method 2: Spatial smoothing through Inverse Distance Weighting	193
7.3	Transport model	195
7.3.1	Car-ownership model	197
7.3.2	Daily trip/no-trip model	200
7.3.3	Household VKT model	201
7.3.4	Travel by public transport	205
7.3.5	Final adjustments to match 2006 aggregates	207
7.3.6	Obtaining an estimate of annual household transport energy use	207
7.3.7	Embodied energy of vehicles	212

7.4	Dwelling-related energy-use model	212
7.4.1	In-dwelling energy	212
7.4.2	Embodied energy in buildings	215
7.5	Profiles of representative households	215
7.5.1	The five representative households	216
7.5.2	Results for the representative households	217
7.6	Chapter summary	220
8	Scenario Development and Model Inputs	221
8.1	Introduction	223
8.2	Demographic inputs	223
8.2.1	Household income	225
8.3	Housing policy inputs	228
8.4	Other inputs & conversion parameters	236
8.4.1	Primary energy conversion factors	236
8.4.2	How were the in-dwelling energy conversion factors derived?	236
8.4.3	How were the private vehicle travel conversion factors obtained?	237
8.4.4	How were the public transport conversion factors obtained?	237
8.4.5	Embodied energy conversion factors	238
8.5	Variations to inputs for alternative scenarios	238
9	Integrated Modelling – Analysis and Results	241
9.1	Introduction	243
9.1.1	Other metropolitan-scale estimates of the impact of land use on energy use	244
9.2	Scenarios <i>without</i> land-use/transport feedback	248
9.2.1	Scenario 1: baseline	249
9.2.2	Scenario 2: +20% in centres, +0% in suburbs, -40% on fringe	270
9.2.3	Scenario 3: +0% in centres, +75% in suburbs, -40% on fringe	273
9.2.4	Scenario 4: +5% in centres, -20% in suburbs, +0% on fringe	276
9.2.5	Scenario 5: -10% in centres, -40% in suburbs, +40% on fringe	279
9.2.6	Scenario 6: -20% in centres, -7% in suburbs, +40% on fringe	282
9.2.7	Scenario 7: ‘mildly Parisian re-development’ (-40% fringe)	285
9.2.8	Scenario 8: ‘high-rise re-development’ (-40% fringe)	290
9.2.9	Scenario 9: ‘Parisian re-development’ (-67% fringe)	293
9.2.10	Scenario 10: ‘Hong-Kong style re-development’ (-67% fringe)	297
9.2.11	Scenario 11: ‘Urban sprawl’ (+150% fringe)	301
9.3	Scenarios <i>with</i> land-use/transport feedback	305
9.3.1	Scenario 1a: baseline	307
9.3.2	Scenario 2a: +20% in centres, +0% in suburbs, -40% on fringe	309
9.3.3	Scenario 3a: +0% in centres, +75% in suburbs, -40% on fringe	310
9.3.4	Scenario 4a: +5% in centres, -20% in suburbs, +0% on fringe	311
9.3.5	Scenario 5a: -10% in centres, -40% in suburbs, +40% on fringe	312
9.3.6	Scenario 6a: -20% in centres, -7% in suburbs, +40% on fringe	313
9.3.7	Scenario 7a: ‘mildly Parisian re-development’ (-40% fringe)	314

9.3.8	Scenario 8a: ‘high-rise re-development’ (-40% fringe)	315
9.3.9	Scenario 9a: ‘Parisian re-development’ (-67% fringe)	316
9.3.10	Scenario 10a: ‘Hong-Kong style re-development’ (-67% fringe)	317
9.3.11	Scenario 11a: ‘Urban sprawl’ (+150% fringe)	318
9.4	Miscellaneous scenarios/analyses	319
9.4.1	Peak oil	320
9.4.2	Scenario 13: Multi-pronged approach, weak response	324
9.4.3	Scenario 14: Multi-pronged approach, moderate response	326
9.4.4	Scenario 15: Multi-pronged approach, strong response	327
9.4.5	Scenario 16: Multi-pronged approach, very strong response	328
9.5	Chapter summary	329
9.5.1	Implications for planning policy in Sydney	331
9.5.2	Conclusions	332
10	Conclusions	335
10.1	Summary of key findings relating to thesis questions	337
10.1.1	Question 1: “How does dwelling type affect residential dwelling-related energy use?”	337
10.1.2	Question 2: “How does transport and land-use policy influence household travel behaviour (and resulting energy use)?”	338
10.1.3	Question 3: “How does housing location policy influence aggregate dwelling-related and transport-related household energy use?”	339
10.2	General discussion	340
10.3	Future research	341
10.3.1	Building life	342
10.3.2	The land-use→transport feedback, and the nature of urban feedback systems in general	342
10.3.3	The proper role of government and markets in planning	343
10.4	Concluding remarks	344
A	Thesis Related Software	347

Abstract

This thesis investigates the impact of physical planning policy on combined transport and dwelling-related energy use by households. Separate analyses and reviews are conducted into dwelling-related and transport-related energy use by households, before a model is developed to investigate the city-wide implications of different land-use scenarios in Sydney, Australia.

The analysis of household energy use in Chapter 3 suggests that medium density housing (i.e. loose-rise apartments, townhouses, and terraces) is likely to result in the lowest per-capita energy use, while also allowing for sufficient densities to make frequent public transport service viable.

The analysis of transport energy in Chapter 4 confirms that increasing urban density is associated with decreased car ownership and use, independent of other factors. However, land use changes alone are likely to result in modest changes to travel behaviour.

The results of the scenario modelling in Chapters 7-9 support the view that changes to land use alone can reduce household energy consumption, but the changes, even over a long time period (25 years) are small ($\approx 0 - 10\%$) for all but the most extreme land-use policies. Instead, a coordinated (land-use/transport and other policy levers) approach is much more effective. The results confirm that it is transport energy that is most sensitive to planning policy, but that a combined consideration of dwelling-related and transport-related energy use is still useful. The micro-simulation model developed to assess the impact of different land-use planning scenarios allows the establishment of a lower-bound estimate of the effect that housing policy has on household energy use, assuming 'business as usual' transport policy, household behaviour, and technology.

