

# ENERGY USE OF URBAN TRANSPORT AND BUILDINGS:



## A New Combined Metric

Bruno Osório<sup>\*</sup> ‡, Nick McCullen<sup>\*</sup>, Ian Walker<sup>†</sup> and David Coley<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering; <sup>†</sup> Department of Psychology — University of Bath  
email: ‡ b.osorio@bath.ac.uk



## Introduction

To implement actions to reduce the negative effects of carbon-based energy consumption calls for a good method of measuring that energy. Prior research has always considered urban buildings and transport energy costs separately. A combined energy use metric is developed at a large scale to provide better understanding of energy consumption patterns. Because commuting plays such a substantial role in energy demand, the results show a direct relationship between lower per capita energy consumption and urbanised areas, demonstrating how energy efficient urban living is.

## Background

- Urban areas have been growing continuously [1] leading to an increasing carbon-related energy consumption [2]
- The rise of CO<sub>2</sub> and other GHG emissions results in negative consequences: climate change, air pollution, and others
- Priority: implementing strategies to mitigate the effects of the negative outcomes
- Measuring energy consumption is essential to outline strategies
- An energy use metric enables us to identify consumption patterns

## Methodology

- There is an advantage to combine the energy consumption of buildings and transport due to their interdependency [3], given that people move from homes to workplaces
- Energy metric: estimate of the buildings operational energy and the commuting transport carbon footprint
- Use of freely available and reliable data published by official governing bodies [4, 5]
- Use of Lower layer Super Output Area (LSOA) geographic level
- Applied a common unit of measurement: kgCO<sub>2</sub>e

## Combined metric




Figure 1: Energy consumption by LSOA per capita: (a) Total and (b) Buildings

- Lower per capita consumption is found in major urban areas
- Larger LSOA units generally show more energy use
- Observed a similarity between total energy and buildings alone
- Rural areas have significantly higher energy consumption

## Transport analysis




Figure 2: (a) Commuting transport carbon footprint per capita; (b) Population density > 4500 pers/km<sup>2</sup>

- Relation: low transport footprint ⇔ high density areas
- Greater London: its better public transport system denotes lower per capita commuting transport energy
- Predominantly, urban areas are more energy efficient

## Conclusions and future work

- Estimating energy consumption is important to provide information to design better mitigation policies
- Significant benefit from a combined energy use metric
- The simplicity of the new metric enables it to be reproduced for other regions
- Consumption patterns show that more densely populated areas have better energy efficiency [6]
- Future development: understand the relationship between energy consumption and urban characteristics

## References

- [1] Makido, Y., Dhakal, S., Yamagata, Y. (2012) Relationship between urban form and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: evidence from fifty Japanese cities. *Urban Climate*, 2:55–67.
- [2] Reinhart, C., Davila, C. C. (2016). Urban building energy modeling – A review of a nascent field. *Building and Environment*, 97:196–202.
- [3] Stephan, A., Crawford, R. H. , De Myttenaere, K. (2012). Towards a comprehensive life cycle energy analysis framework for residential buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, 55:592–600.
- [4] DECC (2015). Statistics at Department of Energy & Climate Change. Online; accessed 06-2016.
- [5] O'Brien, O., UCL CASA (2014). DataShine: Travel to work flows. Online; accessed 06-2016.
- [6] Næss, P. (2012). Urban form and travel behavior: Experience from a Nordic context. *Journal of Transport and Land Use*, 5:21–45.