

URBAN PLANNING AND RENEWABLE ENERGY: A REVIEW

Altaf Hasan Tarique, Assistant Professor, Department of Mechanical & Chemical Engineering, Galgotias University

ABSTRACT

In order to help meet our country's need for sustainable energy in the future, urban planners and practitioners will have to join together to explore many innovative approaches. A designer's view on the renewable energy future is the subject of the current article. In order to be able to understand and explore the relevant planning problems, the analyst starts with a framework. Both the technical environmental element and sustainable development are included in the framework. Designers that use these techniques may have the option of doing life cycle analysis and exergy analyses. According to past publications, the notion of an adapted trias energetica remains a viable design approach for renewable energy-based urban planning. When it comes to sustainable development, environmental evaluations should look at how the planning or decision process influences society, the economy, law, design, and ethics. It then gives some concepts for formulating designs which use renewable energy as a means of sustaining the built environment. The conceptual model in line with the modified trias energetica theory includes concepts of passive urban energy design, the exergaming of energy supply systems, and the use of renewable energy.

ABSTRACT: Urban Planning, Renewable Energy, Planning

INTRODUCTION

It offers a big challenge for research and practise since it is difficult to create a synergy between the transition to a renewable energy future and the transition to sustainable cities.

Sustainable construction measures, such as higher insulation levels or solar-based energy supply, are widely accepted as a step to adopt at the individual building level, but these measures must not be looked at in isolation from the wider energy infrastructure issues (i.e., macro-scale). Now, examine the meso-scale, which may need to be evaluated alongside the micro and macro-levels. Both of these concerns - providing for energy, and developing sustainable cities - are critically dependent on one other. Think about CHP or boiler plants for district heating and cooling, as well as geothermal applications servicing groups of buildings or grouped solar arrays when considering the issue of energy supply. Urban planning may impact energy consumption estimates in several ways, such as, for example, with concerns connected to compactness, morphology, and building orientation, and the exchange of waste heat. Because 'energy' and the 'built environment' are intricately interrelated, the two initiatives must work together to promote sustainability. I suppose that the energy characteristics of an urban fabric, both in terms of demand and

supply, must be considered a “whole system” in conjunction with the surrounding environment. To be sure, we will deal with energy as well as environmental development.

These optimizations—we may conjecture from the start of this study—are sensitive to the size and situation of the task. For example, upgrading an existing compact urban district, and including related advantages in terms of combined energy consumption for buildings and mobility, is likely to be more effective in accomplishing our goal of getting the maximum benefit from building energy than creating a new passive housing district on a greenfield outside the city where residents may primarily rely on car traffic. The enhanced performance of each individual passive dwelling may be cancelled out by the greater energy consumption required to support more traffic volume. It has also been investigated by Stöglehner and Narodoslowsky that the new infrastructure networks required for low-density towns need a lot of energy.

Some observations of this kind may be made about how various energy technologies are included at different grid size levels, and in particular about how smart grids integrate them. Furthermore, creating a solar farm outside of an urban area might be more cost-effective as installation of PV panels or solar boilers on each building within the same district is not required. Given the context of the situation, other things include the following: location and land use pressure, spatial quality, orientation and shading, investments, maintenance, emissions, and nuisance control.

LIFE CYCLE ASSESEMENT

The influence of a building's construction, usage, and destruction on the environment may be assessed using the life cycle assessment (LCA). The following are regulations and established practises that are making their way into building design from single construction components all the way up to large metropolitan fragments. It is often measured in effect categories like climate change, depletion of natural resources, or threats to human health. Contested or optional: aggregating all of the affects into a single “score” or “environmental cost” is Additionally, this is because aggregation involves weighing of different environmental impacts, and thus involves normative decisions, such as deciding which environmental impact to prioritise (e.g., which one to focus on, whether human health is more important than ecosystem health, or the other way around). In this context, the LCA of energy systems, such in [12,14], is very relevant.

PRINCIPAL ENERGY VS EXERGY

Energy sustainability also focuses on efficiency. Better energy efficiency leads to lower primary energy consumption, which reduces environmental impact. Although it is important to look at primary energy use and exergetic efficiency to get accurate LCA results, doing separate studies of primary energy use and exergetic efficiency offers valuable insights.

On the other hand, doing so gives an accurate representation of the true amounts of energy required for a particular application. A passive home with a space heating and cooling energy need of 15 kWh/m² per year using the present mix of electricity will need a minimum of 40 kWh/m² of primary energy. Thus, primary

energy unit (PUU) measurement of consumption patterns should be given precedence over existing methods, where no PUU measurement is used.

For these types of investigations, energy usage is assessed using a qualitative method called exergy. It encourages an interrelated kind of optimization, considering the inherent qualities of various energy types in connection to their use. Under such conditions, creative breakthroughs are possible, especially with respect to the conception and design of constructed environments. Simply put, exergy is the amount of energy required to create work. The level of work depends not only on the energy source, but also on the environment in which it takes place. As such, an energy carrier's exergy (or work capability) is always represented relative to the surrounding environment.

CONCLUSION

This article includes a broad variety of research perspectives to arrive at a synthetic picture of the issues it considers. Therefore, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research is required to address urban challenges. Section 2.2 asserts that ecologically sustainable solutions cannot be accomplished without relating to all of the aforementioned domains. With relation to the energy transition, these domains have served as a battlefield for urban planners and designers for some time. It will be inescapable to take a systems-perspective and examine the unthinkable regular occurrences of business as usual. The conclusions reached by Wächter et al. with regard to a sustainable energy transition in Austria are comparable, when they state that "Societal transformations aimed at fostering a sustainable energy system are value-laden and goal-oriented, and they occur due to the necessity to abandon business-as-usual" ([59], p. 199). On the other hand, numerous exciting prospects await.

REFERENCES

1. Adil, A. M., & Ko, Y. (2016). Socio-technical evolution of Decentralized Energy Systems: A critical review and implications for urban planning and policy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 57, 1025–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.079>
2. Agudelo-Vera, C. M., Leduc, W. R. W. A., Mels, A. R., & Rijnaarts, H. H. M. (2012). Harvesting urban resources towards more resilient cities. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 64, 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2012.01.014>
3. Al Garni, H. Z., & Awasthi, A. (2017). Solar PV power plant site selection using a GIS-AHP based approach with application in Saudi Arabia. *Applied Energy*, 206, 1225–1240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.10.024>
4. Alberti, M. (1996). Measuring urban sustainability. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 16(4–6), 381–424. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255\(96\)00083-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255(96)00083-2)
5. Ashtari, A., Bibeau, E., Shahidinejad, S., & Molinski, T. (2012). PEV charging profile prediction and

- analysis based on vehicle usage data. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 3(1), 341–350. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSG.2011.2162009>
6. Azaza, M., & Wallin, F. (2017). Multi objective particle swarm optimization of hybrid micro-grid system: A case study in Sweden. *Energy*, 123, 108–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.01.149>
 7. Beccali, M., Columba, P., D'Alberti, V., & Franzitta, V. (2009). Assessment of bioenergy potential in Sicily: A GIS-based support methodology. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 33(1), 79–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2008.04.019>
 8. Bergmann, A., Hanley, N., & Wright, R. (2006). Valuing the attributes of renewable energy investments. *Energy Policy*, 34(9), 1004–1014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2004.08.035>
 9. Bhutto, A. W., Bazmi, A. A., & Zahedi, G. (2011). Greener energy: Issues and challenges for Pakistan - Biomass energy prospective. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 15(6), 3207–3219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2011.04.015>
 10. Brandoni, C., & Polonara, F. (2012). The role of municipal energy planning in the regional energy-planning process. *Energy*, 48(1), 323–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2012.06.061>
 11. Calvillo, C. F., Sánchez-Miralles, A., & Villar, J. (2016). Energy management and planning in smart cities. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 55, 273–287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.133>
 12. Curry, N., & Pillay, P. (2012). Biogas prediction and design of a food waste to energy system for the urban environment. *Renewable Energy*, 41, 200–209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2011.10.019>
 13. Dalla Rosa, A., Boulter, R., Church, K., & Svendsen, S. (2012). District heating (DH) network design and operation toward a system-wide methodology for optimizing renewable energy solutions (SMORES) in Canada: A case study. *Energy*, 45(1), 960–974. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2012.06.062>
 14. Ghasemian, M., Ashrafi, Z. N., & Sedaghat, A. (2017). A review on computational fluid dynamic simulation techniques for Darrieus vertical axis wind turbines. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 149, 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2017.07.016>
 15. Girardin, L., Marechal, F., Dubuis, M., Calame-Darbellay, N., & Favrat, D. (2010). EnerGis: A geographical information based system for the evaluation of integrated energy conversion systems in urban areas. *Energy*, 35(2), 830–840. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2009.08.018>
 16. Howard, B., Parshall, L., Thompson, J., Hammer, S., Dickinson, J., & Modi, V. (2012). Spatial distribution of urban building energy consumption by end use. *Energy and Buildings*, 45, 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2011.10.061>
 17. Huang, Z., Yu, H., Peng, Z., & Zhao, M. (2015). Methods and tools for community energy planning: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 42, 1335–1348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.11.042>
 18. Hui, S. C. M. (2001). Low energy building design in high density urban cities. *Renewable Energy*, 24(3–4), 627–640. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-1481\(01\)00049-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-1481(01)00049-0)
 19. Izquierdo, S., Rodrigues, M., & Fueyo, N. (2008). A method for estimating the geographical

- distribution of the available roof surface area for large-scale photovoltaic energy-potential evaluations. *Solar Energy*, 82(10), 929–939. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2008.03.007>
20. K Hossain, A., & Badr, O. (2007). Prospects of renewable energy utilisation for electricity generation in Bangladesh. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 11(8), 1617–1649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2005.12.010>
21. Kammen, D. M., & Sunter, D. A. (2016). City-integrated renewable energy for urban sustainability. *Science*, 352(6288), 922–928. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad9302>
22. Kanchev, H., Colas, F., Lazarov, V., & Francois, B. (2014). Emission reduction and economical optimization of an urban microgrid operation including dispatched PV-based active generators. *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy*, 5(4), 1397–1405. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSTE.2014.2331712>
23. Karki, S. K., Mann, M. D., & Salehfar, H. (2005). Energy and environment in the ASEAN: Challenges and opportunities. *Energy Policy*, 33(4), 499–509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2003.08.014>
24. Kazim, A. M. (2007). Assessments of primary energy consumption and its environmental consequences in the United Arab Emirates. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 11(3), 426–446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2005.01.008>
25. Kempton, W., & Kubo, T. (2000). Electric-drive vehicles for peak power in Japan. *Energy Policy*, 28(1), 9–18. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215\(99\)00078-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215(99)00078-6)
26. Kühne, R. (2010). Electric buses - An energy efficient urban transportation means. *Energy*, 35(12), 4510–4513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2010.09.055>
27. Kuznetsova, E., Li, Y.-F., Ruiz, C., & Zio, E. (2014). An integrated framework of agent-based modelling and robust optimization for microgrid energy management. *Applied Energy*, 129, 70–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.04.024>
28. Li, Y., Fu, L., Zhang, S., & Zhao, X. (2011). A new type of district heating system based on distributed absorption heat pumps. *Energy*, 36(7), 4570–4576. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.03.019>
29. Liew, P. Y., Theo, W. L., Wan Alwi, S. R., Lim, J. S., Abdul Manan, Z., Klemeš, J. J., & Varbanov, P. S. (2017). Total Site Heat Integration planning and design for industrial, urban and renewable systems. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 68, 964–985. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.05.086>
30. Lin, J., Cao, B., Cui, S., Wang, W., & Bai, X. (2010). Evaluating the effectiveness of urban energy conservation and GHG mitigation measures: The case of Xiamen city, China. *Energy Policy*, 38(9), 5123–5132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.04.042>
31. Magadza, C. H. D. (2000). Climate change impacts and human settlements in Africa: Prospects for adaptation. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 61(1), 193–205. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006355210516>
32. Manfren, M., Caputo, P., & Costa, G. (2011). Paradigm shift in urban energy systems through distributed generation: Methods and models. *Applied Energy*, 88(4), 1032–1048.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2010.10.018>

33. Maroufmashat, A., Fowler, M., Sattari Khavas, S., Elkamel, A., Roshandel, R., & Hajimiragha, A. (2016). Mixed integer linear programming based approach for optimal planning and operation of a smart urban energy network to support the hydrogen economy. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 41(19), 7700–7716. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2015.08.038>
34. Melaina, M., & Bremson, J. (2008). Refueling availability for alternative fuel vehicle markets: Sufficient urban station coverage. *Energy Policy*, 36(8), 3233–3241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.04.025>
35. Miles, T. R., Miles Jr., T. R., Baxter, L. L., Bryers, R. W., Jenkins, B. M., & Oden, L. L. (1996). Boiler deposits from firing biomass fuels. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 10(2–3), 125–138. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0961-9534\(95\)00067-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0961-9534(95)00067-4)
36. Mirza, U. K., Ahmad, N., & Majeed, T. (2008). An overview of biomass energy utilization in Pakistan. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 12(7), 1988–1996. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2007.04.001>
37. Niemi, R., Mikkola, J., & Lund, P. D. (2012). Urban energy systems with smart multi-carrier energy networks and renewable energy generation. *Renewable Energy*, 48, 524–536. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2012.05.017>
38. Nigim, K., Munier, N., & Green, J. (2004). Pre-feasibility MCDM tools to aid communities in prioritizing local viable renewable energy sources. *Renewable Energy*, 29(11), 1775–1791. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2004.02.012>
39. Orehounig, K., Mavromatidis, G., Evins, R., Dorer, V., & Carmeliet, J. (2014). Towards an energy sustainable community: An energy system analysis for a village in Switzerland. *Energy and Buildings*, 84, 277–286. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.08.012>
40. Otterpohl, R., Albold, A., & Oldenburg, M. (1999). Source control in urban sanitation and waste management: Ten systems with reuse of resources. *Water Science and Technology*, 39(5), 153–160. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1223\(99\)00097-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1223(99)00097-9)
41. Otterpohl, R., Grottker, M., & Lange, J. (1997). Sustainable water and waste management in urban areas. *Water Science and Technology*, 35(9), 121–133. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1223\(97\)00190-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0273-1223(97)00190-X)
42. Ozturk, M., Saba, N., Altay, V., Iqbal, R., Hakeem, K. R., Jawaid, M., & Ibrahim, F. H. (2017). Biomass and bioenergy: An overview of the development potential in Turkey and Malaysia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 79, 1285–1302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.111>
43. Ramos, A., Chatzopoulou, M. A., Guarracino, I., Freeman, J., & Markides, C. N. (2017). Hybrid photovoltaic-thermal solar systems for combined heating, cooling and power provision in the urban environment. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 150, 838–850. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2017.03.024>
44. Salvi, B. L., & Subramanian, K. A. (2015). Sustainable development of road transportation sector

- using hydrogen energy system. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 51, 1132–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.030>
45. Sarralde, J. J., Quinn, D. J., Wiesmann, D., & Steemers, K. (2015). Solar energy and urban morphology: Scenarios for increasing the renewable energy potential of neighbourhoods in London. *Renewable Energy*, 73, 10–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2014.06.028>
46. Shafiei, S., & Salim, R. A. (2014). Non-renewable and renewable energy consumption and CO2 emissions in OECD countries: A comparative analysis. *Energy Policy*, 66, 547–556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2013.10.064>
47. Sharpe, T., & Proven, G. (2010). Crossflex: Concept and early development of a true building integrated wind turbine. *Energy and Buildings*, 42(12), 2365–2375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2010.07.032>
48. Tian, W., Wang, Y., Ren, J., & Zhu, L. (2007). Effect of urban climate on building integrated photovoltaics performance. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 48(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2006.05.015>
49. Villarroel Walker, R., Beck, M. B., Hall, J. W., Dawson, R. J., & Heidrich, O. (2014). The energy-water-food nexus: Strategic analysis of technologies for transforming the urban metabolism. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 141, 104–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.01.054>

