

# T-1. Increase Residential Density



## GHG Mitigation Potential



Up to 30.0% of GHG emissions from project VMT in the study area

## Co-Benefits (icon key on pg. 34)



## Climate Resilience

Increased density can put people closer to resources they may need to access during an extreme weather event. Increased density can also shorten commutes, decreasing the amount of time people are on the road and exposed to hazards such as extreme heat or flooding.

## Health and Equity Considerations

Neighborhoods should include different types of housing to support a variety of household sizes, age ranges, and incomes.

## Measure Description

This measure accounts for the VMT reduction achieved by a project that is designed with a higher density of dwelling units (du) compared to the average residential density in the U.S. Increased densities affect the distance people travel and provide greater options for the mode of travel they choose. Increasing residential density results in shorter and fewer trips by single-occupancy vehicles and thus a reduction in GHG emissions. This measure is best quantified when applied to larger developments and developments where the density is somewhat similar to the surrounding area due to the underlying research being founded in data from the neighborhood level.

## Subsector

Land Use

## Locational Context

Urban, suburban

## Scale of Application

Project/Site

## Implementation Requirements

This measure is most accurately quantified when applied to larger developments and/or developments where the density is somewhat similar to the surrounding neighborhood.

## Cost Considerations

Depending on the location, increasing residential density may increase housing and development costs. However, the costs of providing public services, such as health care, education, policing, and transit, are generally lower in more dense areas where things are closer together. Infrastructure that provides drinking water and electricity also operates more efficiently when the service and transmission area is reduced. Local governments may provide approval streamlining benefits or financial incentives for infill and high-density residential projects.

## Expanded Mitigation Options

When paired with Measure T-2, *Increase Job Density*, the cumulative densification from these measures can result in a highly walkable and bikeable area, yielding increased co-benefits in VMT reductions, improved public health, and social equity.





## GHG Reduction Formula

$$A = \frac{B - C}{C} \times D$$

## GHG Calculation Variables

| ID  | Variable  | Value  | Unit     | Source            |
|---|---|--------|----------|-------------------|
| <b>Output</b>   |   |        |          |                   |
| A   | Percent reduction in GHG emissions from project VMT in study area | 0–30.0 | %        | calculated        |
| <b>User Inputs</b>                                    |   |        |          |                   |
| B   | Residential density of project development                        | [ ]    | du/acre  | user input        |
| <b>Constants, Assumptions, and Available Defaults</b> |   |        |          |                   |
| C   | Residential density of typical development                        | 9.1    | du/acre  | Ewing et al. 2007 |
| D   | Elasticity of VMT with respect to residential density             | -0.22  | unitless | Stevens 2016      |

Further explanation of key variables:

- (C) – The residential density of typical development is based on the blended average density of residential development in the U.S. forecasted for 2025. This estimate includes apartments, condominiums, and townhouses, as well as detached single-family housing on both small and large lots. An acre in this context is defined as an acre of developed land, not including streets, school sites, parks, and other undevelopable land. If reductions are being calculated from a specific baseline derived from a travel demand forecasting model, the residential density of the relevant transportation analysis zone should be used instead of the value for a typical development.
- (D) – A meta-regression analysis of five studies that controlled for self-selection found that a 0.22 percent decrease in VMT occurs for every 1 percent increase in residential density (Stevens 2016).

## GHG Calculation Caps or Maximums

### Measure Maximum

( $A_{\max}$ ) The percent reduction in GHG emissions (A) is capped at 30 percent. The purpose for the 30 percent cap is to limit the influence of any single built environmental factor (such as density). Projects that implement multiple land use strategies (e.g., density, design, diversity) will show more of a reduction than relying on improvements from a single built environment factor.



### Subsector Maximum

( $\sum A_{\text{maxT-1 through T-4, T-55}} \leq 65\%$ ) This measure is in the Land Use subsector. This subcategory includes Measures T-1 through T-4 and T-55. The VMT reduction from the combined implementation of all measures within this subsector is capped at 65 percent.

### Example GHG Reduction Quantification

The user reduces VMT by increasing the residential density of the project study area. In this example, the project's residential density would be 15 du per acre (B), which would reduce GHG emissions from project VMT by 14.2 percent.

$$A = \frac{15 \frac{\text{du}}{\text{ac}} - 9.1 \frac{\text{du}}{\text{ac}}}{9.1 \frac{\text{du}}{\text{ac}}} \times -0.22 = -14.2\%$$

### Quantified Co-Benefits



#### Improved Local Air Quality

The percent reduction in GHG emissions (A) would be the same as the percent reduction in NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and PM. Reductions in ROG emissions can be calculated by multiplying the percent reduction in GHG emissions (A) by an adjustment factor of 87 percent. See *Adjusting VMT Reductions to Emission Reductions* above for further discussion.



#### Energy and Fuel Savings

The percent reduction in vehicle fuel consumption would be the same as the percent reduction in GHG emissions (A).



#### VMT Reductions

The percent reduction in VMT would be the same as the percent reduction in GHG emissions (A).

### Sources

- Ewing, R., K. Bartholomew, S. Winkelman, J. Walters, and D. Chen. 2007. *Growing Cooler: The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change*. October. Available: [https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/cit\\_07092401a.pdf](https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/cit_07092401a.pdf). Accessed: January 2021.
- Stevens, M. 2016. Does Compact Development Make People Drive Less? *Journal of the American Planning Association* 83:1(7–18), DOI: 10.1080/01944363.2016.1240044. November. Available: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309890412\\_Does\\_Compact\\_Development\\_Make\\_People\\_Drive\\_Less](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309890412_Does_Compact_Development_Make_People_Drive_Less). Accessed: January 2021.