# **CITY OF CANNING**

# CITY CENTRE CCAP PRECINCT ANALYSIS SUSTAINABILITY REPORT

Prepared by Kinesis for the City of Canning August 2012



## Contents

Executive Summary	2
Summary of Scenarios for Canning City Centre	3
Introduction	
C <sup>CAP</sup> Precinct Workshop	5
Precinct Details	6
Performance Summary	7
Energy	9
Westfield Carousel	12
Water	13
Transport	16
Operational Affordability	17
Marginal capital costs	18
Appendix 1: C <sup>CAP</sup> Precinct Report	20
Appendix 2: Qualifications and Data Sources	25

## **Executive Summary**

Kinesis were engaged by the City of Canning to quantify the sustainability performance of the Canning City Centre Structure Plan.

Under a Business as Usual scenario, the Structure Plan is estimated to increase:

- Residential dwellings by 800% to 13,728 dwellings
- Commercial and retail floor space by 45% to 781,666 m2
- Increase greenhouse gas emission by 178% to 139,000 tonnes CO2-e/year
- Increase water consumption by 168% to 2,400 ML/year

Using the C<sup>CAP</sup> Precinct sustainability modelling tool, two stages of sustainability intervention were explored with the City of Canning in a workshop on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2012 to mitigate the increase in resource consumption across the site (see Table 1):

- **Demand side strategies**, incorporating energy and water efficiencies, improved building thermal performance and household travel mode shift through lower parking rates and improved public transport access. These demand side strategies are achieved through building design specifications.
- **Supply side strategies**, incorporating solar energy, trigeneration and water recycling. These supply side strategies require close consultation with key stakeholders, including land owners and utilities to ensure the appropriate combination of energy and water technologies to meet both the sustainability, financial and network objectives for the site.

**Compared to the Business as Usual scenario**, these demand and supply side strategies (**Workshop Scenario**) are estimated to achieve:

- 45% reduction in precinct greenhouse gas emissions
- 49% reduction peak electricity demand
- 35% reduction in total water consumption

In addition, under the **Workshop Scenario**, **compared to an average resident in the Perth Metropolitan Area**, a resident living in the Canning City Centre is estimated to:

- Emit 35% less greenhouse gas emissions
- Consume 63% less potable water
- Drive 21% less kilometres
- Spend 12% less on energy, water and transport operating costs

The results from this **Workshop Scenario** are achieved at an estimated marginal capital cost of approximately **\$90 million** or **\$36 per m**<sup>2</sup> of constructed floor area.



## Summary of Scenarios for Canning City Centre

Strategy Business as Usual Specification		Demand Side Strategies	Demand + Supply Side Strategies			
Thermal Efficiency	<ul> <li>Residential 5-star NatHERs rating.</li> <li>Non-Residential - Building Code of Australia Section J compliant.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Residential 6-star NatHERs (approximately 70 MJ/m²/year of heating and cooling demand).</li> <li>Non-Residential - 30% improvement in building thermal demand, equivalent to approximately 300 MJ/m² /year of heating and cooling demand.</li> </ul>	• As per Demand Side Strategies			
Appliance + Fixture Efficiency	<ul> <li>3-star energy refrigerator</li> <li>1.5-star energy clothes dryer</li> <li>2-star energy clothes washer</li> <li>2.5-star energy dishwasher</li> <li>2-star WELS clothes washer</li> <li>2.5-star WELS dishwasher</li> <li>3-star WELS showerhead, toilet and tap-ware</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5-star energy refrigerator and clothes dryer</li> <li>5-star energy clothes washer</li> <li>4-star energy dishwasher</li> <li>4.5-star WELS clothes washer</li> <li>4-star WELS dishwasher</li> <li>3-star WELS showerhead</li> <li>4-star WELS toilet</li> <li>5-star WELS tap-ware</li> </ul>	• As per Demand Side Strategies			
Irrigation	• Standard practice irrigation demand, equivalent to approximately 0.60 kL/m <sup>2</sup> of irrigated area per year.	• A 30% improvement in irrigation water demand, through drip irrigation or equivalent, equating to approximately 0.40 kL/m <sup>2</sup> of irrigated area/year.	• As per Demand Side Strategies			
Lighting	• Standard non-residential lighting (largely fluorescent lighting fixtures at approximately 50-65 lumens per watt)	• 30% reduction in non-residential lighting electricity consumption through T5 fluorescent and LED lighting fixtures (80-90 lumens per watt).	• As per Demand Side Strategies			
Residential Hot Water	Gas storage	Solar gas boost	See Trigeneration			
Trigeneration	Not applicable	Not applicable	• 10 MWe centralised system supply residential hot water, and non-residential heating, cooling and hot water			
Solar	Not applicable	Not applicable	Potential for 20,000 m2 of solar thermal or solar PV			

Strategy	Business as Usual Specification	Demand Side Strategies	Demand + Supply Side Strategies
Recycled water	Not applicable	Not applicable	• Rainwater + stormwater harvesting for toilet flushing, laundry and irrigation of open space and playing fields (estimated collection tank of 3,900 m3).
Public transport	<ul> <li>Mode: Train</li> <li>Average distance to service: 400 m</li> <li>Average peak frequency of service: 8 min</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Mode: Light Rail</li> <li>Average distance to service: 200 m</li> <li>Average peak frequency of service: 4 min</li> </ul>	As per Demand Side Strategies
Residential car parking	• 1.25 car park spaces per dwelling	• 0.7 car park spaces per dwelling	No change

**Table 1:** Summary of proposed strategies for the Canning City Centre

## Introduction

Kinesis has been engaged by Canning City Council to quantify the energy, water and overall sustainability performance of the Canning City Centre Structure Plan. This analysis is being undertaken using C<sup>CAP</sup> Precinct.

Originally built by Kinesis for Landcom and now licensed by a number of government land development agencies around Australia, C<sup>CAP</sup> Precinct is an award winning mathematical tool that models key environmental, financial and affordability indicators for precinct-scale development projects.

## CCAP Precinct Workshop

Sustainability analysis of the Canning City Centre Structure Plan was undertaken at a workshop between Kinesis, energy utilities and the City of Canning on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2012. At the workshop, two stages of intervention were explored to mitigate the increase in resource consumption across the site:

- **Demand side strategies**, incorporating energy and water efficiencies, improved building thermal performance and household travel mode shift through lower parking rates and improved public transport access.
- Supply side strategies, incorporating solar energy, trigeneration and water recycling.

The modelled results for the demand and supply sides strategies contained in this report are compared to the following **benchmarks**:

- **Existing**: the performance of the existing development in the Canning City Centre development area.
- **Business As Usual (BAU)**: the performance of new development proposed for the Canning City Centre development area built to regulatory compliance. This scenario was established in consultation with the participants at the C<sup>CAP</sup> Precinct Workshop.
- **Metropolitan Average**: average transport, energy and water consumption profiles of existing residents in the Perth Metropolitan Area.

Following this workshop, analysis was refined and a recommended set of sustainability strategies was developed for two scenarios:

This report is supported by:

**Appendix 1** – C<sup>CAP</sup> Precinct Report is a record of the modelling which details the inputs, technology selections and results of the reference and modelled scenario.

Appendix 2 – Qualification and Key Data Sources used within CCAP Precinct.



## **Precinct Details**

The Canning City Centre Structure Plan proposes an additional 12,198 dwellings and 242,336 m2 of non-residential floor space connecting the Cannington railway station to the Canning Civic Centre in Cannington, WA. The details of the development and built form were provided by Canning City Council and refined with updated information at the C<sup>CAP</sup> Precinct workshop (Table 2).

PROPOSED CANNING CITY CENTRE



Figure 1: Canning City Centre Structure Plan

### PRECINCT DETAILS

Land Use	Existing	Additional	Final
Total Precinct - ha	332.5	332.5	332.5
Residential dwellings - dwellings			
Detached	1,530*	1,449	2,979
Multi-unit	0	10,749	10,749
Total Residential dwellings	1,530	12,198	13,728
Non-residential floor space – m²			
Manufacturing, Storage, and Utilities	58,360	8,880	67,240
Service Industry	22,940	8,270	31,210
Shop Retail	116,740	60,000	176,740
Other Retail	48,450	19,630	68,080
Office Business	62,430	80,510	142,940
Health, Welfare and Community Services	8,750	40,110	48,860
Entertainment, Recreation and Culture	11,130	19,000	30,130
Hotel and Serviced Apartments	2,530	7,580	10,110
Car Park	208,000	-1,600	206,400
Total Non-Residential Floor Space	539,330	242,380	781,710

**Table 2:** Precinct details for the Canning City Centre

\*Note: Exiting dwelling numbers include a small proportion of multi-unit and attached dwellings; however, the City was unable to disaggregate this figure. For the purposes of this report, existing dwellings were assumed to be detached.



## **Performance Summary**

The Canning City Centre Structure Plan was compared to the existing resource demands from the existing buildings within the Canning City Centre development area.

Suburb level data provided by Western Power and ATCO gas was calibrated with existing dwellings and floor space information provided by the City of Canning. This metered data provided a basis for the estimate of existing electricity, gas and water consumption across the site (see Table 3).

The resource consumption implications of the Canning City Centre Structure Plan was analysed under a Business as Usual (or building code compliant) scenario before sustainability strategies were explored.

The **Business as Usual** and **Workshop Scenarios** represent an agreed set of strategies for the Canning City Centre through discussions and analysis undertaken at the C<sup>CAP</sup> Precinct workshop between Canning City Council, key utility stakeholders and Kinesis on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2012.

Two stages of intervention were explored in the **Workshop Scenarios** with the City of Canning to mitigate the increase in resource consumption across the site:

- **Demand side strategies**, incorporating energy and water efficiencies, improved building thermal performance and household travel mode shift through lower parking rates and improved public transport access.
- Supply side strategies, incorporating solar energy, trigeneration and water recycling.

The key results of these scenarios are outlined Table 3.

			Workshop Scenarios		
Key Metric	Existing	Business as Usual	Demand Side Strategies	Demand + Supply Strategies	
ENERGY					
Total precinct CO2 - tCO2-e/year	51,000	139,000	105,000	77,000	
Reduction against BAU	-	-	25%	45%	
Total precinct electricity demand - MWh/year	51,000	138,000	108,000	46,000	
Total precinct gas demand - GJ/year	76,000	279,000	148,000	652,000	
Total precinct peak electricity demand kW	23,000	60,000	45,000	31,000	
Residential CO2 - tCO2-e/year	14,000	78,000	54,000	51,000	
Residential peak electricity demand - kW/dwelling	n/a	2.8	2.0	2.0	

### SUMMARY OF SUSTAINABILTY PERFORMANCE

			Workshop Scenarios			
Key Metric	Existing	Business as Usual	Demand Side Strategies	Demand + Supply Strategies		
WATER						
Total precinct water demand - ML/year	900	2,400	1,880	1550		
Reduction against BAU	-	-	21%	35%		
Residential consumption – ML/year	300	1,390	1,220	960		
Non-Residential consumption – ML/year	600	1,010	670	600		
Stormwater discharge - ML/year	1,050	1,860	1,510	0		
Sewer discharge - ML/year	640	1,860	1,510	2,670		
TRANSPORT						
Residential CO2 - tCO2-e/year	-	54,000	49,000	49,000		
Reduction against BAU	-	-	11%	11%		
Vehicle Kilometres Travelled - km/person/day	-	18	16	16		
AFFORDABILITY						
Energy, water + transport - \$/household/year	\$24,100	\$16,500	\$14,500	\$14,500		
Reduction against BAU	-	-	12%	12%		

Table 3: Key Results for the existing, BAU and Workshop Scenarios explored for the Canning City Centre.

## Energy

The existing residential dwellings and non-residential floor space within the Canning City Centre are estimated to consume 51,000 MWh of electricity and 76,000 MJ of gas, equivalent to 51,000 tonnes of CO2-e.

Under a **Business as Usual** scenario, the development growth outlined in the Canning City Centre Structure Plan is estimated to increase:

- Greenhouse gas emission by 178% to 139,000 tonnes CO2-e/year
- Electricity consumption by 170% to 138,000 MWh/year
- Peak electricity consumption by **154% to 60,000 kW**
- Gas consumption by **268% to 279,000 MJ/year**

## Workshop Scenario Analysis

Reductions in energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions were explored through the following strategies:

## **Demand Side Strategies:**

- Improvements in thermal efficiency
- The inclusion of energy efficient appliances
- Better building fabric
- Gas storage hot water system to solar boost hot water system

## **Supply Side Strategies:**

- Trigeneration for heating, cooling and hot water
- Solar thermal or solar PV

Compared to the **Business as Usual** scenario, these strategies are estimated to achieve:

- 45% reduction in precinct GHG emissions
- 49% reduction peak electricity demand



### GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

**Figure 2:** Estimated greenhouse gas emissions from the Business as Usual, Demand Side and Supply Side scenarios compared to the existing Canning City Centre.



# The individual and cumulative impact of each technology modelled for the Canning City Centre is shown in Figure 3. The details of each of these strategies are outlined below.



#### EMISSION REDUCTIONS - SUPPLY + DEMAND SIDE WORKSHOP SCENARIO

**Figure 3:** The individual and cumulative impact of each emission reduction strategy for the Canning City Centre compared to the Business as Usual scenario.

#### **Demand Side Strategies**

Demand side energy efficiency strategies proposed in the development have been achieved through both improved thermal design and the incorporation of energy efficient appliances. Specifically, these strategies include:

- A 30% improvement in non-residential building.
- A 30% reduction in non-residential lighting electricity consumption through the provision of T5 fluorescent and LED lighting fixtures (80-90 lumens per watt).
- Residential building thermal efficiency from 5-star to 6-star NatHERs (approximately 70 MJ/m<sup>2</sup>/year of heating and cooling demand).
- Installation of the following energy efficient appliances in each residential dwelling:
  - 5-star energy refrigerator
  - 5-star energy clothes dryer
  - 5-star energy clothes washer
  - 4-star energy dishwasher

Demand side strategies alone contribute to a 25% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions compared to the **Business as Usual** scenario.

The implementation of these demand side strategies are achieved through building design specifications or performance requirements that meet the demand reduction results outlined in this scenario.

## **Supply Side Strategies**

To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the demand on the local electricity grid, a distributed **trigeneration system** was modelled with the connected loads of residential hot water and non-residential heating, cooling and hot water.

A 10  $MW_e$  trigeneration plant was sized based on the electrical load of the connected residential and non-residential floor space (see Figure 4). This means that the plant is designed to meet the electrical, rather than thermal load. This sizing strategy was adopted to ensure no net annual electrical energy was exported outside the study area and that, in effect, the trigenerated electricity was consumed within the precinct where it can be sold at economic peak and shoulder rates. This system is estimated to:

- Reduces greenhouse gas emissions 28,000 tonnes CO2-e,
- Meet an annual building thermal demand of 126,000 GJ; and
- Generate 55,000 MWh of low carbon electricity.

The high and inconsistent peak thermal load of residential space conditioning means that to size the trigeneration plant to meet these loads would require an additional 4 MW of trigeneration plant to meet an average residential heating and cooling load. As a result, this solution was not proposed for the Canning City Centre.

**Solar thermal** was explored to provide boost heat energy to the trigeneration system (see Figure 4). A solar thermal system of approximately  $20,000 \text{ m}^2$  of roof space (equivalent to approximately 5% of the total precinct roof space) would save an additional 3,900 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions each year, or a 3% reduction compared to the Business as Usual scenario.

Due to the high capital cost associated with solar thermal (see Marginal Capital Cost section), **solar PV** was explored as an alternative. Covering the same area (20,000 m<sup>2</sup> or approximately 2.8 MW) of roof space with solar PV would save an additional 4,600 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions each year, or a 4% reduction compared to the Business as Usual scenario.



### TRIGENERATION + SOLAR THERMAL

Figure 4: Energy inputs and outputs of a trigeneration system



**Geothermal** was also explored as a substitute for the heat generated by the trigeneration plant. This is equivalent to approximately  $6 \text{ MW}_{\text{heat}}$  from a geothermal bore with temperatures sufficient to drive an absorption chiller (approximately 90-95 degrees).

Substituting trigeneration with geothermal energy removes the low carbon electricity generated by the trigeneration plant. This additional electricity demand can be met through increased solar PV generation. However, approximately 21 MW of solar PV (equivalent to 150,000 m2 of panel area) will be required to achieve an equivalent greenhouse gas emission reduction from the trigeneration plant configuration outlined above at an additional cost of between \$60 million to \$100 million.

A combination of the above renewable and low carbon technologies should be explored further once the potential (bore size, depth and temperatures available) for geothermal is established. In addition, the technologies proposed for the Canning City Centre were sized to ensure no net annual electrical energy was exported outside the study area. Investigation of exporting electricity to the broader Canning City Centre and beyond should be discussed alongside electricity network considerations.

## Westfield Carousel

The Westfield Carousel contributes to 12% of the existing floor space within the Canning City Centre. In addition, Westfield Carousel is proposing to expand its floor space to approximately 180,000 m2, equivalent to nearly 30% of total floor space and associated building greenhouse gas emissions across the site.

The proposed growth of Westfield provides a significant opportunity to embed low carbon demand side efficiency and supply side strategies to reduce the energy demand and greenhouse gas emissions of the Canning City Centre Structure Plan.

The floor space of the proposed development growth to the Westfield Carousel building was modelled in order to understand the individual contribution of Westfield to meet the overall energy and greenhouse gas emission targets for the Canning City Centre.

- **Trigeneration**: Westfield Carousel will contribute 2.3 MWe of the total trigeneration plant proposed for the Canning City Centre.
- **Solar**: The roof area of Westfield Carousel is estimated to be 50,000 m2, with adequate space to house the 20,000 m2 solar thermal boost or solar PV proposed for the Canning City Centre.

## Water

The existing residential dwellings and non-residential floor space within the Canning City Centre are estimated to consume 900 ML of water. Currently, 24% of this water consumption is outdoor irrigation demand.

Under a **Business as Usual** scenario, the development growth outlined in the Canning City Centre Structure Plan is estimated to increase total water consumption by 168% to 2,400 ML/year.

Under the Canning City Centre Structure Plan, a majority of water consumption (84%) will be indoor water demand due to the high density urban form proposed for the site.

## Workshop Scenario Analysis

Reductions in water consumption were explored through the following strategies:

### **Demand Side Strategies:**

- Best practice residential fixture efficiency
- Best practice residential appliance efficiency
- High efficiency non-residential water profile

### **Supply Side Strategies:**

• The collection and reuse of stormwater or recycled water for irrigation and indoor uses.

Compared to the **Business as Usual** scenario, these strategies are estimated to achieve a 35% reduction in total water consumption.



### WATER CONSUMPTION

**Figure 5:** Estimated water consumption from the Business as Usual, Demand Side and Supply Side scenarios compared to the existing Canning City Centre.



The individual and cumulative impact of each technology modelled for the Canning City Centre is shown in Figure 6. The details of each of these strategies are outlined below.



WATER REDUCTIONS - SUPPLY + DEMAND SIDE WORKSHOP SCENARIO

**Figure 6:** The individual and cumulative impact of each water reduction strategy for the Canning City Centre compared to the Business as Usual scenario.

#### **Trigeneration Water Demand**

It should be noted that **trigeneration** consumes high levels of water associated with heat rejection and cooling. The proposed 10  $MW_e$  trigeneration system is estimated to consume approximately 110 ML of water per year, equivalent to a 5% increase in water consumption (Figure 6).

#### **Demand Side Strategies**

Demand side energy efficiency strategies proposed in the development have been achieved through both improved thermal design and the incorporation of energy efficient appliances. Specifically, these strategies include:

- A 30% improvement in irrigation water demand, equivalent to approximately 0.18 kL/m<sup>2</sup> of irrigated area per year.
- Installation of the following water efficient appliances in each residential dwelling:
  - 4-star WELS toilet
  - 3-star WELS showerhead
  - 5-star WELS tapware
  - 4-star WELS dishwasher
  - 4.5-star WELS clothes washer

The implementation of these demand side strategies are achieved through building design specifications that meet the requirements outlined above.



Demand side strategies alone contribute to a 23% reduction in water consumption compared to the **Business as Usual** scenario.

### **Supply Side Strategies**

### **Rainwater and Stormwater**

Roof, road and infrastructure surfaces can be drawn on for rainwater and stormwater harvesting, both at the individual building as well as at the community scale.

A rainwater and stormwater harvesting system was configured to capture 100% of the surface water runoff across the site in a central or a series of distributed collection tanks to provide water for residential and public open space irrigation as well as internal toilet and laundry uses. This system is estimated to reduce water consumption by 410 ML per year.

Due to the climate and rainfall pattern in Perth (low summer rainfall and high winter rainfall), a stormwater collection tank of 39,000 m3 is required to provide adequate storage to meet the nominated demands. Despite this significant stormwater collection tank size, the stormwater system will be required to draw on mains scheme water during the summer months when rainfall is low and outdoor water demand is high (see Figure 7).



### STORMWATER SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

Figure 7: The water inflows and outflows of the proposed stormwater system for the Canning City Centre

## Transport

Located 12 km from the Perth CBD and immediately adjacent to the Cannington Railway Station, the Canning City Centre has a significant opportunity to become a low car-use precinct.

Under a **Business as Usual** scenario, private vehicle use and associated greenhouse gas emissions is expected to be **11% lower than the Perth Metropolitan average** at approximately **18** km per person per day.

The **Workshop Scenario** incorporates light rail through the City Centre along Cecil Ave. While the improvements to frequency and location of public transport provided by the light rail do not significantly reduce car use, this strategy should be viewed as the leverage to achieve the high density urban form, land use mix and low parking rates that achieve the low car-use objectives of the site. Under this scenario, private vehicle use and associated greenhouse gas emissions is expected to be **21% lower than the Perth Metropolitan average.** 

In addition, low parking rates contribute to increased household affordability due the savings attributed to the costs of purchasing a parking space, and the purchase, registration and insurance costs of owning and operating a vehicle (see Affordability, Figure 9). The transport parameters adopted for the **Business as Usual** and **Workshop Scenarios** are listed in Table 6 and the modelled results are provided in Figure 8.

VariableBusiness as UsualModel (Efficiency & Efficiency + Supply)Land Use Mix (0-1 rating)0.70.7Precinct employmentApproximately 10,480 jobsApproximately 10,480 jobsCar Parking Rates2 car space per detached dwelling 1.25 car space per multi-unit dwelling0.7 car space per multi-unit dwellingPublic transport accessNearest major transport node: 400m Weekday peak frequency: 8 minsNearest major transport node: 200m Wode: Light Rail			
Land Use Mix (0-1 rating)0.70.7Precinct employmentApproximately 10,480 jobsApproximately 10,480 jobsCar Parking Rates2 car space per detached dwelling2 car space per detached dwellingPublic transport accessNearest major transport node: 400mNearest major transport node: 200mMode: TrainMode: Light Rail	Variable	Business as Usual	Model (Efficiency & Efficiency + Supply)
Precinct employmentApproximately 10,480 jobsApproximately 10,480 jobsCar Parking Rates2 car space per detached dwelling 1.25 car space per multi-unit dwelling2 car space per detached dwelling 0.7 car space per multi-unit dwellingPublic transport accessNearest major transport node: 400m Weekday peak frequency: 8 minsNearest major transport node: 200m 	Land Use Mix (0-1 rating)	0.7	0.7
Car Parking Rates       2 car space per detached dwelling       2 car space per detached dwelling         1.25 car space per multi-unit dwelling       0.7 car space per multi-unit dwelling         Public transport access       Nearest major transport node: 400m       Nearest major transport node: 200m         Weekday peak frequency: 8 mins       Weekday peak frequency: 4 mins         Mode: Train       Mode: Light Rail	Precinct employment	Approximately 10,480 jobs	Approximately 10,480 jobs
Public transport access       Nearest major transport node: 400m       Nearest major transport node: 200m         Weekday peak frequency: 8 mins       Weekday peak frequency: 4 mins         Mode: Train       Mode: Light Rail	Car Parking Rates	2 car space per detached dwelling	2 car space per detached dwelling
inout man	Public transport access	Nearest major transport node: 400m Weekday peak frequency: 8 mins Mode: Train	Nearest major transport node: 200m Weekday peak frequency: 4 mins Mode: Light Rail

### KEY TRANSPORT VARIABLES

Table 6: Transport parameters used to calculate the car use of Canning City Centre residents



#### **REDUCTIONS IN CAR USE**

**Figure 8:** Estimated Vehicle Kilometres Travelled (VKT) per person per day for the Business as Usual and Workshop scenarios compared to the Perth Metropolitan Average



## **Operational Affordability**

The Workshop Scenario outlined in this report achieves a **24% reduction in energy, water and transport household operational costs** against the Perth Metropolitan average (Figure 9).

The affordability implications of the sustainability measures are reflected in the indicative household operating costs from energy, water and transport. Household expenditure includes electricity, gas, thermal, mains water and recycled water costs (excluding sewerage charges). Fixed costs such as service usage and meter costs were excluded as these do not tend to differ from the Business as Usual scenario. The costs of vehicle ownership and use (including financing, registration, maintenance and fuel) were also included in the analysis.

The average Australian household spends approximately 18% of total household expenditure on energy, water and transport costs. At 16% of total yearly household expenditure, transport costs are the third highest costs behind housing (18%) and food (17%)<sup>1</sup>.

While the development's land use mix and proximity to public transport have both influenced household expenditure on transport, the greatest reduction in this area has come from lowering the average rate of vehicle ownership. Through limited parking space availability and the implementation of on street parking controls, the Canning City Centre can achieve **household transport savings of 26%**. Due to the magnitude of transport expenditure relative to other household costs, this saving is largely responsible for the overall increase in household affordability.



### HOUSEHOLD COSTS

**Figure 9:** Estimated transport, energy and water costs for residents in Canning City Centre compared to the Perth Metropolitan Average

<sup>1</sup>ABS Household Expenditure Survey, Australia: Summary of Results, 2009-10



## Marginal capital costs

The marginal capital costs (i.e. marginal costs above the Business as Usual scenario) for the sustainability features outlined in the **Workshop Scenario** are estimated to be approximately **\$90 million** or **\$36 per m**<sup>2</sup> of constructed floor area.

The estimated marginal capital cost of \$8.5 million for trigeneration includes the capital costs over and above the cost of providing individual building and dwelling heating, cooling and hot water systems. It accounts for the 10  $MW_e$  cogeneration primary plant, heat driven chiller for non-residential buildings, thermal pipe network and connection costs (see Figure 8 and Table 7).

Costs associated with solar thermal and solar were not included in the sustainability performance and are therefore not listed in the figure or table below. The 20,000 m<sup>2</sup> solar thermal system analysed to supplement the trigeneration system has a capital cost of approximately \$37 million. It should be noted that while solar thermal was included to make best use of the roof space for solar energy and supplement the trigeneration system, the significant marginal capital cost may preclude the use of this technology in the Canning City Centre. The 2.8 MW Solar PV system alternative, on the other hand, has a capital cost of approximately \$7 million.

The rainwater and stormwater recycling system specified for the Canning City Centre is estimated to cost approximately \$10 million, equivalent to approximately \$15/kL of treated wastewater. With a range of wastewater treatment technologies available, the final figure will depend significantly on the chosen system.



CAPITAL COST CONTRIBUTIONS

Figure 8: Estimated marginal capital costs of proposed energy and water strategies in Stage 1

Technical specifications for each of the technology listed in Figure 8 are discussed in the Energy and Water sections above. Details of the marginal capital costs are listed in Table 7.



Proposed Strategy	Marginal Capital \$	Total Capital \$
Residential NatHERS (6-star NatHERs dwellings)	\$4,500,000	-
Residential Energy Appliances (4-5 star appliances)	\$13,000,000	-
Residential Space Heating + Cooling (5-star systems)	\$19,400,000	-
Non-Residential Lighting (80-90 lumins/watt)	\$5,000,000	-
Non-Residential Building Fabric (300 MJ/m2)	\$20,000,000	-
Trigeneration (10 MWe, including plant + thermal pipe network)*	\$8,300,000	\$20,000,000
Residential Water Fixtures (3-4 WELS tap fittings)	\$860,000	-
Residential Water Appliances (4-5 WELS appliances)	\$9,100,000	-
Non-Residential Water Efficiency	\$120,000	-
Rainwater + Stormwater Reuse (For irrigation, toilet + laundry)	\$9,900,000	\$9,900,000
TOTAL MARGINAL CAPITAL COST	\$90,180,000	

**Table 7:** Estimated costs of proposed energy and water strategies in the Canning City Centre under the Workshop Scenario

\* The marginal capital cost is lower than the total capital cost to reflect the cost savings from installing individual hot water, heating and cooling systems

The modelled marginal capital costs for the sustainability features included in this analysis were estimated based on Kinesis's project experience and available data from published economic assessments. The estimated costs accord with the size and scale of the energy and water sustainability measures included in the analysis.

## Appendix 1: CCAP Precinct Report

## SUSTAINABILITY REPORT

PROJECT NAME

Canning City Centre

Produced by Kinesis on 6 August 2012

MAIN v4.04, Embodied GHG v4.3, Energy v4.02, Water v4.13, Transport v4.02

#### **KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (COMPARISON TO BAU)**



#### PRECINCT DETAILS

The section below outlines the key elements of the modelled precinct that have been entered into C<sup>CAD</sup> Precinct. More details regarding the allocation of floor space between non-residential and mixed use precincts as well as specific dwelling types can be found in the Precinct module of the tool.

PROJECT LOCATION	Canning CC FINAL	]	
CLIMATE			
NatHERS Zone	13		
Rainfall	705 mm		
Evaporation	2,079 mm		
TOTAL PRECINCT AREA	333 ha	Total Residential Dwellings	
		Detached	2.979 dwellings
Non-Developable Area		Attached	0 dwellings
- Riparian Zone	25.0 ha	Multi-unit	10,749 dwellings
Conservation Woodlands	5.5 ha	Total	13,728 dwellings
Other Non-Developable Area	8.5 ha		
Total Non-Developable Area	<b>39.0</b> ha	Total Non-residential Floor Spa	ce
		Commercial/Office	142,940 m2
Developable Area		Retail	285,060 m2
Non-Residential Precinct	191.2 ha	Medical	9,772 m2
Mixed-Use Precinct	0.0 ha	Light Industrial	98,450 m2
Residential Precinct	102.3 ha	Education	39,088 m2
Total Developable Area	<b>293.5</b> ha	Community	0 m2
		Total	<b>575,310</b> m2
Road Area	<b>71.8</b> ha		
Open Space			
Playing Fields	9.9 ha		
Parks & Public Gardens	13.5 ha		
Native Parklands/Reserves	5.5 ha		
Public Plazas	0.8 ha		
Total	29.7 ha		



#### ENERGY

The Energy module of C<sup>GP</sup> Precinct uses local climate data to model the predicted energy loads and consumption of a building. In doing this, it provides the user with a full set of opportunities for exploring energy efficiency, renewable energy generation and combined cooling, heat and power initiatives.

Gas and electricity use of the precinct, as well as a full account of the precinct's thermal loads in the form of residential and non-residential water heating, space heating and space cooling demands, are calculated and reported below

The Energy module also provides information relating to the interaction of the precinct with the grid. Peak power demand and the quantity and timing of any exported electrical power are examples of information that is able to be provided by the model to assist with the economic feasibility of any scenario.

The graph on the right of the results below shows the per person greenhouse gas emissions from all sources within the precinct. Any emissions below the line indicate generated or exported low carbon or renewable energy.

#### ENERGY RESULTS

KEY RESULT 1 45% better in greenhouse gas emissions compared to the reference development

	M	odel		Refe	rence
	Elec - MWh	Gas - GJ		Elec - MWh	Gas - GJ
Annual Precinct Energy Import	45,945	651,986	[ [	137,875	278,795
Annual Precinct Energy Export	815	0		0	0
Net Annual Precinct Energy Demand	45,130	651,986		137,875	278,795
Annual Precinct GHG Emissions	76,511	t(CO2)/yr		138,962	t(CO2)/yr
Water supply, treatment & pumping	9,881	t(CO2)/yr		6,236	t(CO2)/yr
Annual Residential GHG Emissions	51,112	t(CO2)/yr		77,739	t(CO2)/yr
-	1,978	kg(CO2)/(person	.yr)	3,009	kg(CO2)/(person.
Reduction against state benchmark (eg BASIX)	23%	1	,		•

#### ENERGY INPUTS

#### EFFICIENCY

EFFICIENCY	Detached		Attached		Multi			Non-Residential
Thermal comfort	5.0	5.0			6.0	6.0		n/a
Appliances	Std Practice		Std Practice		Best Practice			n/a
Hot water	Gas Storage		Gas Storage		District Hot Wate	er		cogeneration - all
Heating	2 Star 1-phase R	C Air Con	2 Star 1-phase	RC Air Con	5 Star 1-phase R	C Air Con		cogeneration - all
Cooling	2 Star 1-phase Ai	r Con	2 Star 1-phase	Air Con	5 Star 1-phase Ai	ir Con		cogeneration - all
RENEWABLE ENERGY								
Private Solar PV	0	kW peak	0	kW peak	0	kW peak		
Community Solar PV	0	kW peak						
TRIGENERATION				SOLAR THEF	RMAL			
Cogen electrical size	10,000	kW peak		Solar Thermal C	ollector Area - m2	20,000		
Annual electricity generation	54,750	MWh		Solar-Thermal ene	ergy use efficiency	n/a		
Cogen electrical efficiency (HHV)	41%							
Cogen fuel use efficiency	67%							



#### WATER

The Water module of C<sup>LAP</sup> Precinct quantifies mains potable and alternative water demands of a precinct and provides opportunities to explore end-use efficiencies, rain/storm water harvesting and water recycling. Responding to housing form and occupancy, the efficiency of water appliances and fixtures, the choice of cooling system, ambient temperatures and the rainfall (in the case of irrigation), the demands quantified by the Water model are able to be met by a user-selectable range of reuse or water harvest measures. These comprise:

Private rain tanks of user specifiable size, connectable to a specifiable fraction of the dwelling roof
 Community recycled water supply that can be configured for collection of greywater, sewer, stormwater runoff or roof water from residences and/or non-residences
 An off-site recycled water supply

The Water results and inputs used to achieve the results are provided below.

#### WATER RESULTS

KEY RESULT 1 35% better in water consumption compared to the reference develop

### CONSUMPTION RESULTS

ONSUMPTION RESULTS				DISCHARGE RESULTS				
	Model		Reference		Stormwater		Sewer	
Total Mains Water - ML/yr	1,554		2,397		volume	max rate	volume	max rate
Residential Mains Water - ML/yr	955		1,390		ML/yr	kL/hr	ML/yr	kL/hr
Non-Residential Mains Water - ML/yr	599		1,007	Discharge quantities	0	0	2,666	52,221
per resident - kL/(pers.yr)	37		54	•				
Residential reduction against metropolitan average	70%		·•		TSS	TP	TN	GP
				Stormwater Pollutants - kg/yr	0	0	0	0
Total energy for water supply	11,027	MWh/yr	6,960	MWh/yr concentration - mg/L	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

#### WATER INPUTS

EFFICIENCY	Detached	Attached	Multi
efficient irrigation?	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
fixture efficiency	Std Practice	Std Practice	Best Practice
appliance efficiency	Std Practice	Std Practice	Best Practice

#### RAINWATER TANKS

	Detached	Attached	Multi
connected fraction of total roof area	100%	100%	100%
tank size multiplier (beyond BASIX)	1.0	1.0	1.0
garden	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
toilet	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
laundry	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
hot water	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
volume of all model tanks - kL	0	0	0
model raintank harvests - kL/yr	0	0	-0

#### COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY

Existing Recycled Water Supply 0 L/(hh.day) or Residential

TRUE

TRUE

FALSE

volume ML/yr

1,565

659

1,158

252

Non-Residential TRUE

0 kL/day

Proposed treated water end use IR + toilet/laundry (TL) Scheme supply coverage residential + non-residential

Non-Residential Efficiency high efficiency

Reservoir capacity for scheme - m3 groundwater recharge

Max inflow rate - L/s

GPT

FALSE

0

CDS FALSE

Stormwater Treatment		
Stormwater detention system capacity	0	m3
Max primary treatment flow rate	0	m/s

Spill/exce

Potable top-up

**Community Water Supply** 

all internal wastewater

Treated water available for u

Demand placed on schem

rainwater stormwate

Stormwater treatment measures?

TRUE

FALSE max rate

kL/hr

52,002

352

51,902

#### 23

#### TRANSPORT

The Transport module of C<sup>CAP</sup> Precinct draws the key spatial, land use and socio-demographic variables to assess the transport greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle hours travelled. These key variables include land use mix (walkability), housing density, local employment, distance to regional centre, walk and wait time to the nearest high frequency public transport and household vehicle ownership. Fre these variables the Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the precinct - Transport greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents within the greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel from residents associated with travel from residents as a second because a second because as a second because associated with travel from residents as a second because as a second be . nership. From

Vehicle kilometres travelled
 Vehicle hours travelled

The land use and locational variables and associated Transport results are provided below.

#### TRANSPORT RESULTS



TRANSPORT INPUTS



#### FINANCIAL ANALYSIS + AFFORDABILITY

The Affordability module of C<sup>CAP</sup> Precinct draws on the inputs and results from the Energy, Water and Transport modules as well as current utility retail prices and transport related costs to quantify the on-going costs associated with living in the modelled precinct. In addition, it provides an estimate of net capital costs associated with each sustainability measure selected in the tool.

The household affordability and financial results are provided below.

AFFORDABILITY RESULTS

KEY RESULT	1	10% better	in household expenditure (\$) compared to residents
			in average new development across the Metropolitan area

#### HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE

	Model	Reference	Metro Ave	average across all dwelling types
\$/yea	\$0	\$0	\$0	Feed-in tariff
\$/yea	\$225	\$225	\$225	Energy fixed costs
\$/yea	\$908	\$873	\$873	Water fixed costs
\$/yea	\$1,037	\$1,362	\$1,445	Energy variable costs
\$/yea	\$107	\$124	\$300	Water variable costs
\$/yea	\$9,832	\$10,792	\$13,406	Transport fixed costs
\$/yea	\$2,607	\$2,918	\$3,291	Transport variable costs
\$/yea	\$14,717	\$16,294	\$19,540	TOTAL
-				

#### MARGINAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Energy	Investor marginal	capex over 1 years	
R NatHERS	\$4,500,000	\$330	per dwelling
R Energy Appliances	\$13,000,000	\$940	per dwelling
R Hot Water	\$0	\$0	per dwelling
R Space Heating	\$9,700,000	\$700	per dwelling
R Space Cooling	\$9,700,000	\$700	per dwelling
R Solar PV	\$0	\$0	per dwelling
R Street Lighting	\$0	\$0	per dwelling
NR Lighting	\$5,000,000	\$6	per m2
NR Building Fabric	\$20,000,000	\$26	per m2
NR Hot Water	\$0	\$0	per m2
NR Space Heating	\$0	\$0	per m2
NR Space Cooling	\$0	\$0	per m2
NR Street Lighting	\$56,000	\$0	per m2
Cogeneration	\$8,300,000		-
Community Solar PV	\$7,000,000		
Community Wind	\$0		
Solar Thermal	\$0		
Geothermal	\$0		
TOTAL	\$77,256,000		
Water	Investor marginal	capey over 1 years	

Water

	Investor marginal capex over 1 years		
R Irrigation	\$0	\$0	per dwelling
R Water Fixtures	\$860,000	\$63	per dwelling
R Water Appliances	\$9,100,000	\$670	per dwelling
NR Water Efficiency	\$120,000	\$0	per m2
R Raintanks	\$0	\$0	per dwelling
Recycled Water Supply	\$9,900,000		•
TOTAL	\$19,980,000		

END OF REPORT.

kinesis.org

## Appendix 2: Qualifications and Data Sources

This report and the information generated in the workshop on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2012 are provided subject to some important assumptions and qualifications:

- The results presented in this report are modelled estimates using mathematical calculations and are based solely on the activities conducted at the workshop and information provided by Canning City Council. The data, information and scenarios presented in this report have not been separately confirmed or verified. Accordingly the results should be considered to be preliminary in nature and subject to such confirmation and verification.
- Energy, water and greenhouse consumption estimates are based on local climate and utility data available to the consultant at the time of the report. These consumption demands are, where necessary, quantified in terms of primary energy and water consumptions using manufacturer's data and scientific principles.
- Transport results are based on a travel regression model that draws on the key land use, location and demographic variables to determine a best estimate for residential vehicle use. Associated greenhouse gas emissions are calculated using representative private and public vehicle emissions data from a range of sources.
- Cost estimates provided in this report are indicative only based on Kinesis's project experience and available data from published economic assessments.
- The Kinesis software tool and results generated by it are not intended to be used as the sole or primary basis for making investment or financial decisions (including carbon credit trading decisions). Accordingly, the results set out in this report should not be relied on as the sole or primary source of information applicable to such decisions.

Key data sources referenced in this analysis include:

- 1. Bureau of Meteorology local rainfall, temperature and evaporation data
- 2. Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism, 2010, Energy in Australia 2010, ABARE, Canberra
- 3. National Water Commission, 2011, National performance report 2009-2010: urban water utilities, National Water Commission, Canberra
- 4. Department of Infrastructure and Transport, 2011, Road vehicle kilometres travelled: estimations from state and territory fuel sales, Australian Government, Canberra
- 5. Australian Greenhouse Office (2010) National GHG Accounts Workbook, July
- 6. Energy Use in the Australian Residential Sector, 1986 2020, Australian Government Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEHWA), 2008.
- 7. Energy Efficient Strategies (2009), Appliance Energy Consumption in Australia: Equations for Appliance Star Ratings
- 8. Building Code of Australia (2007) Energy Efficiency Requirements in Commercial Buildings
- 9. Transport Data Centre (2006) The Development of a Sydney VKT Regression Model
- 10. ABS (2010) 'Household Expenditure Survey, Australia: Summary of Results', catalogue number 65300DO001\_200910, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra.
- 11. SimaPro Life Cycle Analysis Australian materials data sets where available.
- 12. Lawson, B (1996) Building Materials Energy and the Environment, Appendix B, Embodied Energy Tables.

kinesis.org

- 14. CSIRO (2009) 'Intelligent grid: a value proposition for distributed energy in Australia', Report ET/IR 1152, CSIRO, Australia.
- 15. Delfin (2006) 'News at Ropes Crossing', issue 01 (August), available at www.delfin.com.au/llweb/ropescrossing/main.nsf/images/pdf\_rc\_01\_august2006\_01.pdf /\$file/pdf\_rc\_01\_august2006\_01.pdf [accessed 1/11/2010].
- RACQ (2009) 'Private ownership costs', available at www.racq.com.au/motoring/cars/car\_economy/vehicle\_running\_costs [accessed 5/5/2010].
- 17. Yarra Valley Water (2009) 'Recycled water marks milestone at Aurora', available at www.yvw.com.au/Home/Aboutus/news/Recycledwaternews/Aurorarecycledwater/index.ht m [accessed 1/11/2010].
- 18. Yarra Valley Water (2010) 'Highlands recycled water project', available at www.yvw.com.au/Home/Waterandsewerage/recycledwater/Recycledwaterareas/Highlands /index.htm [accessed 1/11/2010].