

Analyzing the Importance of Studying Urban Intensity and Compactness: A Pathway to Sustainable and Livable Cities

Ar. Jeeva Joseph

Student, M.Plan (Urban Planning), School of Architecture and Planning, Government Engineering College, Thrissur, Kerala, India

Abstract - Urban intensity and compactness play a crucial role in promoting sustainable and livable cities by optimizing land use, improving accessibility, and reducing environmental impact. This study explores these concepts, their significance in urban planning, and methodologies for assessment through a comparative analysis of case studies from Copenhagen, Singapore, Curitiba, Barcelona, and Portland.

Findings indicate that high-density, mixed-use development and efficient public transportation enhance sustainability and economic vitality. Cities with integrated transit systems, such as Curitiba's Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Barcelona's Superblocks, successfully reduce car dependency and promote walkability. However, challenges such as rising housing costs, policy resistance, and infrastructure demands highlight the need for balanced urban strategies.

Comparative analysis underscores the importance of governance, community participation, and sustainable urban policies in achieving compact, resilient cities. While no single model fits all urban contexts, lessons from these cities provide valuable insights for urban planners. By integrating transport, land use, and sustainability policies, cities can develop adaptive strategies to manage urban growth effectively while ensuring affordability and quality of life. This research emphasizes the need for inclusive planning approaches to create sustainable, efficient, and livable urban environments.

Key Words: Urban Intensity, Urban Compactness, Urban Sustainability, Sustainable Urban Development, Mixed-Use Development, Liveable Cities, etc

1. INTRODUCTION

Urban intensity and compactness are critical factors in shaping sustainable and liveable cities [1], [2]. As urban populations continue to grow, efficient land use and resource management become essential in mitigating urban sprawl and promoting sustainable development [3], [4]. Urban intensity refers to the concentration of human activities, interactions, and built environments, influencing economic vitality, sustainability, and quality of life [5], [6]. Compactness, on the other hand, focuses on optimizing land use through high-density, mixed-use development while minimizing urban expansion [7], [8].

Understanding the relationship between urban intensity and compactness can provide valuable insights for urban planners and policymakers [9], [10]. By analysing these factors, cities can enhance accessibility, infrastructure efficiency, and environmental sustainability [11], [12]. This study explores the concepts of urban intensity and compactness, their significance in urban planning, and the methodologies used for their assessment [13], [14].

1.1 Aim

The aim of this study is to analyze the importance of studying urban intensity and compactness in urban planning.

1.2 Objectives

To define and explore the concepts of urban intensity and compactness in urban planning.

To assess the significance of urban intensity and compactness in sustainable urban development.

To evaluate the methodologies used to measure and analyse urban intensity and compactness.

To provide policy recommendations for enhancing urban sustainability through increased intensity and compactness.

1.3 Methodology

This study employs a mixed-method approach, combining qualitative and quantitative research techniques to analyse urban intensity and compactness. A literature review is conducted to explore existing research on these concepts and their impact on sustainable urban development. Case study analysis of selected cities provides real-world insights on urban development challenges and opportunities.

1.4 Scope and Limitations

This study focuses on urban areas with varying levels of intensity and compactness, including cities that have successfully implemented compact urban development strategies. It examines the interconnections between urban intensity, compactness, and sustainability indicators such as transportation efficiency, economic activity, and liveability. By evaluating different urban models, the study aims to contribute valuable recommendations for sustainable urban

planning and policy formulation. The work is limited to web-based studies.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Urban intensity and compactness are critical concepts in urban planning that significantly influence the sustainability and livability of urban areas. This literature study explores these concepts, their importance, relevant indicators for measurement, and methods for analysis.

2.1 Urban Intensity

Urban intensity is a multifaceted concept that plays a crucial role in understanding urban environments. It encompasses various dimensions, including population density, land use diversity, and the interactions among different urban elements. Urban intensity can be defined as the concentration of human activities, interactions, and built environments within a specific area [1]. It reflects how densely populated and actively used an urban space is. According to studies, urban intensity is not synonymous with density; rather, it involves the synergies created by density, mix, and access within urban settings [2].

The intensity of use is a specific aspect of urban intensity that refers to the volume of spatial, temporal, and social interactions that a district can offer [3]. This systemic approach emphasizes the importance of user experiences and activities in shaping urban environments. Urban intensity can manifest in various forms, such as population density (the number of people per unit area), economic activity (the concentration of jobs or businesses), and land-use intensity (the extent to which land is developed for various purposes) [4]. Different types of densities—residential, commercial, and industrial—interconnect to form the overall urban intensity. Understanding these interconnections is vital for effective urban planning [5].

Urban intensity is closely linked to economic vitality, sustainability, and quality of life. High urban intensity is often associated with vibrant economic activity [6]. Cities with concentrated populations and diverse land uses tend to foster innovation and entrepreneurship due to increased interactions among individuals and businesses [7]. Compact and intense urban forms can lead to more sustainable practices by reducing travel distances, promoting public transit usage, and minimizing resource consumption [8]. Studies indicate that cities with higher urban intensity tend to have lower carbon footprints compared to sprawling areas [9]. Additionally, urban intensity influences the quality of life by providing residents with access to amenities, services, and social interactions [10]. A well-designed, intense urban environment can enhance community engagement and overall well-being [11].

Several indicators are used to measure urban intensity. Population density, measured as the number of residents per unit area (e.g., persons per hectare), serves as a primary indicator [12]. Land use mix, which assesses the diversity of residential, commercial, recreational, and industrial spaces, is another key indicator [13]. Economic density, including employment density (the number of jobs per unit area) or economic output per area (e.g., GDP per square kilometer), also contributes to understanding urban intensity [14]. Additionally, the intensity of use, as defined in previous studies, reflects how actively public spaces are utilized based on human activities taking place within them [15].

Various methods are employed to analyze urban intensity. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) are widely used to visualize spatial distributions and analyze patterns related to urban intensity [16]. These tools allow researchers to map population densities, land use patterns, and accessibility metrics effectively. Statistical analysis, such as correlation analyses, helps identify relationships between various indicators of urban intensity. For instance, examining how population density correlates with economic activity provides insights into urban dynamics [17].

City Information Models (CIM) integrated with Building Information Models (BIM) offer advanced tools for quantifying urban intensity indicators [18]. CIM provides a digital representation of a city's physical and functional characteristics, while BIM focuses on individual buildings. Recent studies propose using CIM data to automate the quantification process of urban intensity through parameters such as soil sealing (the proportion of impermeable surfaces), building morphology (characteristics such as building volume and porosity), and public space accessibility (metrics related to mobility and transport infrastructure) [19]. Surveys and community engagement further provide qualitative insights into perceptions of urban intensity and its impacts on daily life [20]. Comparative case studies of municipalities that have successfully implemented strategies to enhance urban intensity offer valuable lessons for cities [21].

The concept of urban intensity is essential for understanding the dynamics of urban environments and their implications for sustainability and quality of life. By studying urban intensity, planners can create vibrant communities that foster economic vitality while enhancing residents' overall well-being [22].

2.2 Compactness

The concept of compactness in urban planning refers to the strategic arrangement of urban development that promotes high density, mixed land uses, and efficient resource utilization while minimizing urban sprawl [1][2]. A compact city is defined as an urban area characterized by relatively high residential density and mixed land uses [3]. It encourages the integration of residential, commercial, and

recreational spaces within close proximity to reduce reliance on automobiles and promote walking and cycling [4]. This model stands in contrast to dispersed urban forms, which often lead to increased travel distances and environmental degradation [5]. Compact cities are designed to enhance accessibility through efficient public transportation systems, allowing residents to reach essential services with minimal travel time [6]. This urban form fosters social interactions and community engagement due to the close-knit nature of neighborhoods [7].

Compact cities prioritize vertical development and high-density housing to maximize land use while minimizing urban sprawl [8]. They encourage a blend of residential, commercial, and recreational spaces within neighborhoods, promoting a vibrant urban life [9]. Efficient infrastructure in compact cities typically requires smaller networks (e.g., water supply, electricity) due to their concentrated development patterns, leading to reduced costs for both governments and residents [10]. Additionally, by promoting shorter trips and alternative modes of transportation, compact urban forms contribute to lower energy consumption and reduced pollution levels [11].

Compactness is increasingly recognized as a sustainable growth model that helps curb urban sprawl [12]. By concentrating development in defined areas, cities can preserve natural habitats and agricultural land while optimizing resource use [13]. This approach supports environmental sustainability by reducing greenhouse gas emissions associated with transportation [14]. High-density development allows for more efficient use of existing infrastructure and services, leading to economic efficiency [15]. The concentration of population leads to economies of scale in public service provision, reducing per capita costs for services like water, energy, and waste management [16].

Compact cities also enhance the quality of life by providing residents with easy access to amenities such as schools, parks, healthcare facilities, and retail outlets [17]. This accessibility reduces travel times and fosters social interactions among community members [18]. Furthermore, the presence of public spaces encourages community engagement and recreational activities [19]. The design of compact cities promotes stronger social connections due to the proximity of residences and communal areas [20]. Public spaces serve as venues for social gatherings and cultural events, enhancing community ties and reducing social isolation [21].

Indicators for compactness include land use mix, which assesses the balance between residential, commercial, recreational, and industrial spaces [22]. Accessibility metrics evaluate how easily residents can reach essential services (e.g., grocery stores, schools) within a reasonable distance [23]. Population density serves as a primary indicator, and

public space availability measures the quantity and quality of public spaces available for community interaction [24].

Methods for analyzing compactness include GIS tools, which visualize spatial distributions of land use patterns and assess how closely different uses are located relative to each other [25]. Statistical analyses, such as correlation studies, help identify relationships between indicators of compactness [26]. Surveys and community engagement yield qualitative insights into residents' perceptions of compactness and accessibility in their neighborhoods [27]. Case studies of municipalities that have successfully implemented strategies for compact development provide valuable lessons for urban planning [28].

The Compaction Index is a metric used in urban studies to evaluate the density and arrangement of built-up areas within an urban landscape [29]. It is calculated using the formula:

$$\text{Compaction Index} = A/P^2$$

Where A is the area of the urban patch (in square units) and P is the perimeter of the urban patch (in linear units) [30]. A higher index value indicates a more compact urban form, while a lower value suggests a more dispersed development pattern [31].

Evaluating urban intensity and compactness is essential for promoting sustainable urban development [32]. Compact urban forms can lead to reduced greenhouse gas emissions, improved air quality, and better resource management [33]. Understanding these concepts helps urban areas prepare for future challenges related to climate change, population growth, and infrastructure demands [34]. Compact urban environments can enhance the quality of life by providing residents with access to amenities, reducing commute times, and fostering community interaction [35]. By embracing these principles, cities can build resilient, sustainable, and livable urban spaces [36].

3. CASE STUDIES

Copenhagen is widely recognized for its successful implementation of compact and sustainable urban development strategies [10]. The city has prioritized high-density, mixed-use neighborhoods that promote walkability and cycling. A well-integrated public transportation system, including buses, trains, and metro services, has significantly reduced car dependency [42]. Green spaces are strategically incorporated into urban design, ensuring that residents have access to parks and recreational areas within short distances [37]. The city's emphasis on pedestrian-friendly infrastructure and sustainable mobility has made it one of the most livable cities in the world [38]. However, challenges such as rising housing costs and limited land availability

persist, requiring continuous policy adjustments to maintain affordability while preserving urban compactness [11].

Singapore exemplifies an extremely high-density yet well-planned urban environment, achieving a balance between urban intensity and quality of life [39]. Through strategic land-use planning and vertical development, Singapore has managed to accommodate its growing population while maintaining sustainability [22]. The city-state's extensive public transport system ensures seamless connectivity, reducing reliance on private vehicles [41]. Additionally, innovative policies such as the Vehicle Quota System help control traffic congestion [40]. Green infrastructure, including rooftop gardens, vertical greenery, and nature reserves, enhances urban livability despite the high density [24]. However, housing affordability remains a challenge, as rising property prices create disparities in access to quality housing [11]. Despite these challenges, Singapore continues to serve as a global model for compact and sustainable urban development [5].

Curitiba is a leading example of a city that has successfully integrated transit-oriented development to achieve urban compactness [43]. The city's Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, introduced in the 1970s, has played a crucial role in shaping land use and promoting high-density development along transit corridors [41]. The city has effectively managed its urban expansion by ensuring that commercial and residential developments are concentrated around public transportation hubs [3]. Curitiba's zoning laws encourage mixed-use development, allowing people to live close to their workplaces and essential services [15]. The city's green policies, including extensive parks and flood management strategies, further enhance sustainability [25]. However, Curitiba faces challenges related to economic inequality and the need for continued investment in infrastructure to meet the demands of its growing population [20].

Barcelona has pioneered the Superblock model; a unique urban planning approach designed to reduce car traffic and promote pedestrian-friendly environments [43]. This model restructures city blocks into clusters where vehicular access is restricted, creating safer and more vibrant public spaces [23]. By fostering high-density mixed-use development, the city ensures that essential services, commercial activities, and residential areas are within walkable distances [44]. The integration of cycling infrastructure and enhanced public transport connectivity has further improved mobility within the city [27]. While the Superblock model has been successful in reducing air pollution and encouraging social interactions, it has also faced resistance from businesses and residents accustomed to car-centric mobility [28]. Despite these challenges, Barcelona's approach demonstrates how urban intensity and compactness can enhance sustainability and livability [30].

Portland, Oregon, is known for its Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) policy, which restricts urban expansion to prevent sprawl and encourage compact development [45]. By enforcing land-use regulations, Portland has successfully promoted high-density, transit-oriented neighborhoods while preserving surrounding agricultural and natural lands [46]. The city's public transportation network, including an efficient light rail system and bus services, reduces dependency on private cars [38]. Emphasis on green building initiatives and sustainability-focused policies has further contributed to its reputation as an environmentally friendly city [42]. However, while Portland's urban containment strategy has preserved green spaces and improved walkability, it has also led to rising housing costs due to limited land availability [32]. Balancing affordability with sustainable growth remains an ongoing challenge for the city's planners and policymakers [18].

These case studies collectively highlight the diverse approaches cities have taken to achieve urban intensity and compactness [16]. While each city has succeeded in enhancing sustainability and livability, they also face challenges such as affordability, infrastructure demands, and policy resistance [4]. These examples serve as valuable references for other urban centers seeking to implement compact and sustainable development strategies [1].

3.1 Comparative Analysis

Urban intensity and compactness are essential strategies for sustainable city development, but their implementation varies based on geographical, economic, and policy contexts. The five case studies—Copenhagen, Singapore, Curitiba, Barcelona, and Portland—demonstrate different approaches to achieving these goals. This comparative analysis explores their similarities, differences, and key takeaways.

All five cities have embraced high-density urban development to curb urban sprawl, but their approaches differ. Singapore, due to its land constraints, has prioritized vertical growth with high-rise residential and commercial buildings [39]. In contrast, Curitiba and Barcelona have focused on transit-oriented development (TOD), ensuring that high-density housing and businesses are located along efficient transport corridors [41][43]. Copenhagen and Portland, while also supporting compact growth, emphasize mixed-use zoning and urban containment policies to control expansion and maintain accessibility [37][46].

A key factor in urban compactness is mobility, and all case studies highlight innovative public transport solutions. Curitiba pioneered the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, which has influenced global transit planning [41]. Singapore and Copenhagen have integrated multimodal transport networks, with strong public transit, cycling, and pedestrian infrastructure [37][39]. Barcelona's Superblock model prioritizes walkability and restricts cars within certain areas

[43], while Portland has emphasized light rail transit and an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to minimize urban sprawl [46]. The effectiveness of these approaches is evident in how each city reduces car dependency, leading to lower emissions and improved urban livability.

Sustainability is a critical element in compact city planning. Singapore leads in green building initiatives and vertical gardens, ensuring that green spaces are integrated into urban developments despite limited land [39]. Copenhagen has implemented large-scale green spaces and renewable energy policies, making it one of the most sustainable cities globally [37]. Curitiba has focused on eco-friendly urban planning, with parks doubling as flood control mechanisms [41]. Similarly, Portland's sustainable zoning and environmental policies promote green urbanism [46]. Barcelona, through its Superblocks, enhances public spaces while reducing vehicular pollution [43]. While all cities prioritize sustainability, their strategies vary based on environmental needs and urban constraints.

Despite their successes, each city faces unique challenges. Singapore and Copenhagen struggle with housing affordability, as compact and high-density living has led to rising property prices [37][39]. Curitiba, while successful in transit-oriented development, faces economic inequality, limiting accessibility for lower-income populations [41]. Barcelona's Superblock model has met resistance from businesses and residents accustomed to car-centric development [43]. Portland's Urban Growth Boundary has been effective in preserving green spaces, but it has also contributed to higher housing costs due to restricted land supply [46]. Balancing compactness with affordability remains a key challenge across all case studies.

The role of governance and public participation significantly affects urban compactness strategies. Singapore's top-down planning model ensures efficient implementation but may lack extensive public involvement [39]. Copenhagen and Portland emphasize community-driven urban policies, allowing for citizen participation in planning decisions [37][46]. Curitiba's transit-oriented model has been a long-term success due to strong governance [41], while Barcelona's Superblocks demonstrate gradual implementation and adaptation based on public feedback [43]. The level of government intervention versus community engagement plays a crucial role in determining the success of compact urban policies.

Key takeaways from the case studies indicate that integrated transport systems are essential for reducing car dependency and promoting sustainability. Cities with well-planned public transport, such as Singapore, Copenhagen, and Curitiba, have successfully improved accessibility and urban efficiency [37][39][41]. Mixed-use and high-density planning, as seen in Copenhagen, Barcelona, and Singapore, enhances urban vibrancy by bringing residential, commercial, and

recreational spaces closer together [37][39][43]. Additionally, green infrastructure plays a significant role in sustainability, with Curitiba's parks, Singapore's vertical gardens, and Barcelona's redesigned public spaces serving as prime examples [39][41][43]. However, a major challenge is affordability, as rising housing costs in Copenhagen, Singapore, and Portland highlight the need for inclusive and affordable housing policies [37][39][46]. Lastly, public participation greatly influences the success of compact city initiatives, with community-driven approaches in Copenhagen and Portland proving more sustainable in the long run than top-down strategies like Singapore's [37][39][46].

Each city provides a unique perspective on achieving urban intensity and compactness. While there is no universal model, integrating transport, sustainability, and affordable housing policies is crucial for successful compact city planning. By learning from these case studies, other urban centers can tailor strategies to their local contexts, ensuring both sustainable growth and improved quality of life.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The study highlights that urban intensity and compactness contribute significantly to sustainability, economic vitality, and enhanced quality of life. Case studies demonstrate that cities with well-planned high-density development, integrated transport systems, and sustainable urban policies are more resilient and livable. Copenhagen and Singapore showcase the benefits of high-density mixed-use planning, while Curitiba's transit-oriented approach emphasizes accessibility. Barcelona's Superblock model successfully reclaims public spaces for pedestrians, whereas Portland's Urban Growth Boundary controls sprawl effectively. However, affordability remains a challenge across all cities, underscoring the need for inclusive housing policies alongside compact development.

In conclusion, achieving sustainable urban intensity and compactness requires a multi-dimensional approach, incorporating policy interventions, public participation, and infrastructure investments. While there is no one-size-fits-all solution, cities can learn from these case studies to create tailored strategies that foster resilience, sustainability, and livability. Future research should explore how emerging technologies and smart city initiatives can further enhance compact urban development.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Jenks, E. Burton, and K. Williams, *Compact Cities: Sustainable Urban Forms for Developing Countries*, London, UK: Spon Press, 1996.
- [2] R. Ewing and R. Cervero, "Travel and the built environment: A meta-analysis," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, vol. 76, no. 3, pp. 265–294, 2010.

- [3] J. Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York, NY, USA: Random House, 1961.
- [4] UN-Habitat, "Urbanization and Development: Emerging Futures," *World Cities Report*, United Nations Human Settlements Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, 2016.
- [5] P. Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century*, 4th ed., Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.
- [6] M. Batty, "Defining density," *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 571–572, 2010.
- [7] K. Lynch, *Good City Form*, Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1981.
- [8] B. Newman and P. Kenworthy, *Sustainability and Cities: Overcoming Automobile Dependence*, Washington, DC, USA: Island Press, 1999.
- [9] D. Banister, "Transport and climate change," *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 327–341, 2007.
- [10] OECD, "Compact City Policies: A Comparative Assessment," Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, France, 2012.
- [11] C. C. Whitehead, "Affordable housing in compact cities: The policy challenges," *Urban Studies*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 897–909, 2017.
- [12] European Environment Agency, "Urban Sustainability Issues: What is a Resource-efficient City?" Technical Report No. 23, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2015.
- [13] T. G. McGee, "Urbanization takes a new turn," *Habitat International*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 75–77, 2009.
- [14] D. L. A. Gordon and B. Hindrichs, "The compact city: Concept and feasibility," *Journal of Urban Design*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 261–277, 2000.
- [15] H. Priemus, "How to make housing sustainable? The Dutch experience," *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1031–1046, 2009.
- [16] L. Bertolini, F. le Clercq, and L. Kapoen, "Sustainable accessibility: A conceptual framework to integrate transport and land use plan-making," *Transport Policy*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 207–220, 2005.
- [17] M. Hickman and D. Banister, *Transport, Climate Change and the City*, London, UK: Routledge, 2014.
- [18] R. Cervero and J. Day, "Suburbanization and transit-oriented development in China," *Transport Policy*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 315–323, 2008.
- [19] D. Pojani and D. Stead, "Sustainable urban transport in the developing world: Beyond megacities," *Sustainability*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 7784–7805, 2015.
- [20] J. Farrington, "The new narrative of accessibility: Its potential contribution to discourses in transport geography," *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 319–330, 2007.
- [21] UN-Habitat, "The state of the world's cities 2020," United Nations, Nairobi, Kenya, 2020.
- [22] K. Williams, E. Burton, and M. Jenks, *Achieving Sustainable Urban Form*, London, UK: Routledge, 2000.
- [23] P. Hall and C. Ward, *Sociable Cities: The Legacy of Ebenezer Howard*, Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 1998.
- [24] T. Beatley, *Green Urbanism: Learning from European Cities*, Washington, DC, USA: Island Press, 2000.
- [25] C. F. Ridley, "Urban compaction and sustainability: Can it work?" *Urban Studies*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 35–47, 2011.
- [26] J. Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, New York, NY, USA: Vintage Books, 1961.
- [27] M. Batty and P. Longley, "Fractal Cities: A Geometry of Form and Function," San Diego, CA, USA: Academic Press, 1994.
- [28] L. Duhl, "The Urban Condition: People and Policy in the Metropolis," New York, NY, USA: Basic Books, 1963.
- [29] S. T. Marshall, "Streets and Patterns," New York, NY, USA: Spon Press, 2005.
- [30] R. White and G. Engelen, "Cellular automata and fractal urban form: A cellular modeling approach to the evolution of urban land use patterns," *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 1175–1199, 1993.
- [31] D. Banister and N. Stead, "Impact of information and communications technology on transport," *Transport Reviews*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 611–632, 2004.
- [32] H. D. Foster, "Disaster Planning: The Preservation of Life and Property," New York, NY, USA: Springer, 1980.
- [33] C. Kennedy, S. Pincetl, and P. Bunje, "The study of urban metabolism and its applications to urban planning and design," *Environmental Pollution*, vol. 159, no. 8–9, pp. 1965–1973, 2011.
- [34] R. Inglehart, "Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies," Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997.

[35] M. McNally and A. Kulkarni, "Assessment of influence of land use-transportation system on travel behavior," *Transportation Research Record*, vol. 1607, pp. 105–115, 1997.

[36] T. Beatley, "Green Urbanism: Learning from European Cities," Washington, DC, USA: Island Press, 2000.

[37] J. Gehl, *Cities for People*, Washington, DC, USA: Island Press, 2010.

[38] R. Knowles, "Transport shaping space: Railways and their role in shaping urban regions," *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 276–286, 2010.

[39] B. Yuen and A. Kong, "Climate change and urban planning in Southeast Asia," *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 70–85, 2009.

[40] P. Barter, "Transport, urban structure and 'lock-in' in the Kuala Lumpur Metropolitan Area," *International Development Planning Review*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 1–24, 2004.

[41] R. Cervero, "Transit-oriented development in the United States: Experiences, challenges, and prospects," *Transportation Research Board Special Report*, no. 102, 2004.

[42] P. Newman and J. Kenworthy, *Sustainability and Cities: Overcoming Automobile Dependence*, Washington, DC, USA: Island Press, 1999.

[43] S. Rueda, "Superblocks for the design of new cities and the transformation of existing ones," in *Sustainable Pathways for our Cities and Regions*, pp. 111–137, Springer, 2018.

[44] A. Muñoz and J. Galindo, "Urban form and the ecological footprint of commuting. The case of Barcelona," *Ecological Economics*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 499–514, 2005.

[45] A. Nelson, "Preserving prime farmland in the face of urbanization: Lessons from Oregon," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 467–488, 1992.

[46] C. Benfield, "Portland: A model of smart growth urbanism," *Environmental Law and Policy Review*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 307–326, 2010.