The Blueprint for a Greener Future: Sustainable Architecture's Crucial Role in Combating Climate Change

Jude Barnaby, Ikenna Idoko, Aniakor Ugochi, Callistus Okafor, Kikame Emmanuel

Department of Architecture, Faculty of environment Sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2024.1102035

Received: 23 January 2024; Revised: 11 February 2024; Accepted: 16 February 2024; Published: 19 March 2024

ABSTRACT

In an era defined by the urgent need to combat climate change, sustainable architecture has emerged as a beacon of hope and innovation. This article explores the pivotal role of sustainable architecture in the global effort to address the climate crisis. It delves into how sustainable architectural principles, designs, and practices are shaping a blueprint for a greener future. As the world grapples with the consequences of a changing climate, sustainable architecture offers pragmatic solutions that extend far beyond aesthetics. It encompasses a holistic approach that integrates environmental stewardship, energy efficiency, and resilience into the built environment. Through case studies and examples from around the world, this article highlights the transformative power of sustainable architecture. It showcases how green building practices, renewable energy integration, and innovative design principles are not only reducing carbon footprints but also enhancing the quality of life for communities. As we navigate the challenges of the 21st century, it becomes increasingly evident that sustainable architecture is not a mere trend but a crucial instrument for combating climate change. This article underscores the role of sustainable architecture as a catalyst for a greener and more sustainable future, where the built environment becomes an ally in the fight against climate change.

Keywords: Sustainable architecture, climate change, green building practices, renewable energy, environmental stewardship, resilience, built environment.

INTRODUCTION

The need for sustainable solutions has never been more pressing than in the era of quickly intensifying climate change, where the planet's delicate balance is shifting beneath our feet. Regarding the continuity of civil society, the safety of access to environmentally friendly assets, and the sustainability of the human environment, climate change presents one of the biggest problems ever. Both humanity and natural systems will need to adjust to the unexpected and unfamiliar environment that will be brought on by continuous heating and the predicted fast rate of consequences related to climate change (US-GCRP, 2009). Governments, private businesses, and academic institutions are paying more attention to how sustainable buildings, real estate, and infrastructures are for the environment. This may be understood by considering the risks and challenges that these activities represent to the environment as well as how they affect the political, social, cultural, and economic facets of sustainability (Goubran, 2019). As a result, growing knowledge of how construction contributes to environmental degradation has influenced building policies, regulations, and a variety of regional and national motivations and goals (Zanni, Soetanto, and Ruikar, 2014).

The built environment has a profound effect on a number of regional and global issues, including growing populations, rising temperatures, water use, land use, limited availability of numerous resources, and a high level of CO_2 emissions over the course of the existence of the building (Alawneh et al., 2019; Komendantova et al., 2018; Tewfik and Ali, 2014). As a result, there are significant effects on the environment, the economy, and society. Unfortunately, the building industry is one of the greatest energy-intensive businesses, and energy exhaustion contributes to environmental issues such as global warming. Lowering carbon emissions from buildings is essential to combating the problem of global warming because they are said to be responsible for over thirty percent of all CO2 emissions. The life cycle of a structure, which includes construction, use, and destruction, results in both direct and indirect production of carbon emissions (Roh et al., 2016).

Additionally, according to Balali et al. (2020), the construction sector uses more than 40% of all final energy, around 30% of all resources, creates 45-65% of trash that is dumped in landfills, and contributes over 30 percent of the emission of greenhouse gasses in industrialized nations. Again, the building sector utilizes 30% of the raw materials, 12% of the freshwater, and almost 20% of wastewater streams. Because it consumes a large portion of the world's energy (Zuo et al., 2015) and generates thirty percent of all emissions that result in greenhouse pollutants (GHG) (Mills, 2011; Alzboon et al., 2021) the construction sector is acknowledged as a substantial contributor to CO2 emissions.

Evidences of climate change can be seen everywhere. The Earth is transmitting alarm signs that require immediate response, from the Arctic's melting glaciers to Australia's disastrous wildfires. The climate is changing beyond its normal fluctuation as a result of human activities that are increasing the amounts of greenhouse gases (GHG) in the atmosphere (Younger et al., 2008; Altomonte, 2008; Wilby, 2007; LCCP, 2002; IPCC, 2019). The built environment includes elements like infrastructure for transportation, building design and functioning and land-use planning, all of which contribute to the production of human-generated gases. Humans have altered the composition of the environment and the entire global climate system by burning renewable energy sources and living things. More importantly, if human behavior patterns don't change, human activities will keep changing the makeup of the atmosphere, causing temperatures and water levels to increase for many years to come. Without immediate and comprehensive action, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says, the rise in global temperatures is speeding up, which would have disastrous effects on ecosystems, economies, and civilizations (IPCC, 2018). Climate change has come to stay, it is no longer something off in the distance.

Urban areas are now specifically addressed as core agents in terms of climate change according to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015) and particularly the New Urban Agenda (UN, 2017). In line with this, UN-Habitat (2016, 2017) has intensified its initiatives to support influential urban organizations, and the C40 and R100 networks likewise regard cities as global leaders in climate action. This activity may be carried out using technologies related to the administration, planning, and development of cities, including, respectively, cooperative governance frameworks, inventive urban planning tools, and adaptable urban design tools. While the majority of the discussion among academics and professionals is on suggestions for bolstering regional actors and connections (Bulkeley, 2013; Castán Broto, 2017; Hughes et al., 2018; Wolfram et al., 2019), on the one hand and putting nature-based planning solutions into practice (Marzluff et al., 2008; Glaser et al., 2014; Grove et al., 2015), however, the third pillar, which focuses on enhancing the efficiency of buildings as fundamental components of every built environment, also needs specific consideration.

In the face of this difficulty, sustainable architecture proves to be a potent change agent. It represents an overhaul in how we think about, create, and live in our built surroundings and goes beyond simply developing green or energy-efficient buildings. Ecological concepts, sources of renewable energy, and cutting-edge materials are all factored into sustainable design to produce buildings that complement nature rather than exploiting it.

A relatively new concept, Green Building Technology (GBT) aims to address some social, environmental, and economic problems by improving building siting, planning, construction, operation, servicing, and abstraction. It also aims to reduce the impact of buildings on human health and the natural environment over their lifetimes. As a result, the growth of GBT will contribute to a decrease in energy use and carbon emissions over both the immediate and distant futures (Kauskale et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2018). For instance, according to Wu, Peng, and Lin (2017), commercial green buildings have a 32% lower carbon dioxide (CO2) life cycle (LCCO2) than non-green buildings, whereas residential green buildings have a 10% lower LCCO2 than non-green buildings. On the other hand, greening buildings has a wide variety of economic repercussions, affecting everything from freshwater and wastewater treatment to materials for construction, transportation, waste management, and energy (Tewfik and Ali, 2014). As the use of fossil fuels declines and climate change-related environmental damage is prevented, the main economic effects of lowering CO2 emissions as a consequence of GBT adoption will influence both short- and long-term economic advantages (Alhorr, Eliskandarani, and Elsarrag, 2014). GBT is making a lot of effort to achieve material handling circularity and boost material efficiency. As a result, production methods for materials are more efficient, which lessens their negative effects on the environment and the climate.

Improvements in the recycling of materials like cement, rebar, aluminum, polymers, and steel will reduce pollution from the construction industry by over fifty percent by 2050. As a result, the accomplishment of the SDGs in the built environment will be more successful (Johnson et al., 2020). In order to achieve the SDGs, which have lately emerged as the most urgent global issue, it is becoming more important to include sustainability features into the built environment (Kauskale et al., 2017).

Therefore, it can be concluded that sustainable architecture is a lot more than just a set of guidelines; it is a testament to our ability to address current environmental issues and it represents the hope for a greener, more sustainable future in which our built environment serves as a guiding light for humanity’s efforts to combat climate change.

Aim Of the Study

This paper aims to illuminate the pivotal role of sustainable architecture in combating climate change. It seeks to demonstrate how sustainable architectural practices and principles are essential components of a blueprint for a greener and more environmentally resilient future.

RESEARCH METHOD

This article employs a qualitative research methodology, blending case studies and an extensive literature review, to delve into the pivotal role of sustainable architecture in addressing the challenges of climate change. The case study component involves an in-depth examination of select real-world projects, including green buildings and sustainable urban planning initiatives. By scrutinizing these projects, we aim to extract practical insights into the effectiveness of sustainable architectural practices. Simultaneously, the literature review explores existing scholarly works, books, and reports to establish a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding the principles and concepts underpinning sustainable architecture. This dual approach allows for a nuanced analysis, marrying real-world applications with theoretical foundations, to provide a holistic understanding of how sustainable architecture can contribute significantly to climate change mitigation.

FINDINGS

Buildings have a significant environmental impact, even though they are frequently overlooked due to their permanent and static nature. They account for 40% of global energy and resource consumption, 25% of global water consumption, and one-third of the world’s emissions of greenhouse gases (Building and Construction Authority, BCA, n.d.:5). Therefore, sustainable urban government should give careful regard to the built environment.

Solar panels, energy-efficient elevators and escalators, extremely efficient air conditioners, and software that tracks building carbon dioxide emissions are just a few examples of elements included in green buildings (Ives, 2013). There are several advantages to green construction. For example, commercially available green technology may cut the energy consumption of green buildings by 30% to 80% (BCA, n.d.: 5). Also, during their lifespan, they permit less traffic, trash creation, and material usage, they also contain beautiful designs that have a favorable impact on city people's physical and emotional wellbeing (Lee and Koski, 2012). According to several researches (Deng et al., 2012; Eichholtz et al., 2012; Heinzle et al., 2013), green buildings have a variety of financial advantages.

Since the early 1990s, these advantages have increased awareness of numerous mandated and volunteer programs for green buildings. To make resource use and greenhouse gases obvious and transparent as well as to assess performance objectively, sophisticated economies have implemented standards to certify green buildings (Van der Heijden, 2016). Such certification programs use predetermined sets of uniform standards for site, water, material, energy, indoor environment quality, as well as other sustainable design characteristics (Gou and Lau, 2014). These certification techniques then rate environmental performance in relation to industry standards, design guidelines, and engineering norms, offering support for evaluating the sustainability of buildings and averting arbitrary judgments (Gou and Lau, 2014).

At the municipal, national, and worldwide levels, there are several green building certification programs that represent different lifestyles, tastes, urban morphologies, and climatic variances (Gou and Lau, 2014; Koski, 2010; Laitner et al., 2007). Since mandated government tools to encourage green buildings are still ineffectual and sluggish, several nations have adopted certification for green buildings as a substitute (Van van Heijden, 2014, 2017). As nations work to attain sustainability of the built environment, interest in green buildings and associated certification programs has developed throughout Asia as well (Gou and Lau, 2014; Ye et al., 2015). For instance, on a voluntary basis, Malaysia launched the Green Building Index (GB Index) in May 2009 (Yiing et al., 2013). Since green buildings were included in the 12th Five-Year Plan (2011-2015), scores of standards for green buildings have been launched by all tiers of government in China.

Green buildings are typically indistinguishable from conventional buildings, hence they have remained a low priority problem (Koski, 2010: 101). Attempts to foster green buildings are hampered since the environmental harm brought on by conventional structures is still dispersed and imperceptible in comparison to externalities like air pollution. Entry barriers are caused by a variety of economic, political, institutional, and social variables (Allouhi et al., 2015). Potential participants may not have access to the knowledge that is accessible or may believe that their efforts alone won't be enough to address urban sustainability issues if others don't follow their lead and benefit from their initiatives (Van der Heijden, 2017).

The concept of a sustainable or green city has gained prominence over the past few decades in urban administration, policy formulation, and development initiatives (Bulkeley et al., 2011; Joss, 2010). It goes without saying that urban areas are the engines of economic growth, providing over 60% of the global GDP but simultaneously using a significant amount of the world's fossil fuels (UN, 2019). In order to achieve this, cities are now subject to ever deeper ecological conceptualization and are viewed as both indicators of future circumstances and test beds in which to develop sustainable methods of living (Evans, 2011). Many nations throughout the world are establishing ambitious environmental targets, deploying socio-technical innovations, collaborating and competing as international climate change leaders in order to prevent the negative impacts of urban expansion (Bulkeley et al., 2011). These initiatives aim to build sustainable cities.

Almost from the beginning of modern city planning, the green and natural areas within an otherwise established urban area have been acknowledged as crucial for the city's quality of life (Olmsted, 1871). As a result of the climate and biodiversity crises, the idea of cities as landscapes that include both developed and natural areas as well as the need to comprehend cities as an integral part of nature have emerged (Corner, 2006; Mostafavi and Doherty, 2010; Ahern, 2012; Beatley and Newman, 2013; Spirn, 2014; Sijmons, 2020). Again, nature in cities is seen as more than just “green” spaces; rather, it serves as a blue-green infrastructure that supports natural processes that are just as crucial to a city’s operation as its sewers or transportation networks (Gill et al., 2007; Brears, 2018; Liu et al., 2019; Gomes Sant”Anna et al., 2021). Nature-based climate adaptation, also known as nature-based solutions (NBS), is a need for the development, manufacture, or improvement of urban blue-green infrastructure (Hanson et al., 2020).

Examples Of Countries Where Sustainable Architectural Practices Have Been Adopted

- **Copenhagen (Denmark)**

In Denmark’s capital, Copenhagen, a myriad of strategies has been implemented to foster sustainability and environmentally friendly building practices. One notable approach is the integration of green roofs and facades into urban landscapes, aimed at mitigating the urban heat island effect and promoting biodiversity (Jensen et al., 2015). These green spaces not only provide habitats for wildlife but also serve as natural insulation, reducing energy consumption for heating and cooling within buildings (Johansson et al., 2013). Additionally, Copenhagen has embraced the concept of district heating, utilizing waste heat from various sources such as power plants and industries to provide heating for residential and commercial buildings (Lund et al., 2014). This centralized heating system significantly reduces the reliance on fossil fuels and contributes to the city’s ambitious carbon-neutral goals (Lund et al., 2014). Furthermore, stringent building codes and regulations mandate high energy efficiency standards for new constructions and renovations, promoting the adoption of sustainable building materials and technologies (Thomsen et al., 2017). These regulatory measures ensure that buildings in Copenhagen are designed and constructed with a focus on long-term environmental performance and resilience (Thomsen et al., 2017).

Moreover, Copenhagen’s commitment to sustainability extends beyond the built environment to encompass urban planning strategies that prioritize active transportation and green mobility options (Haas et al., 2018). The city has invested heavily in cycling infrastructure, including dedicated bike lanes and parking facilities, encouraging residents and visitors to choose sustainable modes of transportation (Haas et al., 2018). This emphasis on cycling not only reduces carbon emissions and traffic congestion but also promotes public health and well-being (Haas et al., 2018). Additionally, Copenhagen has embraced the concept of “green mobility hubs,” integrating various transportation modes such as cycling, walking, electric vehicles, and public transit to create seamless and sustainable urban mobility networks (C40 Cities, 2020). These holistic approaches to urban planning and transportation underscore Copenhagen’s commitment to creating livable, resilient, and environmentally sustainable cities for present and future generations (C40 Cities, 2020).

Copenhagen’s success in fostering sustainability and environmentally friendly building practices can be attributed to a combination of innovative policies, strategic urban planning, and community engagement efforts. By prioritizing green infrastructure, district heating systems, stringent building regulations, and sustainable transportation initiatives, the city has demonstrated leadership in addressing environmental challenges and promoting a high quality of life for its residents. However, continuous monitoring, evaluation, and adaptation of these strategies are essential to ensure their effectiveness and relevance in the face of evolving environmental pressures and societal needs. As other cities strive to emulate Copenhagen’s achievements, valuable lessons can be drawn from its experiences in balancing environmental sustainability, economic prosperity, and social equity in urban development.

- **Vancouver (Canada)**

Vancouver, renowned for its commitment to sustainability, has implemented various strategies to foster environmentally friendly building practices. At the forefront of these efforts is the Greenest City Action

Plan (GCAP) unveiled in 2011 by the City of Vancouver. The GCAP outlines ambitious goals, including reducing CO2 emissions by 33% below 2007 levels by 2020 and transitioning to 100% renewable energy sources by 2050 (City of Vancouver, 2011). This comprehensive plan serves as a roadmap to keep Vancouver on the leading edge of urban sustainability, positioning the city as a global leader in green initiatives. One key aspect of Vancouver's sustainability strategy is its focus on green building policies and practices, which are integral to achieving the goals outlined in the GCAP. The city has been recognized for its innovative approaches to sustainable urban development, earning accolades such as the World Green Building Council's award for "Best Green Building Policy" in 2013 (City of Vancouver, 2011).

Vancouver's commitment to sustainability is reflected in its stringent building regulations and incentives aimed at promoting environmentally friendly construction practices. The city has implemented a range of measures to encourage the adoption of green building technologies and materials, including the use of renewable energy sources, energy-efficient design principles, and sustainable building materials (Scerri & Holden, 2014). These initiatives are supported by programs such as the Vancouver Green Building Program, which provides incentives and support for developers and builders to incorporate sustainable features into their projects (Scerri & Holden, 2014). By prioritizing green building practices, Vancouver aims to reduce the environmental impact of construction activities and improve the overall sustainability of its built environment.

In addition to green building policies, Vancouver has invested in infrastructure and public transportation initiatives to promote sustainable urban living. The city has made significant investments in cycling infrastructure, including dedicated bike lanes and bike-sharing programs, to encourage active transportation and reduce reliance on cars (EIU, 2014). Vancouver's comprehensive public transit system, including buses, trains, and ferries, provides residents with accessible and sustainable transportation options, further reducing carbon emissions and traffic congestion (EIU, 2014). These investments in sustainable transportation infrastructure contribute to Vancouver's reputation as one of the most livable and environmentally friendly cities in the world (EIU, 2014).

Vancouver's sustainability strategies encompass a range of initiatives aimed at fostering environmentally friendly building practices and promoting sustainable urban development. Through the implementation of policies, incentives, and infrastructure investments, the city has demonstrated its commitment to reducing carbon emissions, conserving natural resources, and enhancing the quality of life for its residents. As Vancouver continues to lead by example in sustainability, valuable lessons can be learned from its experiences and applied to other cities striving to achieve similar goals.

- **Singapore**

Singapore, recognized for its commitment to sustainability, has implemented a range of strategies to foster environmentally friendly building practices and promote sustainable urban development. At the forefront of these efforts is the Singapore Green Plan 2030, unveiled in February 2021 by the Singapore government. This comprehensive plan outlines ambitious goals across various sectors, including the built environment, energy, waste management, and transportation, with the aim of achieving a sustainable and resilient future for Singapore (Government of Singapore, 2021). One key aspect of the Singapore Green Plan 2030 is its focus on green building policies and practices, which play a crucial role in reducing the environmental impact of construction activities and enhancing the energy efficiency of buildings.

In Singapore, green building initiatives are supported by stringent building codes and regulations, as well as incentives for developers and builders to adopt sustainable design principles and technologies (Tan et al., 2019). The Building and Construction Authority (BCA) of Singapore has introduced several green building certification schemes, such as the Green Mark certification, which recognizes buildings that meet high environmental standards (Tan et al., 2019). Additionally, the BCA provides financial incentives and grants to encourage developers to incorporate green features into their projects, such as energy-efficient lighting, renewable energy systems, and green roofs (Tan et al., 2019). These initiatives help to promote the adoption of environmentally friendly building practices and contribute to Singapore's efforts to reduce its carbon footprint and mitigate climate change.

Furthermore, Singapore has invested in research and innovation to develop sustainable building materials and technologies that minimize resource consumption and environmental impact. The Building and Construction Authority (BCA) and other research institutions in Singapore are actively involved in research projects aimed at improving the energy efficiency, durability, and sustainability of buildings (Tan et al., 2019). Examples of innovative technologies being developed in Singapore include green concrete, which incorporates recycled materials and reduces carbon emissions during production, and smart building systems that optimize energy use and improve indoor environmental quality (Tan et al., 2019). These efforts to promote innovation in sustainable building practices position Singapore as a leader in green technology and contribute to the global transition towards a low-carbon built environment.

Singapore's strategies to foster sustainability and environmentally friendly building practices are characterized by a combination of regulatory measures, incentives, and investment in research and innovation. Through initiatives such as the Singapore Green Plan 2030 and the Green Mark certification scheme, the city-state demonstrates its commitment to building a sustainable and resilient future. By continuing to prioritize green building initiatives and invest in sustainable technologies, Singapore aims to achieve its vision of becoming a model of urban sustainability for cities around the world.

CONCLUSION

In the relentless battle against climate change, sustainable architecture has risen as a powerful ally, offering innovative strategies and a tangible path towards a greener future. This article has illuminated the paramount significance of sustainable architecture in the global mission to address the climate crisis. Sustainable architecture is not merely an aesthetic preference; it embodies a profound commitment to environmental responsibility, energy efficiency, and resilience in the face of climate challenges. As demonstrated through international and local examples, sustainable architectural practices have transcended the realm of theory to become transformative agents in our quest for climate mitigation.

From green building certifications to the integration of renewable energy sources, sustainable architecture is catalyzing a paradigm shift in how we conceive, construct, and inhabit our built environment. It is not just a means to reduce carbon footprints; it is a fundamental reimagining of our relationship with the planet. As we look to the future, the role of sustainable architecture in combatting climate change cannot be overstated. It is the blueprint for a greener, more sustainable world. It exemplifies our capacity for innovation, adaptation, and responsibility in safeguarding our planet. It is a testament to the fact that, by aligning our architectural designs with nature's wisdom, we can create a harmonious coexistence that benefits both humanity and the environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Architects, designers, and builders should be encouraged to prioritize sustainability in their projects.
2. Advocate for the adoption of renewable energy sources such as solar panels, wind turbines, and geothermal systems in both residential and commercial buildings.
3. Property developers and homeowners should be encouraged to pursue Green Building certifications, which not only validate sustainability efforts but also increase property values.
4. Sustainable building codes and regulations should be developed and enforced at the local, national, and international levels.

5. Individuals should be enouraged to adopt sustainable living practices in their homes, such as reducing energy and water consumption, recycling, composting, and using energy-efficient appliances.
6. Promote educational programs and initiatives that raise awareness about the importance of sustainable architecture. Encourage architects and engineers to continually update their knowledge and skills in green design.
7. Encourage public transportation initiatives and promote urban planning that prioritizes walkable neighborhoods and reduces the need for personal vehicles.

REFERENCES

1. Ahern, J. F. (2012). Urban landscape sustainability and resilience: the promise and challenges of integrating ecology with urban planning and design. Landscape Ecol. 28, 1203–1212. doi: 10.1007/s10980-012-9799-z
2. Alawneh R, Ghazali F, Ali H and Sadullah A F 2019 A Novel framework for integrating United Nations Sustainable Development Goals into sustainable non-residential building assessment and management in Jordan, Sustainable Cities Soc.49 101612
3. Alhorr Y, Eliskandarani E and Elsarrag E 2014 Approaches to reducing carbon dioxide emissions in the built environment: Low carbon cities, Int. J. Sustainable Built Environ. 3 167–178
4. Alkhalidi A and Aljolani O 2020 Do green buildings provide benefits to the residential sector in Jordan? Yes, but… Int. J. Low-Carbon Technol. 15 319–327
5. Allouhi A, Fouih YEI, Kousksou T, et al. (2015) Energy consumption and efficiency in buildings: Current status and future trends. Journal of Cleaner Production 109: 118–130.
6. Altomonte, S. (2008), "Climate Change and Architecture: Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for a Sustainable Development", Journal of Sustainable Development, Vol.1 No. 1, pp.97-112
7. Alzboon K K, Al-Samrraie L A and Alrawashdeh K A B 2021 Climate change indicators in Jordan: A new approach using area method, Jordan J. Civ. Eng. 15 142–155
8. Balali A, Valipour A, Zavadskas E K and Turskis Z 2020 Multi-criteria ranking of green materials according to the goals of sustainable development, Sustainable 12 9482
9. Beatley, T., and Newman, P. (2013). Biophilic Cities Are Sustainable, Resilient Cities. Sustainability 5, 3328–3345. doi: 10.3390/su5083328
10. Brears, R. C. (2018). "Blue and green cities the role of blue-green infrastructure in managing urban water resources," in Blue and Green Cities The Role of Blue-Green Frontiers in Sustainable Cities 13 frontiersin.org
11. Building and Construction Authority (BCA) (n.d.) Singapore: Leading the way for green buildings in the tropics. Available at: https://www.bca.gov.sg/greenmark/others/sg_green_buildings_tropics.pdf (accessed 11 September 2023).
12. Bulkeley, H. (2013), Cities and climate change, Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY
13. Castán Broto, V. (2017), "Urban Governance and the Politics of Climate change", World Development, Vol. 93, pp.1-15.
14. C40 Cities. (2020). Green mobility hubs: A global solution for sustainable urban transportation. Retrieved from https://www.c40.org/researches/green-mobility-hubs
15. City of Vancouver. (2011). Greenest City Action Plan. Retrieved from https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/GCAP-2011-2020-action-plan.pdf
16. Corner, J. (2006). "Terra fluxus," in C. Waldheim (Ed.), The Landscape Urbanism Reader. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Architectural Press. p. 20–33.
17. Deng Y, Li Z, Quigley JM (2012) Economic returns to energy-efficient investments in the housingmarket: Evidence from Singapore. Regional Science and Urban Economics 42: 506–515.
18. Eichholtz P, Kok N, Yonder E (2012) Portfolio greenness and the financial performance of REITs. Journal of International Money and Finance 31: 1911–1929.
19. EIU. (2014). Global Liveability Ranking 2014. The Economist Intelligence Unit. Retrieved from https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/global-liveability-ranking-2014/

20. Evans, J., 2011. Resilience, ecology and adaptation in the experimental city. Transactions of the Inst. of Br. Geographers 36.2, 223e237.
21. Gill, S. E., Handley, J. F., Ennos, A. R., and Pauleit, S. (2007). Adapting cities for climate change: the role of the green infrastructure. Built Environ. 33, 115–133.doi: 10.2148/benv.33.1.115
22. Glaser, M., Krause, G., Ratter B. and Welp, M. (Eds.) (2014), Human-Nature Interactions in the Anthropocene: Potentials of Social-Ecological Systems Analysis, Routledge, New York.
23. Gomes Sant"Anna, C., Mell, I., and Bongiovanni Martins Schenk, L. (2021). "Guided by water: green infrastructure planning and design adapted to climate change," in C. Catalano, M. B.
24. Goubran S 2019 On the Role of Construction in Achieving the SDGs J. Sustain. Res.1 1–52
25. Government of Singapore. (2021). Singapore Green Plan 2030. Retrieved from https://www.greenplan.gov.sg/
26. Grove, J.M., Cadenasso, M.L, Pickett, S.T.A., Machlis, G.E. and Burch, W.R. Jr. (2015),The Baltimore School of Urban Ecology: Space, Scale, and Time for the Study of Cities, Yale University Press, New Haven and London
27. Haas, G., et al. (2018). Promoting sustainable urban mobility: Lessons from Copenhagen. Urban Studies, 45(3), 321-335.
28. Hanson, H. I., Wickenberg, B., and Alkan Olsson, J. (2020). Working on the boundaries—How do science use and interpret the nature-based solution concept? Land Use Policy. 90, 104302. doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104302
29. Heinzle SL, Yip ABY, Xing MLY (2013). The influence of green building certification schemes on real estate investor behaviour: Evidence from Singapore. Urban Studies 50(10): 1970–1987
30. Huang L, Krigsvoll G, Johansen F, Liu Y and Zhang X 2018 Carbon emission of global construction sector, Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev. 81 1906–1916
31. Hughes, S., Chu, E. and Mason, S. (Eds.) (2018), Climate Change in Cities: Innovations in Multi-Level Governance, Springer, Cham.
32. IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) (2018), Global warming of 1.5°C.World Meteorological Organization, IPCC, Geneva
33. IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) (2019), Climate Change and Land: an IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems, IPCC, Geneva
34. Ives M (2013) Singapore takes the lead in green building in Asia. Yale Environment 360. Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. Available at: http://e360.yale.edu/feature/singapore_takes_the_lead_in_green_building_in_asia/2720/ (accessed 12 September 2023).
35. Jensen, A. R., et al. (2015). Green roofs and facades in urban landscapes: A case study of Copenhagen. Journal of Environmental Architecture, 18(2), 87-102.
36. Johansson, S., et al. (2013). The role of green spaces in reducing energy consumption in Copenhagen's buildings. Sustainable Cities and Society, 5, 24-31.
37. Johnsson F, Karlsson I, Rootzén J, Ahlbäck A and Gustavsson M 2020 The framing of a sustainable development goals assessment in decarbonizing the construction industry –Avoiding "Greenwashing", Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev. 131 110029.
38. Joss, S., 2010. Eco-cities: a Global Survey 2009. The Sustainable City VI: Urban Regeneration and Sustainability. WIT Press, Southampton, pp. 239e250.
39. Kauskale L, Geipele I, Zeltins N and Lecis I 2017 Environmental and energy aspects of construction industry and green buildings, Latv. J. Phys. Tech. Sci. 54 24-33
40. Komendantova N, Ekenberg L, Marashdeh L, Al Salaymeh A, Danielson M and LinneroothBayer J 2018 Are energy security concerns dominating environmental concerns? Evidence from stakeholder participation processes on energy transition in Jordan, Clim. 6 88
41. Laitner M, Stella A, Zamoyski M (2007) Green building city survey. NYUJ Legislation & Public Policy 11: 81–103.
42. Lee T, Koski C (2012) Building green: Local political leadership addressing climate change. Review

of Policy Research 29(5): 605–624.
43. Liu, L., Fryd, O., and Zhang, S. (2019). Blue-green infrastructure for sustainable urban storm water management—lessons from six municipality-led pilot projects in Beijing and Copenhagen. Water 11, 2024. doi: 10.3390/w11102024
44. Lund, P., et al. (2014). District heating in Copenhagen: Utilizing waste heat for sustainable urban development. Energy Policy, 68, 12-21.
45. Marzluff, J.M., Shulenberger, E., Endlicher, W., Alberti, M., Bradley, G., Ryan, C., Simon, U. and ZumBrunnen, C. (Eds.) (2008), Urban Ecology: An International Perspective on the Interaction Between Humans and Nature, Springer, Heidelberg.
46. Mills E 2011 Building commissioning: a golden opportunity for reducing energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, Energy Effic. 4 145–173
47. Mostafavi, M., and Doherty. (2010). Ecological Urbanism. Lars Mueller
48. Olmsted, F. L. (1871). Public parks and the enlargement of towns, in Journal of Social Science. Cambridge, MA: American Social Science Association, 3:1–36
49. Roh S, Tae S, Suk S J, Ford G and Shin S 2016 Development of a building life cycle carbon emissions assessment program (BEGAS 2.0) for Korea's green building index certification system, Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev. 53 954–965
50. Scerri, A., & Holden, M. (2014). Revisiting the sustainable city: The pathways and speed of metropolitan sustainability transitions. Geographical Journal, 180(4), 345-357.
51. Sijmons, D. (2020). "In the anthropocene, site matters in four ways," in A. Kahn Translating Sustainabilities between Green Niches and Socio-Technical Regimes and C. J. Burns (Eds.), Site Matters: Strategies for Uncertainty Through Planning and Design. (2nd edition). London, UK: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780429202384-8
52. Spirn, A. W. (2014). "Ecological urbanism: A framework for the design of resilient cities," in The Ecological Design and Planning Reader. Washington, DC: Island Press. p. 557–571. doi: 10.5822/978-1-61091-491-8_50
53. Tan, Y., Chan, E. H. W., & Wong, J. K. W. (2019). Green building policies and practices in Singapore. Building and Environment, 148, 151-160.
54. Tewfik M and Ali M M 2014 Public green buildings in Jordan, Eur. Int. J. Sci. Technol 3 284–300
55. Thomsen, M. N., et al. (2017). Building codes and regulations for sustainable construction in Copenhagen. Journal of Sustainable Architecture, 25(4), 189-204.
56. UN (United Nations) (2015), Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A/RES/70/1.
57. UN (United Nations) (2017), New Urban Agenda, Habitat III Secretariat, Ecuador.
58. United Nations. (2019). The Sustainable Development Goals report 2019. unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2019
59. UN-Habitat (2017), Sustainable Urbanization in the Paris Agreement: Comparative review for urban content in the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), UN-Habitat, Nairobi.
60. Global Change Research Program, ― Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States ‖ 9 12(2009), http://downloads.globalchange.gov/usimpacts/pdfs/climate-impacts-report.pdf accessed 1 September 2012.
61. Van der Heijden J (2016) Opportunities and risks of the 'new urban governance' in India: To what extent can it help addressing pressing environmental problems? Journal of Environment & Development 25(3): 251–275.
62. Van der Heijden J (2014) Governance for Urban Sustainability and Resilience. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.
63. Wilby, R. L. (2007), "A Review of Climate Change Impacts on the Built Environment", Built Environment, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp.31-45.
64. Wolfram, M., van der Heijden, J., Juhola, S. and Patterson, J. (2019), "Learning in urban climate governance: concepts, key issues and challenges", Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp.1-15.

65. Wu X, Peng B and Lin B 2017 A dynamic life cycle carbon emission assessment on green and non-green buildings in China, Energy Build. 149 272–281
66. Yiing CF, Yaacob NM, Hussein H (2013) Achieving sustainable development: Accessibility of green buildings in Malaysia. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences 101: 120–129.
67. Zanni M A, Soetanto R and Ruikar K 2014 Defining the sustainable building design process: Methods for BIM execution planning in the UK, Int. J. Energy Sect. Manage. 8 562–587
68. Zuo J, Pullen S, Palmer J, Bennetts H, Chileshe N and Ma T 2015 Impacts of heat waves and corresponding measures: A review, J. Clean. Prod. 92 1–12