

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No FHWA/CA/OR-2006/02		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Increasing Bus Transit Ridership: Dynamics of Density, Land Use, and Population				5. Report Date: 07/1/03 – 04/30/05	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author/s Tridib Banerjee, Dowell Myers, Clara Irazabal, Deepak Bahl				8. Performing Organization Report No. 03-24-2006-1	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address California Department of Transportation Division of Research and Innovation, #83 P. O. Box 942873 Sacramento, CA 94273-0001				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. 65A0047	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address U.S. Department of Transportation Research and Special Programs Administration 400 7 th Street, SW Washington, DC 20590-0001				13. Type of Report and Period Covered	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes					
16. Abstract The study explores the possibilities of revitalizing existing urban communities, increasing transit ridership, decreasing jobs-housing imbalance, and mitigating the impacts of sprawl from transit corridor development or TCD, a variant of the more general class of TOD or transit-oriented development. We present findings of a study that focuses on the relationship between transit ridership and density and mixed land use developments along major arterial corridors in Los Angeles. Our research focuses on Ventura Boulevard and Vermont Avenue as a comparative study of two heavily subscribed transit corridors. Our analysis suggests that the predominant land use around these corridors is low-density automobile-oriented development which remains transit-unfriendly. However, the City's policy environment has undergone favorable changes with the introduction new zoning ordinances. In light of these changes, we develop and recommend spatial and urban design strategies that productively utilize surplus and marginal space along transit corridors to accommodate future population growth. It is our expectation that the densification of the underutilized commercial corridors will create vibrant local economies, increase opportunities for market and affordable housing, revitalize retail, and lead to a fuller use of transit lines and increased ridership, a trend that we have already observed in higher density bus station areas					
17. Key Words			18. Distribution Statement No Restrictions. This document is available through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161		
19. Security Classification (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classification (of this page)		21. No. Of Pages 115	22. Price

**Increasing Bus Transit Ridership:
Dynamics of Density, Land use, and Population Growth**

**METRANS Draft Report
December 13, 2004**

**Dr. Tridib Banerjee
Dr. Dowell Myers
Dr. Clara Irazabal
Deepak Bahl
Amrith Raghavan
Lu Dai
David Gloss
Navin Vutha**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction & Executive Summary

Chapter 2: Demographic & Socio-economic Analysis

Chapter 3: Land Use Analysis

Chapter 4: Transit Ridership Analysis in the Metro Rapid Bus Stop Areas

Chapter 5: Models Based on Factors Affecting Transit Ridership

Chapter 6: Design Proposal

Appendix

Chapter 1: Introduction & Executive Summary

Los Angeles region has the largest network of bus transit system covering an area of 1,400 sq. miles with 1,433 of road miles of local transit and commuter lines, and 96 miles of Rapid Transit lines.¹ The integrated network currently serves a transit dependent population of 1.4 million daily. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) estimates a continued growth in population, housing, and employment density in the region. Rapid immigration, increase in youth and senior population, and the addition of lower income workers are contributing to an increase in the transit dependent population. This trend is expected to continue as congestion costs and the cost of auto ownership continue to escalate driven largely by Southern California's sprawling development patterns. With current levels of utilization of bus transit (seat miles) at 34% in Los Angeles there is room for increasing ridership with the promotion of more compact developments.²

We introduce the concept of Transit Corridor Development (TCD) to channel population growth and density along the existing transit network. We find that most transit corridors have underutilized commercial land use, vacant lots, or low density residential developments that present a viable alternative to accommodate new growth. TCD focuses on developing the underutilized properties and grey fields to its full potential. The introduction of several ordinances such as Residential Accessories Services (RAS), Location Efficient Mortgages (LEMs) and density bonuses in Los Angeles provides scope for increasing density. Further the introduction of mixed use, infill development, adaptive reuse, grey field development along the corridor present positive opportunity to enhance the physical environment without affecting the surrounding residential areas or existing community character. Our analysis shows that there is an increase in transit ridership with increase in density and land use mix, thereby increasing the likelihood of TCDs becoming locations for new housing thus increasing transit ridership.

The Regional Context

Table 1.1 shows the expected population, households, and employment in the City of Los Angeles for 2030. Population is expected to grow by 19.4 %, households by 30.4 %, and employment by 22.8% between 2000 and 2030. The SCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) estimates 60,280 additional units to be built by 2005 in the City of Los Angeles alone. This presents an opportunity to accommodate future housing needs through efficient land use and better integration of transit.

¹ http://www.metro.net/board/agendas/05_may/planning/item6.pdf

² Source: SCAG, 2004 Draft Regional Transportation Plan, March 2004 P.58 ,Federal Transit Administration (FTA) National Transit Database


Table 1.1: Forecast of Population, Households, and Employment for the City of Los Angeles

City of Los Angeles	Census 2000	Forecast for 2030 Plan Forecast in Growth Vision Plus Plan effect. ³	Percentage Change
Population	3,694,834	4,413,000	19.4%
Households	1,275,412	1,663,000	30.4%
Employment	1,747,420 ⁴	2,265,000	22.8%

Source: Draft 2004 RTP Population, Households, Employment Growth in 2030

Existing population density distribution in the region shows presence of pockets of low density along major transit corridors that can potentially be the location of future housing. (Refer Figure 1.1).

Figure 1.1: Population density distribution of census tracts in Los Angeles County.



Source: SCAG

Research Strategy

Our project analyzes factors such as population growth and density, housing, variety of land uses, and transit infrastructure that may contribute to increase in transit ridership. Secondly, the project develops strategies to increase ridership in bus transit corridors

³ <http://www.scag.ca.gov/rtp/2004draft/ch2.pdf>

⁴ Source : Employment Development Department, California

through increases in residential and mixed-use developments. This is an integral part of the larger strategy that accommodates population growth in higher density and infill developments in existing urban areas and also of well-integrated land use and transportation policy.

The Concept of Transit Corridor Development

TCD offers communities an alternative to the impacts of low-density suburban sprawl and automobile-dependent land use patterns. New in-fill, mixed use and higher density development along existing transit corridors can make significant progress towards improving mobility options and quality of life. Yet, a recent California Department of Transportation study suggests that the predominant land use around significant bus corridors and stations remains low-density automobile-oriented development.⁵ Moreover, local zoning and development codes (FAR, parking requirements, allowable uses and densities) remain transit-unfriendly. Our study focuses on examining the dynamics of land use and density changes among other factors in the areas along transit corridors.⁶

Figure 1.1: Map showing the Metro Rapid and other bus lines in Los Angeles County



Source: MTA

TCD is a variant of the more general class of transit-oriented developments (or TODs), which are associated with the development around transit stations or so called transit villages. We believe increasingly, developments along transit corridors will be seen as a

⁵ Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study: Factors for Success in California (May 2002),

⁶ Refer to figure 1.2 for the key map showing the rapid bus corridors

strategy to help mitigate effects of future sprawl, and improve California's environment and quality of life. TOD offers communities an alternative to the impacts of low-density suburban sprawl and automobile-dependent land use patterns. Moreover, TOD can help answer California's urgent need for more affordable housing by creating opportunities for in-fill development at higher densities. Such developments can make significant progress towards improving mobility options and quality of life by coordinating investments in land use and transportation projects. Optimal transit system design, community partnerships, comprehensive understanding of the local real estate market, innovative urban design concepts, coordination among local, regional, and state agencies, and the right mix of planning and financial incentives are some of the key elements required for successful implementation of developments. The increasing demand for urban housing (at higher densities) that offers reduced commute times and access to urban amenities, points to increasing demand for TOD projects.

While a number of new TODs have been planned and built across the state, there are also major barriers that limit their implementation in California. One of the major challenges to TOD is the underlying zoning and land use along transit stations and corridors. The predominant land use around the majority of significant bus and rail stops remain low-density automobile-oriented development as local zoning is transit-unfriendly, antiquated, and protected by NIMBYism.

Competition for sales tax dollars has left many cities with under performing retail strips, malls, and commercial corridors. The success of one city is the loss of another. This zero sum game has led to a gradual cannibalization of space leaving inner city corridors littered with underutilized and marginal retail. There are many examples in Los Angeles and Gateway Cities where these commercial corridors abut communities and neighborhoods with significant transit dependent populations or potential transit riders. Compounding the problem are local development codes (FAR, parking requirements, allowable uses and densities) around stations and corridors that often tend to favor low-density, auto-oriented uses. Creating and implementing transit friendly zoning becomes an additional challenge.

Objectives of the Study

We want to understand the dynamics of population growth and density and determine to what extent supporting land use and zoning have kept pace with the underlying change in these bus transit corridors. Specifically, the objectives of this project are to:

- Assess the dynamics of demographic, socio-economic, density, and land use changes in these transit corridors, and their interactions.
- Document the environmental, institutional, market, and social factors that are contributing to change in the bus transit corridors.
- Identify major obstacles and opportunities for higher density and mixed-use development in transit corridors.
- Review lessons learned from this analysis that could lead to specific policy recommendations.

- Develop and recommend planning and urban design strategies that productively utilize surplus and marginal space along transit corridors to accommodate future growth in higher densities, and mixed-use developments, thereby increasing bus transit ridership.


The Study Corridors

For this study we chose to focus on two distinctly different bus transit corridors with some of the higher transit ridership as identified by MTA. These are Ventura Boulevard, approximately 16 miles long, from Lankershim Blvd. on the east to Topanga Canyon Blvd. on the west, and Vermont Avenue a length of 11.5 miles from Sunset Blvd. on the north to Imperial Highway on the south. For the purposes of this study walkable distance of half-a-mile from transit routes and stops on both sides define the width of the transit corridors and our study area.

The corridors exhibit diverse service, ridership, land use, travel, retail sales, demographic, and socio-economic patterns. According to MTA, total bus ridership has increased by nearly 40 percent on the 26-mile Wilshire/Whittier and 16-mile Ventura Boulevard corridors since the initiation of the Metro Rapid Program in June 2000. Nearly one third of the increase has come from passengers new to public transit. Metro Rapid is slated to expand in 24 corridors over the next five years in 34 cities and 11 Los Angeles County unincorporated communities.

The Ventura corridor running east-west has relatively higher income level and low density residential development than the Vermont corridor, which runs north-south showing differences in spatial, built form characteristics, and income diversity. The common features among the two corridors are the high transit ridership and under utilization of sites with respect to allowable densities for development.


Figure 1.3: Study Area Vermont Corridor



Study Area: Vermont Corridor

- Vermont Rapid Stops
- Vermont Avenue
- Rail Lines
- Quarter mile buffer
- Half Mile Buffer
- Block Group Boundaries

Figure 1.4: Study Area Ventura Corridor



Study Area: Ventura Corridor

- Ventura Rapid Stops
- Ventura Boulevard
- Rail lines
- Quarter Mile Buffer
- Half Mile Buffer
- Block Group Boundaries

Data Used for the Study

We chose to use publicly available Census data 1990 and 2000 for population and housing analysis. Census block groups that intersected the one mile width of the two corridors were considered as the units of analysis. Rapid bus stop areas were a subset of the corridor units of analysis and consisted of block groups that intersected a one mile diameter of major rapid bus stop intersection.

Employment data from SCAG was used to create the multiple regression models to predict ridership. Here the census tracts that intersected the one mile diameter of Rapid bus stop areas were the individual units of analysis.

We also used SCAG's 2000 land use data to perform land use analysis. In determining total ridership within the transit corridors, we used MTA, weekday boarding and alighting data for all bus lines that passed through the corridor and its intersections. Mapping of demographics was done using Census block group shape files. Maps of bus lines and bus stops were created using MTA shape files.

We have used parcel level data from Zimas - City of Los Angeles website to calculate total existing built area in four selected bus stops areas chosen as a case study. They are Florence and Wilshire in Vermont corridor, and Van Nuys and Laurel Canyon Blvd. in Ventura corridor. In case of missing information, site visits were made to estimate the likely built area. Simulation of future higher density development was done for two station areas; Florence bus stop area in Vermont corridor, and Van Nuys bus stop area in Ventura corridor.

Methodology

GIS was used in defining the boundaries and mapping of the study corridors. We have included a separate note for the data and the boundaries considered for each analysis undertaken within the corresponding chapters. Block groups were used as units of analysis for the different demographic variables.

We have analyzed data by:

- Preparing tables, charts, and line and scatter plots
- Running various regression models for understanding relationship between key variables and multiple regression models for predicting future transit ridership, and
- Mapping of data

Major Findings

In comparing the demographic, land use, and urban form changes in the two corridors, we find different factors underpinning the relationship of population growth and density to transit ridership, and the role of land use and zoning changes that reflect the building and land use characteristics.

1. Socio-economic and housing profile

Vermont and Ventura corridors are unique and exhibit public transit ridership patterns consistent with their housing and population characteristics.

- In terms of ethnicity, population in Vermont corridor is predominantly Hispanic, followed by Blacks, Asians, and Whites in both 1990 and 2000, while population in Ventura is predominantly White followed by Hispanics, Asians, and Blacks.
- A comparison of the median income of population living in different block groups in the two corridors shows that Vermont corridor has household annual income levels lower than \$25,000 in certain pockets while in Ventura corridor the median income overall was higher than \$25,000 in the year 2000.
- As for the mode of travel among workers 16 years and older in the two corridors only 2.5% of workers in Ventura corridor use public transport to work while nearly 22% used public transport in Vermont corridor.
- The density in the two corridors shows a difference as well. Population density in Vermont is 33 persons per acre and housing density approximately 11 units per acre significantly higher than Ventura corridor. Ventura corridor has an average density of 6.6 persons per acre and 3.2 housing units per acre. The corridors show marginally higher growth in housing density compared to Los Angeles during 1990 to 2000.
- The ownership rate in housing is much higher in Ventura corridor compared to Vermont corridor. In 2000, almost 50% of the households were homeowners compared to 13% in Vermont corridor.
- Vermont corridor has more than twice the stock of multifamily housing compared to Ventura. Nearly 68% of the housing stock was multifamily in Vermont corridor compared to 31.5% for Ventura corridor in 2000. Ventura corridor has larger developments (or number of units in structure) in multifamily housing; 65% of housing units are in structures larger than 20 units, while Vermont corridor has smaller structures in multifamily housing with 60% of units accommodated in structures having less than 20 units.

- In 2000, land area under single family residential density of less than 5 units per acre comprises 80% of total area in Ventura corridor, while in Vermont corridor it is less than 20% of total land area.

Meeting Housing Demand

According to SCAG's 2000-05 RHNA, Los Angeles would require 60,280 additional housing units to accommodate new population growth. If we were to use the existing corridors, and use the length of rapid bus lines for accommodating these additional units within the one mile band of the corridors, it would require an increase of approximately one unit per acre only. The corresponding share for Vermont and Ventura corridors will be 7,222 and 10,050 housing units. Of course, the density distribution of housing developments may vary along the corridor based on the existing land use patterns.

Factors that Influence Transit Ridership

Some of the main patterns of ridership follow conventional wisdom:

- There is a positive relationship between population density and percentage of workers 16 years and over using public transit, especially in the Vermont corridor.
- Ethnicity of population, in this case increased percentage of Hispanics contributes to increased transit ridership among workers 16 years and over in both the corridors.
- As is expected, transit ridership among workers 16 years and over decreases with increasing median household income.
- All of these relationships hold true, especially for Vermont corridor, as almost 22% of total worker population use public transport.

Land Use Analysis

A comparison of land use distribution for 2000 in the two corridors shows mild differences in terms of distribution within a half mile and one mile band of the corridors.⁷

- The land use within one mile band is predominantly residential - 67% in case of Vermont corridor and 73% in case of Ventura corridor. Commercial land use varies from a high of 31.5 % within a half mile band and 25% within a one mile band in Vermont corridor to 27.2% within a half mile band and 16.7% within a one mile band in Ventura corridor. The amount of land under vacant and open spaces is limited in both corridors; about 1.6% of Vermont corridor and 1.1% of

⁷ The entire length of corridors were considered for calculating the total area and not the area under the block group which remain the units of analysis for census data and for calculating land use distributions within station areas.

Ventura corridor land is open space and recreation. Within a one mile band, Vermont has about 0.2% of vacant land while Ventura corridor has 3.2% of acreage as vacant land.

- The distribution of land use under various subcategories of residential and commercial areas show significant differences between the two corridors. Vermont corridor has 30.2% under mixed residential, 19.9 % under single family residential, and the rest multifamily residential land use. Ventura corridor has negligible mixed residential area but 58% under single family residential area and the rest as multifamily residential area consisting of duplexes, low rise apartments, and medium rise apartments. In Vermont corridor 16.9% of land area is in retail and 1.4% in general office uses, whereas in Ventura corridor 18.4% of land area is retail and 4.5 % general office uses within the half mile band of the corridor. Other commercial, public facilities, educational and special use facilities account for 13% of Vermont corridor and 4.5% of the Ventura corridor within the half mile band.
- The land use mix around bus stop areas shows wide variation among the two corridors. There are predominantly residential station areas such as Century, Vernon, Slauson, Florence, Manchester, and Imperial in the Vermont corridor. Similarly, Winnetka, Woodley, Van Nuys, Vineland, White Oak, and Balboa are the residential station areas in the Ventura corridor. The predominantly commercial, services, and industrial station areas are Wilshire, Olympic, and King in Vermont corridor, and Topanga, Serrania, Reseda, Van Nuys, and Universal in the Ventura corridor.
- A comparison of land use under different housing typologies shows differences among station areas. Some station areas are predominantly high density, mixed residential, multifamily station areas with less than 10% of acreage as single family residential. Examples of this typology include Santa Monica, Melrose, Beverly, 3rd Street, Wilshire, Olympic, Pico, Jefferson, and King in Vermont corridor. There are other stations which have more than 10% of the acreage devoted to multifamily residential. Reseda, Topanga, and Van Nuys in the Ventura corridor fall under this category.
- The mixed commercial retail and general office station areas are Wilshire, Olympic, and 3rd Street in Vermont corridor, and Topanga, Serrania, Woodley, Sepulveda, Winnetka, Reseda, White Oak, Balboa, Van Nuys, and Universal City in the Ventura corridor.
- Our interest in infill development focuses our attention on older strip retail development areas. Almost all station areas present potential for increased development in this front. The high potential station areas are Santa Monica, Pico and Washington in Vermont corridor, and Topanga, Reseda and Van Nuys in the Ventura corridor.

- Open space recreation areas that support pedestrian friendly use and community focus vary widely among the many station areas. Open space rich station areas in the Vermont corridor have nearly 8% land area dedicated to such uses. Pico and Washington bus stop areas are open space poor with less than 3% or 1% dedicated to such uses. Ventura corridor fares only slightly better relying more on private open space within the large tracts of single family neighborhoods. Balboa station area has 19.9% of land area dedicated to open space and recreation, and Universal City about 7.7% of land area. Topanga, Serrania, Winnetka, and Reseda bus stop areas lack sufficient open spaces.
- We also consider the reuse of parking lots and surrounding vacant areas to be included in increasing development potential.

Transit Ridership and Transit Linkages Analysis

The findings of the study relate the total ridership calculated as the average weekday boardings in all lines within a rapid bus stop intersection to the presence of transit linkages, bus stops, and metro stations near the intersection.

- We find as expected an increase in overall transit ridership with increase in rapid transit ridership for the bus stop area. This relationship is maintained when the two corridors are viewed separately as well.
- We find that the northern bus stop areas such as Santa Monica, 3rd Street, and Wilshire in the Vermont corridor, and Universal City in the Ventura corridor, close to metro rail stations show significantly higher bus activity levels (total boardings on all lines). Further increase in rapid bus connectivity and other bus lines around bus stop areas show high activity levels for Van Nuys and Sepulveda in the Ventura corridor. Reseda bus stop area in the Ventura corridor shows high transit activity due to the presence of more multifamily housing.
- Rapid buses show high ridership on the northern section of the Vermont corridor and the eastern section of the Ventura corridor.
- The bus stop density is higher closer to metro rail stations and rapid line transfer points as in the case of northern station areas on the Vermont corridor, and the Green line station area on the southern part. Ventura corridor bus stop areas with higher bus stop densities are Sepulveda, Van Nuys, and Reseda, along with Topanga (rapid bus transfer point) and Universal city (metro rail station & rapid bus transfer point).
- Ventura corridor has areas that lack sufficient bus stops and lie further from rapid bus stops such as the area between Winnetka and Reseda, and Laurel Canyon and Vineland.

- While we regard that bus stop and other transit infrastructure relate to demand, we see merit in increasing these facilities while we consider new developments along the corridor to enhance ridership and transit development potential.

We find Vermont rapid bus route catering to both people living within and outside the corridor, we would call it a transit commuter generating corridor. Ventura rapid route on the other hand caters to riders mainly living outside the corridor; we would call it a transit commuter destination or passing through corridor. Most destinations tend to be towards the eastern section between Sepulveda/Van Nuys and Universal City.

Results from the models

We ran several OLS models for determining the relationship of total weekday boardings of all bus lines passing the rapid bus stop areas at the intersection, with housing density, employment density, transit linkages and availability of metro rail connection, vehicle ownership.

- We could add this once the chapter five is finalized as this has undergone some changes.

Bus stop area study (to be added)

Recommendations

The development potential in residential areas lie in the introduction of granny flats that could open up housing for the elderly and small households , doubling the capacity in selected areas. This may have to be reviewed on a parcel by parcel basis. Currently the full utilization of multifamily zoned areas within the bus stop areas is considered for analysis to accommodate higher density developments.

TO BE ADDED

Structure of the Report

The report consists of three main sections:

- The first section consists of different chapters including demographic analysis, land use analysis, transit ridership and linkages of the corridors, and the individual station areas along with their major findings.
- The second section includes the different models used for predicting transit ridership
- The third section includes detailed analysis of four case study bus stop areas and a proposal for two selected bus stop areas including possible design alternatives.

Chapter 2: Demographic and Socio-Economic Analysis

Purpose

The following chapter looks at the population and housing characteristics of the study areas, including the mode of transport to work in the two corridors. The purpose of the study is to compare differences within the corridor in terms of population, density, ethnicity, income, use of public transit, housing type, ownership pattern, and vehicle ownership.

Units of Analysis

The unit of analysis chosen for our study includes all the census block groups that lie within and intersect the one mile band along the corridors, Vermont and Ventura. There are a total of 304 block groups, of which 196 block groups are in Vermont corridor, 108 block groups are in Ventura corridor (2000 Census).¹ The study examines the effect of population growth, density, socio-economic and mode choice, and also of housing density, housing characteristics at the aggregate corridor level and the distribution within block groups through maps.

Key Findings

The existing demographic pattern in the corridor shows variation and diversity in the population characteristics in terms of age-group, ethnicity, public transit use to work, and housing characteristics. There is also diversity in population and housing density in the two corridors. Even as the two corridors show high bus transit ridership, Vermont corridor draws on the people living within the corridor, as more than 22% of the workers aged 16 years and above use public transit, compared to Ventura which serves more as a link or a destination point for commuters since less than 3% workers living within the corridor use public transit.

Population Growth within Corridor and Effect on Ridership


- The population growth rate of the two corridors during 1990-2000 at 4.04% has been less than the City of Los Angeles as a whole which has grown by 6.01%. The growth in housing density has been 0.2 housing units per acre in the two corridors compared to 0.125 housing units per acre in the City of Los Angeles.
- The public transit use of workers in the corridors does not show increase as the number of workers decreased in the two corridors between 1990 and 2000. However there has been an overall increase in ridership in the two corridors, due to increase in low income population using public transit and increase in households with no vehicles. Thus the increase in ridership suggests an increase in non-work trips, not reflected in the census population survey.

¹ While comparing 1990, 2000 certain block groups had to be omitted following changes in their boundaries.

Characteristics of Population and Households

The total population in the two corridors was 507,546. There were 186,840 households in 2000.


Figure: 2.1: Comparison of Corridors, Population & Households, 2000



Source: Census 2000

There has been a moderate growth in population in the two corridors between 1990 and 2000. The figures 2.1 and 2.2 show a comparison between the two corridors and Los Angeles during the same period.

Figure 2.2: Comparison of Corridors, Population & Housing Units, 1990, 2000




Source: Census 2000, 1990, SF1

Public transit among workers 16 years and over

In 2000, there were fewer transit riders in the Ventura corridor compared to the Vermont corridor. As an aggregate, there were 25,752 transit users among commuting worker population or 13.3% of workers 16 years and over in the two corridors. In comparing the two corridors figure 2.3 indicates more than a fifth of the working population in Vermont corridor use public transit compared to only 2.3 % in Ventura corridor.

Figure 2.3: Comparison of Corridors, Public Transit Users among Workers 16 years and above.



Source: Census 2000, SF1

Table: 2.1

Demographic Characteristics of Ventura and Vermont Corridors, 2000

2000	Ventura corridor	Vermont corridor	Two corridors	Los Angeles City
Population	174318	333228	507546	3694834
Housing units	83921	112812	196733	1337668
Occupied Housing units	80808	106032	186840	1275358
Land sq.mts.	106474889	40943979	147418868	1214897958
Land Acres	26299.30	10113.16	36412.46	300079.80
Non-Hispanic or Latino	159076	140372	299448	1974918
Hispanic or Latino	15242	192856	208098	1719916
Workers 16 years and over total	92350	110338	202688	1494895
Workers 16 years + commuting	85458	107450	192908	1433200
Car; truck; or van	81395	75913	157308	1203143
Car; truck; or van; Drove alone	74887	56791	131678	982735
Car; truck; or van; Carpooled	6508	19122	25630	220408
Public transportation	1935	23817	25752	152435
Bus or trolley bus	1630	22631	24261	144973
Streetcar or trolley car (publico in Puerto Rico)	20	96	116	804
Subway or elevated	66	749	815	3054
Railroad	81	123	204	1730
Ferryboat	20	5	25	136
Taxicab	118	213	331	1738
Total Other	2128	7720	9848	77622
Bicycle	152	900	1052	9052
Walked	1358	5579	6937	53386
Motorcycle	139	83	222	2474
other	479	1158	1637	12710
Worked at home	6892	2888	9780	61695
Median Income				
15,000 & less		25673	25673	265869
15,000-25,000		197193	197193	182068
25,000-50,000	59200	104590	163790	349375
50,000-75,000	55308	2758	58066	198145
75,000-100,000	27866	1253	29119	107198
100,000 & above	31944	1761	33705	173954
Population 5 yrs & below	9078	30427	39505	285976
Population 5_17 yrs	21317	71518	92835	695335
Population 18_64 yrs	116961	207862	324823	2356380
Population 65 yrs & above	27039	23808	50847	357129

Socio-economic Characteristics

Ethnicity

The corridors show differences in the share of Hispanic population. In the year 2000 compared to Los Angeles, Ventura corridor has a lower percentage of Hispanic population, less than 10%, and Vermont corridor reflects a higher percentage of Hispanic population at 42%. There has been an increase in the share of Hispanics in Ventura corridor since 1990 when the percentage of Hispanic population was 7%. In contrast, share of Hispanics declined in the Vermont corridor from 47% in 1990 to 42% in 2000.

The distribution of population among various ethnic groups shows the largest ethnic group to be White in the Ventura corridor and Latino in the Vermont corridor. There is larger Black or African-American community in the Vermont corridor compared to Ventura corridor. The proportion of Asian community is also higher in the Vermont corridor than in the Ventura corridor. There is a larger proportion of mixed ethnicity in the Ventura corridor compared to Vermont corridor.


Workers and Means of Transport to Work

The working population who traveled to work in the two corridors varies considerably. In the Ventura corridor about 53.1% of the population is workers, in the Vermont corridor only 34.1% are workers, compared to Los Angeles which has 40.4% workers.

The means of transport to work shows variation; Vermont corridor has 22.2% of workers using public transportation to work. In contrast, Ventura corridor has just 2.3% of public transit use, significantly lower than Vermont.

There has been an increase in transit ridership in the corridors; however the census sample data reveals a decrease in the proportion of workers using public transit between 1990 and 2000. In Ventura corridor the decrease is about 0.4 %, in Vermont corridor the decrease is about 1.5 % and in City of Los Angeles it is about 0.3 %. In some ways this indicates the need to integrate other sources of information such as the transit survey information to reveal the pattern in transit ridership. Some of the other factors for increases in transit ridership could be related to non-work trips. The increase in the number of workers in the population also shows increases in household income levels which are linked to decrease in transit commute.

Figure X: Comparison of Corridors, Percentage Public Transit users among workers 16 years and above, 1990, 2000.




Source: Census 1990, 2000, SF 3 sample data

Household Median Income

The two corridors display varying income levels. For 1999, Ventura corridor has household median income greater than \$25,000 and Vermont corridor has pockets with median household income below \$25,000. In Vermont corridor, 70% of population living in block groups has income less than \$25,000, and in addition 7.7 % have median household income below \$15,000.

Figure X: Comparison of Two Corridors, Percentage of Population living in Block Groups with Median Household Income, 1999.




Source: Census 2000, SF 3 sample data

Density


The densities in the two corridors are considerably different. For 2000, Ventura corridor had lower densities of population and housing, 6.6 persons per acre and 3.2 housing units per acre. Vermont corridor had higher density levels than the City of Los Angeles with population density of 32.9 persons per acre and 11.2 housing units per acre.²

Chart 2.14-15: Comparison of Corridors, Population and Housing Density 1990 and 2000



Source: Census 1990, 2000 SF1

Vehicle ownership (to add)



² City of Los Angeles had population density of 12.3 persons per acre and housing density of 4.5 housing units per acre.

Housing:


Table: 2.2 Housing Characteristics of the two corridors for the year 2000

2000	Ventura corridor	Vermont corridor	Two corridors	Los Angeles City
Population	174318	333228	507546	3694834
Housing units	83921	112812	196733	1337668
Occupied Housing units	80808	106032	186840	1275358
Owner occupied housing units	42613	19681	62294	491836
Renter occupied housing units	38195	86351	124546	783522
Vacant Housing units	3113	6780	9893	62310
Single family occupied	41084	32912	73996	588581
Single family Owners	36056	16697	52753	428535
Single family renters	5028	16215	21243	160046
Single Family vacant	1465	2592	4057	23982
Single family total	42549	35504	78053	612563
Multi-family occupied	39709	73106	112815	686149
Multi-family Owners	6550	2984	9534	62944
Multi-family renters	33159	70122	103281	623205
Multifamily vacant	1566	3724	5290	29874
Multifamily units in structure	41275	76830	118105	716023
2 units	488	4967	5455	42814
3 or 4 units	1555	12042	13597	86253
5 to 9 units	4575	14220	18795	126263
10 to 19 units	7900	16218	24118	138634
20 to 49 units	12718	18158	30876	171633
50 or more units	14039	11225	25264	150426
Others_occupied	15	14	29	628
Others_Owners	7	0	7	357
Others_renters	8	14	22	271
Other vacant- Mobile home, Boat; RV; van; etc	82	464	546	8454
Others	97	478	575	9082
Mobile home	82	458	540	8222
Boat; RV; van; etc.	15	20	35	860
Aggregate vehicles	133212	115114	248326	1842106
Households with no vehicles	4433	32145	36578	210770
Owner Occupied no vehicles	1173	2076	3249	25653
Renter Occupied no Vehicles	3260	30069	33329	185117

Occupancy & Tenure

The total number of housing units in Vermont corridor is more than the Ventura corridor with higher densities.³ The ownership rates of housing are higher in Ventura corridor, which is about 50.8 %, compared to 17.4 % in Vermont corridor. Vacancy rate in Vermont corridor is 6.0% compared to 3.7% for Ventura corridor. Los Angeles in comparison had an ownership rate of 36.8% and a 4.7% vacancy rate.

Chart 2.16: Comparison of Corridors, Percentage of Occupancy Status and Tenure, 2000




Source: Census 2000

Single Family and Multifamily

The proportion of multifamily units shows considerable variation between the two corridors. Ventura corridor has 51% of total housing units as single family, and 49.5% of housing units as multifamily, compared to Vermont corridor which has 31.5% of housing units as single family and 68.1% of housing units as multifamily. Vermont corridor shows a higher proportion of multifamily housing units compared to Los Angeles, which has 46% as single family housing units, 53.5% as multifamily and less than 1% mobile homes and others.

³ Census definition of Housing unit-A house, an apartment, a mobile home or trailer, a group of rooms, or a single room occupied as separate living quarters, or if vacant, intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other individuals in the building and which have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall. For vacant units, the criteria of separateness and direct access are applied to the intended occupants whenever possible.


Chart 2.17: Comparison of Corridors, Percentage of Housing Typology, 2000



Source: Census 2000, SF3

The size of housing developments varies in the two corridors as reflected by the housing units in structure among the multifamily units. Larger developments occur in Ventura corridor compared to Vermont corridor. Ventura corridor has 64% of housing units comprised in developments of 20 and above units in structure. Further the proportion of developments 50 and above units in structure is about 33.5 % in Ventura corridor. The number of developments above 3 units in structure and less than 20 units in structure comprises of 55% of housing units in the Vermont corridor.

Chart 2.18: Comparison of Corridors, Percentage of Housing units in Multifamily Structures, 2000




Source: Census 2000, SF3

Meeting Housing Demand

The current estimate of the number of additional housing units needed in Los Angeles as of 2005 is 60,280 units according to SCAG RHNA. The City currently has a housing inventory of 1,337,668 units. The corridors currently accommodate 227,312 units, which represents 17% of City’s housing stock. If the total length of transit corridors in the city of Los Angeles is taken to be 96.5 miles, the total length of the two transit corridors in our study is 27.5 miles and therefore proportionately needs to accommodate 17,720 housing units. The housing stock in the Ventura corridor is 86,205 housing units and will have to accommodate 10,048 additional units in 2005 and the Vermont corridor is 112,812 housing units and will have to accommodate an additional 7,222 housing units by 2005.

In terms of density this means an addition of one unit per acre within the one mile corridor.

Chart 2.19: Housing Needs Estimate for Corridors



Source: Census 2000 & SCAG

Table 2.3: Meeting housing demand in the two corridors for the year 2005

Total Housing units	Ventura Corridor	Vermont Corridor	Los Angeles City	Two corridors
Existing units	83921	112812	1337668	196733
Additional units needed* 2005	10047	7221	60280	17268
Area in acres	26310	10117	300207	36428
Total length of Rapid lines in miles	16	11.5	96	27.5
Existing housing density per acre	3.19	11.15	4.46	5.40
Additional units needed per acre**	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98


*SCAG, Regional Housing Needs Assessment for the year 2005

Housing Density Distribution in Ventura and Vermont Corridors

Population and Housing Density

There is a difference between the Ventura and Vermont corridors in terms of distribution of housing densities in block groups. Taking average housing densities of the block group and their population in the year 2000, Ventura corridor has almost half of the population living in housing density of 0-5 dwelling units (DU) per acre and Vermont corridor has only one eighth of the population living in densities lower than 5 DU per acre. Ventura corridor has another one fifth of population living in housing density of 5-10 DU per acre, Vermont corridor has one third of population living in the 5-10 DU per acre. Further, Ventura has less than one fifth of its population in housing density above 15 DU per acre and Vermont has less than a one third of its population in housing density above 15 DU per acre.⁴

Figure X: Comparison of corridors, population, land area, in block groups within different housing density distributions



Source: Census 2000


Land area and housing density

Looking at the land area occupied by the block groups with different average housing density, Ventura has almost 83% of land area with less than 5 DU per acre; Vermont corridor has about 17.8 % land area with less than 5 DU per acre. Ventura corridor has another 10 % of the land area with housing density between 5-10 DU per acre, and

⁴ Ventura has 8.5 % population living in housing density of 10-15 DU per acre and Vermont has 26.3% population living in housing density of 10-15 DU per acre. Ventura has another 10.6 % of population living in housing density of 15-25 DU per acre, Vermont has 21.1% of population living in housing density of 15-25 DU per acre. For housing density of 25-40 DU per acre, Ventura corridor has 6.2 % of population and Vermont corridor has 14.4 % population living in them, for housing density 40 and above DU per acre, Ventura has 2.5 % population and Vermont has 5.7 % population living in them.

Vermont has 37.5% land area with housing density 5-10 DU per acre. Ventura corridor has less than 5% of its land area with housing density more than 10 DU per acre; Vermont corridor on the other hand has 44.6% of its land area with density more than 10 DU per acre. The distribution of number of housing units with average housing density in block groups is similar to that of population within the two corridors.

Figure X: Comparison of Corridors, housing units in block groups within different housing density distributions




Source: Census 2000

Study of Relationship of Population Traveling to Work Using Public Transit with the Population Characteristics in the Ventura and Vermont Corridors

Population density and use of public transit

There is a non-trivial relationship between the workers using transit and population density in the two corridors. There is an increase in transit use among workers with increase in density; however there are considerable differences between the two corridors.

Figure X: Scatter plot showing population density and percentage of workers using public transit.




The Vermont corridor displays a relationship between increasing population density and increasing work related transit use; however, Ventura corridor displays no such relationship. There are two reasons: First, most of the transit users traveling along this corridor do not live within this corridor.⁵ Second, the corridor has very low percentage of public transit use. Overall less than 3% of workers over 16 years of age use public transit.

Hispanics and the Use of Public Transit

There seems to be a non trivial relationship between percentage of workers using transit and the percentage of Hispanic population.



Figure X: Scatter plot showing percentage Hispanic population and percentage of workers using public transit, two corridors, Vermont, and Ventura separated



Source: Census 2000

Looking at the two corridors separately, the relationship still holds for both the Ventura and Vermont corridors. Considering the overall Hispanic population in the Ventura corridor is very low, the existence of a non-trivial relationship indicates that the increase in Hispanic population is likely to indicate an increase in transit use among the working population.

⁵ Refer Transit study based on HOBBAD survey, chapter 4 of the same report.



Source: Census 2000


Median household income and public transit use

The two corridors display relationship between median household income and public transit use. There is a decrease in public transit use with increase in household income. The two corridors show no relationship of transit use with household income when viewed separately, as there may be other factors that might explain this.

Ethnicity seems to have a more significant role in terms of relationship to work related transit use than income. However there is larger proportion of population with low levels of household income in the Vermont corridor and overall it has a higher percentage of transit users (22.2%).


Chart 2.29- 31: Scatter plot showing median household income and percentage of workers using public transit, two corridors, Vermont, and Ventura separated.

Relationship between Median Household Income and Transit use in the two corridors, 2000




Data used: 304 Block groups within the one mile band of the two study corridors for the year 2000. Transit use is the ratio of workers 16 years and older using public transit to work.

Relationship between Median Household Income and Transit use-Ventura Corridor



Data used: 108 Block groups within the one mile band of the two study corridors for the year 2000.

Relationship between Median Household Income and Transit use- Vermont Corridor



Data used: 196 Block groups within the one mile band of the study corridor for the year 2000.

Source: Census 2000, Block groups as units of analysis

Conclusions

The socio-economic characteristics vary in the corridors even as percentage of worker population using public transit varies. Ventura Rapid bus line is clearly catering to working commuters that do not necessarily live within the corridor and is a link to the Universal City metro station. Vermont Rapid bus line on the other hand relies heavily on the working population living within the corridor. As shown previously, it is not apparent that density of housing and population contribute to transit ridership. Multifamily type of housing, which is 70% of total housing in Vermont corridor, contributes to 22% of workers using public transport, compared to Ventura corridor where about 40% of population live in multifamily housing and contribute merely to 2.3% of workers using public transit. Further the social factors that increase transit ridership also depend largely on the income group one belongs to and the likelihood of being part of the Hispanic population. Previous study show low income groups and newer immigrant group tend to be transit users, however in our study area the relationship is influenced by other factors as well. The mild decreases in transit use over 1990 to 2000 point to changes in transit use with increasing incomes for workers alone.

Population density matters. Looking at relationship between percentage of workers using public transit and density, it may not be a linear relationship, however, there are other factors influencing ridership in combination with density. At a certain threshold level for population density, transit ridership does show increase and would decrease as other factors such as availability of presence of bus and metro rail stations, transit linkages etc. become influential. Chapter 5 covers several multiple regression analysis models used to parse out multiple factors that may be influential in increasing transit ridership.

The increases in transit trips could be attributed to other transit users on the corridor attracted towards destinations within the corridor, especially shopping, offices, recreation and connecting hub for other lines or metro stations that the limited analysis of merely census population data of percentage of workers using public transit will not tell. A more nuanced study of adjoining land uses and the relationship with the transit ridership data of the lines crisscrossing the corridor tells a different story. The following chapter 3 looks at land use mix around the major intersections of the corridor and the subsequent chapter 4 on the relationship between existing transit infrastructure such as bus-stops and bus lines with transit ridership.

Chapter 3: Land Use Analysis

Purpose


This chapter looks at the distribution of different land use types within the corridor that may influence transit ridership. Studies show land use analysis is useful in determining activities that contribute to trip making. We have considered residential areas to contribute to trip origins and commercial services, industrial, open spaces and recreation activities contributing to trip destinations.¹ The greater the intensity of use the greater the volume of trip generated or attracted. For example, in case of residential land, in low density and single family uses the trip generation is reduced considerably compared to multifamily residential areas. Furthermore, compact developments with a mix of uses contribute to increased trips generated. We also look at the possibility whether transit ridership would increase as the mix of land uses and intensity of activity within the land use increases.

(to add data used and methodology, major findings))

Land use distribution in the two corridors

The two corridors show differences in the distribution of land uses (refer figure 3.1). Using the SCAG 2000 land use information classification, both corridors show predominant distribution of land use under residential with Vermont 67% and Ventura 73%.² Within a half mile band there is a marginal decrease in residential land use. The land under commercial use is considerably more within the half mile band compared to a one mile band for the entire corridor; in the Ventura corridor it is 27.2 % and in the Vermont corridor it is 31.4 %, offering destination points for commuters.

Figure 3.1: Overall Land Use Distribution, Vermont corridor, 2000




Source: SCAG Land use data, 2000

¹ Based on previous studies

² The SCAG land use areas include the areas under roads and streets, it excludes only the ROWs of major transportation corridors, such as freeways, rail corridors etc.

Figure 3.2: Overall Land Use Distribution, Ventura corridor, 2000




Source: SCAG, 2000

Vermont has 1.6% of land area under open space and recreation, within one mile band, compared to Ventura which has 1.1 % area under open space. Ventura corridor has considerable area vacant (3.2%) compared to a low of 0.2 % in Vermont corridor, due to large areas falling under the northern slopes of Santa Monica hills.

Residential land use

Within the one mile band stretch for the entire corridor length, there is a larger distribution of land under single family residential in the Ventura corridor, 60 % compared to a low of 20% in Vermont corridor. Further the percentage of mixed and multifamily residential area is about 11.7 % in the Ventura corridor, and 47.2 % in the Vermont corridor. Vermont is clearly a high density residential corridor compared to the Ventura corridor.

Figure 3.3- 4: Charts showing comparison of residential land use in Vermont & Ventura corridors, 2000




Source: SCAG, 2000

Commercial Land use

Ventura corridor has more land, 23.5% - under retail commercial and offices within the half mile band, compared to Vermont corridor at 19.9%.

Figure 3.5- 6: Comparison of commercial land use in Vermont & Ventura corridors, 2000



Source: SCAG, 2000

Figure 3.7: Land use map, Vermont Corridor 2000





Figure 3.8: Land use map, Ventura Corridor 2000



Land use mix around rapid bus stop areas


The land use mix around individual stops shows variations from being predominantly residential to predominantly commercial, services, and/or industrial uses. There are predominantly residential station areas such as Century, Vernon, Slauson, Florence, Manchester, Imperial, and Green line in the Vermont corridor. Similarly, in Ventura corridor, residential station areas are Winnetka, Woodley, Van Nuys, Vineland, White Oak, and Balboa. The predominantly commercial, services and industrial station areas are Wilshire, Olympic and King in Vermont corridor, and Topanga, Serrania, Reseda, Van Nuys and Universal City in the Ventura corridor.

The residential areas are considered as trip generators and the commercial, services and industrial uses are trip attractors. Further our study identifies the distribution of older commercial areas and low density commercial areas which provide opportunities as infill sites and higher density developments.

Vermont Corridor Rapid Bus Stop Areas

The mix of residential and commercial/industrial land uses show a trend along the rapid bus stop areas of the corridor– Wilshire shows the midway point with equal portions of both categories and gradual increases in residential areas toward the north and south along the Vermont corridor.


Figure 3.9: Chart showing land use distributions at bus stop areas, Vermont, 2000



Residential use varies from low of 45% at Wilshire intersection to 87% around Century intersection, retail use varies from a high of 49% at Wilshire intersection to low of 5.4% around the Green line intersection. Hollywood, Sunset, Santa Monica, Beverly, 3rd Street, Wilshire, Washington, Slauson, and Green line rapid bus stop areas show industrial clusters as part of the mix.

Ventura corridor Rapid Bus Stop Areas

Figure 3.10: Chart showing land use distributions at bus stop areas, Vermont, 2000



The rapid bus stop areas on the Ventura corridor show a mix in residential and commercial use varying from a residential high of 78% (Woodley) and low of 40.5% (Universal City), commercial high of 33.6% (Topanga) and low of 4.5% (White Oak). Reseda, Laurel Canyon, Universal City contain industrial clusters as well.


Residential Land use

Vermont corridor

Vermont corridor rapid bus stop areas show considerable proportion of multifamily of which mixed residential forms a major portion showing diversity in the units in structure and type. The highest proportion of multifamily residential of 95% is found around the 3rd Street intersection and a low of 17% around Green line intersection. Large proportion of medium rise and low rise apartments and condominiums are found in Melrose, Beverly, 3rd Street, Wilshire and Olympic rapid bus stop areas, corresponding to the

proximity to metro rail stations. The proportion of single family residential area increases as one moves northward or southward from 3rd Street/Wilshire rapid bus stop areas which forms the node for the densest developments.


Figure 3.11: Chart showing land use distributions at bus stop areas, Vermont, 2000



Ventura Corridor

The area under multifamily residential is considerably smaller in the Ventura corridor varying from a high of 25.6% (Winnetka) to a low of 0% (Woodley).

Figure 3.12: Chart showing land use distributions at bus stop areas, Ventura, 2000



Commercial Land Use


Both corridors show a mix of commercial land uses- educational institutions, public facilities, hotels motels, commercial recreation, older strip and newer retail centers. Retail areas form the major portion under this category, followed by office commercial and educational facilities, public facilities. Attendant paid public parking facilities form a minor portion of the land use, as most parking areas are included within the retail, office commercial areas.

Vermont Corridor

The largest proportion of retail land uses lie around Washington, Pico, Slauson and Manchester rapid bus stop areas. The older strip accounts for more than 50% of all the

retail in these rapid bus stop areas showing potential for mixed use redevelopment. Special uses, public facilities, general office commercial form smaller portion of most rapid bus stop areas. Jefferson lies close to the university area and more than 60% of commercial area comes under this facility. 3rd Street, Wilshire, Olympic are major office areas, while Hollywood, Sunset, Santa Monica are minor office rapid bus stop areas.

Figure 3.13: Chart showing commercial land use at bus stop areas, Vermont, 2000




Ventura Corridor

The proportion of retail commercial area varies from high of almost 80% around Laurel Canyon and a low of 10% around Serrania. Van Nuys, Sepulveda, Woodman, Coldwater Canyon, Laurel Canyon, and Vineland rapid bus stop areas contain large areas under older strip retail and have potential sites that could see an increase in density. Topanga,

Woodley, Sepulveda are major office rapid bus stop areas, while Sepulveda and Woodman contain regional retail centers. Universal City forms the recreation hub in the corridor.

Figure 3.14: Chart showing commercial land use at bus stop areas, Ventura, 2000



Open Space and Recreation

Vermont corridor

Olympic and Pico rapid bus stop areas have at least 8% to 10% area dedicated for open spaces and recreation while almost all other rapid bus stops lack open spaces.

Ventura Corridor

Balboa (19.9%) and Universal City (7.7%) rapid bus stop areas have large areas dedicated to open spaces and recreation while all others rely on private vacant land for open space. Topanga, Serrania, Winnetka, and Reseda rapid bus stop areas clearly lack sufficient open spaces.

Conclusions

The analyses of land uses show potential areas for increases in development in terms of both residences, commercial and mixed uses. Here, mix of uses are not restricted to individual parcels or lots but within a walking radius from bus stops. Higher density residential alternatives have to follow specific locale characteristics in order to face minimum resistance from existing communities. Here a mixture of housing typologies could be incorporated within existing vacant sites and underutilized sites where low-density single story structures could be densified by adding units to the floors above. Further reorientation and rearrangements of uses within lots, especially reorientation of parking areas within existing developments and bringing in retail fronts to pedestrian access creates more walkable commercial areas. Such measures not only enhance connectivity and access to public transport, but makes transit stops attractive places as destinations and activity areas.

Land uses that are potential sites for such adaptations are older strip commercials, parking lots, and low density residential areas in multifamily zones, vacant lands adjoining these areas, under utilized sites in all land use categories in general, which is dealt with more closely in the detailed analysis of two rapid bus stop areas in Chapter X.

Chapter 4: Transit ridership analysis in the metro rapid bus stop areas

This chapter presents ridership data for all bus lines that lie at the rapid bus stop intersection. We also provide maps showing transit infrastructure such as bus stops and metro stations.

Transit ridership levels for all bus lines and rapid transit lines

Figure 4.1: Scatter plot showing comparison of transit ridership on rapid bus lines and all lines combined




Figure 4.1 shows, that there is an increase in transit ridership overall with increase in rapid transit ridership.

This relationship persists at individual corridor level for both Vermont and Ventura corridors as figures 4.2-3, show.

Figure 4.2: Scatter plot showing comparison of transit ridership on rapid bus lines and all lines combined, Vermont corridor 2003,





Figure 4.3: Scatter plot showing comparison of transit ridership on rapid bus lines and all lines combined, Ventura corridor, 2003



Source: MTA, Weekday boardings

Bus activity in both corridors


The rapid bus stop activity maps (Figures 4.4-5) show the intensity of bus transit ridership at station areas within the corridors. Each rapid station area has total transit riders representing boarding and alighting for a 24 hour weekday period representing the activity levels at each station area.¹ The busiest station areas are within the Vermont corridor. Bus stops south of the I-10 Freeway on the Vermont corridor tend to be less busy compared to stops that lie north of the freeway. Wilshire station area is the busiest bus stop area, with the metro rail Red Line and other bus transit linkages.

Figure 4.4: Transit activity map, in rapid bus stop areas Vermont corridor, 2002



Source: MTA 2002

Figure 4.5: Transit activity map, in rapid bus stop areas Ventura corridor, 2002



Source: MTA, 2002

¹ . Based on the January 2003 data provided by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA). The radii of the solid black circles on each stop are increased according to scale.

Activity levels on Ventura Boulevard tend to be more spread out. The metro rail Red Line at Universal City station has significant boarding and alighting activity, in the Ventura corridor. Bus stop areas close to the Red Line also have higher activity levels station areas connecting to other rapid routes (line 761 - Van Nuys and Sepulveda). Reseda bus stop area also experienced high activity levels for reasons specifically related to the presence of high density multifamily housing, and also shows high correlation with workers using public transit as per demographic data. (Refer chapter 2)

Rapid bus transit ridership flow

The analysis of bus rapid transit ridership is based on boarding and alighting data for different station areas. The flow analysis indicates the stretches in which buses run with fuller capacity within the corridors.

Vermont Corridor

In case of Vermont corridor, overall transit ridership is much higher within the stretch north and south of Jefferson bus stop area as is the case for Wilshire station area.² Ridership overall in the southern half of the corridor tends to be much lower. Looking at the activity map in addition to the ridership maps (Figures 4.4, 4.6-7), most commuters alight on Slauson and Vernon stations or north of the I-10 Freeway. Thus buses run to fuller capacity between Slauson through King and remain so until north of the I-10 freeway while station areas in between see little activity. Both northbound and southbound ridership levels are very similar.

². January 2003 data was provided by the LACMTA. Ridership numbers are displayed next to the linkages between Rapid bus stops. The line thickness represents the number of riders according to scale. Data is represented separately for eastbound and westbound or northbound and southbound.

Figure 4.6-7: Transit flow map along rapid bus routes, Vermont corridor, 2003


Rapid Bus Ridership on Vermont Blvd.

Northbound

Bus ridership between Rapid bus stops for a 24 hour weekday period.

- Metro Rail Stations
- Rapid Bus 754 Stops
- Metro Rail Blue Line
- Metro Rail Green Line
- Metro Rail Red Line
- Other Rapid Bus Routes
- Other Metro Local Bus Routes

Source: 12/2002 Shake-up APC Data provided by MTA, 24 Hour Boardings and Alightings by Stop




Rapid Bus Ridership on Vermont Blvd.

Southbound

Bus ridership between Rapid bus stops for a 24 hour weekday period.

- Metro Rail Stations
- Rapid Bus 754 Stops
- Metro Rail Blue Line
- Metro Rail Green Line
- Metro Rail Red Line
- Other Rapid Bus Routes
- Other Metro Local Bus Routes

Source: 12/2002 Shake-up APC Data provided by MTA, 24 Hour Boardings and Alightings by Stop



Source: MTA, 2003

Ventura Corridor

Ventura corridor experiences high ridership levels on the eastern parts of the route, particularly near the Red Line subway station. The flow thickness show high ridership towards the eastern direction of the Ventura corridor. The high ridership levels are maintained until Sepulveda and Van Nuys, bus stop areas where people alight and board on to different lines. Moderate ridership levels are maintained between Reseda Boulevard and Winnetka, and Reseda and White Oak. The flow is similar on both eastbound and westbound directions of the Ventura rapid bus route.

Figure 4.8-9: Transit flow map, along rapid bus routes, Ventura corridor, 2003


Rapid Bus Ridership on Ventura Blvd.

Eastbound

Bus ridership between Rapid bus stops for a 24 hour weekday period.

- Metro Rail Stations
- Rapid Bus 750 Stops
- Metro Rail Red Line
- Other Rapid Bus Routes
- Other Metro Local Bus Routes

Source: 12/2002 Shake-up APC Data provided by MTA, 24 Hour Boardings and Alightings by Stop





Rapid Bus Ridership on Ventura Blvd.

Westbound

Bus ridership between Rapid bus stops for a 24 hour weekday period.

- Metro Rail Stations
- Rapid Bus 750 Stops
- Metro Rail Red Line
- Other Rapid Bus Routes
- Other Metro Local Bus Routes

Source: 12/2002 Shake-up APC
Data provided by MTA, 24 Hour Boardings and Alightings by Stop



Source: MTA, 2003

Transit linkages on the two corridors

Figures 4.10-11, shows transit linkage levels along Vermont and Ventura corridors.³ A crude measure of transit linkages was constructed to include the number of other routes within the immediate area of the rapid bus stop. These options include metro local bus routes, metro limited bus routes, other metro rapid bus routes, metro Rail, DASH, commuter express, and other municipal services.

The transit linkage map (Figure 4.10) shows that highest levels of transit linkages lie north of the Vermont corridor. The southern part of Vermont corridor has fewer transit linkages and limited connections for transfer passengers, with the exception of the I-105 Freeway area. This is also possibly one the reasons for lower transit ridership levels in these stretches. Hollywood, Sunset, and Wilshire have good connectivity and are bus stop areas with maximum transit linkages. King and Florence in the southern part are highly connected bus stop areas. Santa Monica, Vernon, Slauson, and Manchester bus stop areas have moderate level transit linkages. These bus stop areas show high to moderate transit ridership activity as well.

The Ventura Corridor (figure 4.11) does not have a well connected transit system in comparison to Vermont corridor. This might play a role in reducing ridership levels among people living within the corridor. Few station areas show moderate transit linkages or connectivity on the Ventura corridor. They are Topanga Canyon to the west, Sepulveda and Van Nuys in the middle, and Laurel Canyon to the east. Universal City station area has high transit linkage level or connectivity. Unless more bus routes are

³ The number of transit linkages is represented by the diameter of the black circle on each Rapid bus stop.

allocated, the connectivity and transit linkages will remain the same, along with ridership levels.

Figure 4.10: Transit Linkages map, Vermont corridor, 2003





Figure 4.11: Transit Linkages map, Ventura corridor, 2003



Source: MTA, 2003


Bus stop density in rapid bus stop areas on the two corridors

The bus stop density maps, figures 4.12-13, show all local bus stops and rapid bus stops within walking distance of the rapid bus stop area. The walking distance is a half mile radius, 2,640 feet, a reasonable walking distance to connect to another transit stop. Taking the bus instead of walking to transit stations becomes more popular at the distance of 3000 feet.⁴ Additionally, metro rail stations, rapid bus and local metro bus lines and DASH routes are also shown.

Vermont Corridor

Vermont Boulevard has very dense transit linkages north of the I-10 Freeway. This is easily seen in the transit linkages map.

Figure 4.12: Bus stop density map, Vermont corridor, 2003



Source: MTA, 2003

⁴ The information has been collated from MTA, and LA DOT route maps. Untermann, R. 1984. *Accommodating the Pedestrian: Adapting Towns and Neighborhoods for Walking and Bicycling*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.


Ventura Corridor

The density of transit stops is far less on Ventura corridor compared to Vermont. In addition, two significantly large areas on the Ventura corridor are not within reasonable walking distance of any rapid bus stop, stretches between Winnetka and Reseda and between Laurel Canyon and Vineland rapid bus stop areas.

Bus stop densities are higher as one moves closer to metro rail stations. In the Vermont corridor higher bus stop densities follow the northern Redline stations and south towards the Green line station and the areas in between have far fewer stops.

In case of Ventura corridor the areas surrounding the end points of the rapid line Topanga and Universal City and rapid bus stop areas of Van Nuys and Sepulveda show higher bus stop densities. Reseda with higher density multifamily housing also shows higher bus stop density.

Figure 4.13: Bus stop density map, Ventura corridor, 2003



Source: MTA, 2003

Home bound origin and destination (HOBAD) maps

HOBAD maps were used to find the number of commuters from residents living within the study corridors. This was done for Ventura corridor alone, and we found that 11% of those using the rapid line live within the corridor.⁵ In the eastbound direction, 65% of the origins are from outside of the corridor; 44% of the boardings occurred outside of the corridor, the rest were linked trips. In the case of westbound rapid bus (route 750), 89% of the origins occurred outside the corridor while 82% of the boardings occurred outside of the corridor. Thus, more transit users travel from the east, towards Ventura corridor to shop or do business. For westbound destinations, 55% who board live within the corridor while 78% are traveling from outside of the corridor. There is a flow of transit users who travel to the corridor via the rapid bus and then travel farther after alighting from the system. This is different in the case of eastbound transit traffic, where 70% of destinations are outside the corridor and 58% of alighting is outside of the corridor. Most transit users are merely passing through the corridor to connect to other lines.

Relationship of transit ridership and population density

Vermont corridor

There is a relationship between population density and transit ridership levels at the bus stop areas as shown in the chart, figure 4.14, on Vermont corridor.

Ventura Corridor

On Ventura corridor (figure 4.15) the relationship is affected by connectivity or transit linkages as well, especially Van Nuys and Sepulveda station areas.

⁵ The HOBAD maps contain information taken from onboard surveys, origin and destination of transit users of two rapid lines of the corridor. The maps were analyzed to define if the queried item, occurred within the corridor or outside the corridor. With-in the corridor was defined as if the TAZ (Transportation Analysis Zone) was touching the boulevard in question, and all else was defined as outside the corridor. The data were tallied and then totaled. The result defined the user trips from within or outside the corridor.

Figure 4.14: Population density and transit ridership at bus stop areas, Vermont corridor.





Figure 4.15: Population density and transit ridership at bus stop areas, Ventura corridor.



Source: Census, 2000, MTA, 2003

Chapter 5: Models based on factors affecting transit ridership

The previous chapters looked at the effects of socio-economic variables i.e. population dynamics, land use dynamics, and the transit infrastructure, separately. In this section multiple regression analysis is used to explain effect of different urban form and behavioral variables on total weekday boardings on rapid bus corridors for individual bus station areas, including all lines that pass through the intersection.

Purpose

The analysis is used to predict changes in policy measures that can affect transit ridership within Vermont, Ventura, and similar corridors. Increases in housing densities, new employment centers in mixed use developments, improved transit infrastructure, and parking reductions in residential and commercial areas are seen as a positive policy measures not only to address current problems within the city but to increase overall transit ridership. Targeting underutilized land, housing shortages, and housing affordability—especially with regards to work force housing are examples of other relevant policy objectives. Our purpose is to find the extent of transit ridership increase resulting from incremental changes in these policy measures

Data used and the units of analysis

The half mile radius that represents the walkable area around rapid bus stop intersection has been considered as the individual unit of analysis. There are 33 bus stop areas in both the corridors, 19 in Vermont and 14 in Ventura corridor. Five bus stop areas of Vermont corridor are metro rail station accessible. They are Wilshire, Beverly, Santa Monica and Hollywood stations of the Red Line and the Vermont station of the Green Line. Universal City is the only bus stop area with metro rail station in the Ventura corridor. The station area is represented by the total area in block groups that intersected the half mile radius around the intersection of the rapid bus stop. Pooled data was used for key demographic variables from this information. In case of employment the pooled data were taken from census tracts intersecting the bus stop area.

Methodology

In order to predict transit ridership, multiple regression models were run for rapid bus stop areas in Vermont and Ventura corridors; combined and individually. We discerned different effects of the key variables on transit ridership. Population density, housing density, employment density, percentage of non-residential area, land use mix, vehicle ownership, presence of metro rail, transit linkages were some of the key variables considered for the models as they represented trip generating and trip attracting characteristics of a given area.

Simple correlations are used to explain the relationship between the different key variables.

We also regressed indicators separately to test their significance on transit ridership.

Effect of Population Density

Population density is significant in all models when station areas in Vermont and Ventura corridors are reviewed in aggregate. Population density is significant in Vermont corridor and not significant in Ventura corridor when the station areas were considered separately. Here the observations are few in number and we realize the model may have reliability problems; however population density remains consistently significant when all station areas are considered.

Effect of Housing Density and Multifamily Land Use

We measured intensity of residential development in two ways, housing density, and the extent of multi family residential land use. Both these measures are significant in the Vermont corridor; only housing density is significant in Ventura corridor indicating the absence of significant multifamily housing in this corridor.

Effect of Employment Density

We find a positive relationship between higher employment density and transit use taking all station areas into consideration. The variable is significant in Vermont corridor only.

Effect of Non-residential Land Use

Non-residential land use in combination with population density was used to test the effects of trip attraction, after controlling for the presence of metro rail, and percentage of multifamily. Non-residential land use variable is significant only in Vermont corridor and not in Ventura corridor.

Effect of Land Use Mix

We tested the effects of mixed land uses on transit ridership. Land use mix was defined using Simpson's diversity index method, where a single measure was computed using the areas under different land uses. The formula measures both the variety and distributive aspects amongst the different land uses in an area. For example more land uses and equal distribution amongst them would yield higher diversity value. Land use diversity index ranges from 0 to 1, one indicating high diversity, 0 indicating no diversity. Land use diversity is significant indicating a positive relationship with rapid transit ridership, when tested alone. In the model testing the combined effects of population density and land use mix; population density was the only significant variable, while land-use mix or diversity had no effect.

Effect of Metro Rail and Transit Linkages

The presence of metro rail station is significant within the different models when tested with most other factors. The variable “transit linkages” measures the total number of connections available within the intersection where the rapid bus stops are also located. This variable tested significant in almost all models. For example in Ventura corridor, only the Metro rail station availability and transit linkages measure showed significant relationship with ridership measured as boarding ridership, while population density did not.

Effect of Vehicle Ownership

The percentage of households with no vehicles tested significant, only in Vermont corridor. The percentage of households without vehicles is very small and likely with insignificant variance in Ventura corridor and does not appear to have any influence on transit ridership. However the measure vehicles per household showed significant relationship, with higher vehicles per household, there is a decrease in transit ridership. In effect people living in higher density housing with fewer cars per household are likely to use transit, and are possible contenders for housing in our study corridors for increasing transit ridership. (to be included in recommendations)

Effect of Ethnicity and Income (to edit and discuss what needs to be done)

We find that the effect of individual population characteristics such as ethnicity is a relevant factor and is significant when regressed individually but lacks effect within the combined models. We found a similar situation with income variable. It is possible that the relationships are complex with likely interaction effects between some of these variables. Possible auto correlation between population or housing density with Hispanic population and also with lower income groups is also quite likely.

We therefore choose not to control for these variables in the models chosen.

Description of the Models

Transit Ridership = f (Residents, Employment, Transit infrastructure, Vehicle ownership)

Transit Ridership = f (Housing density, Employment density or Non residential area, Number of transit linkages, Availability of metro rail, Number of vehicles per household)

We hypothesize that housing density, employment density, and availability of transit infrastructure determine boardings on transit.

Our dependant variable transit ridership calculated as weekday boardings of all bus lines passing the bus stop area intersection is regressed on a combination of independent variables, housing density, employment density, transit linkages or availability of metro

rail station, and number of vehicles per household.¹ The 33 rapid bus stop station areas in Vermont and Ventura corridor are our units of analysis.

Models

In our first model housing density, employment density and transit linkages we find housing density and transit linkages are significant variables, having positive effect on transit ridership, while employment density is insignificant.

Our second model considered a combination of housing density, non-residential land use and transit linkages. Housing density, non-residential land uses and transit linkages are all significant with positive influences to transit ridership.

Table: 5.1: Model results
Dependent variable - Station area weekday boardings

Parameters	Model 1	Model 2a	Model 2b	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 5a	Model 6
R ²	0.72	0.74	0.75	0.75	0.81	0.77	0.79	0.78
Adjusted R ²	0.69	0.71	0.71	0.73	0.79	0.75	0.77	0.76
F	24.7***	27.2***	20.8***	29.9***	42.4***	34.0***	27.2***	35.0***
Intercept	-445.69 -0.98	-1490.98 -2.18	408.48 0.21	4583.75 4.06*	5120.23 7.04	-211.36 -0.38	1959.55 1.27	2110.66 1.34
Housing density	149.52 3.71***	182.03 7.13***	141.89 3.08**			172.98 7.35***	120.69 2.89**	128.93 3.09**
Employment Density	18.33 1.17			45.11 4.4***	36.96 3.99***			
Non-residential area (%)		2661.21 1.91	2966.45 2.08*			1212.08 0.91	1686 1.26	
Transit linkages	223.53 2.00	221.11 2.06*	185.64 1.65	157.06 1.45				
Metro rail					1404.77 3.45**	1467.06 3.22**	1404.10 3.13**	1571.74 3.64***
Vehicles per household			-1136 -1.04	-2808.66 -4.5***	-2822.44 -5.62***		-1404.27 -1.50	-1126.95 -1.23

*P <= 0.05

** P <= 0.01

*** p <= 0.001

As a subset of the second model we tested the relationship of transit ridership with housing density, employment density, transit linkages with vehicle ownership, and found housing density and non-residential land use to be significant. Transit linkages and vehicle ownership were not significant.

¹ We controlled for many factors such as income levels, percentage Hispanic population and so on and found they were insignificant, compared to our other key variables such as population density, housing density, etc.


Our third model used employment density, presence of metro rail, and number of vehicles per household as independent variable on transit ridership.² All three variables are significant in this model. Employment density and metro rail add transit riders and while vehicle ownership per household decreases ridership.

The only model that tested housing density with land use mix showed housing density as the only significant variable. Better indicators of mixed use area characteristics may be needed to increase its explanatory power as we did see it positively influencing transit ridership when tested alone. We have not used this model to predict ridership, however we find the concept of mixed use worthy of study in future work.

Vermont and Ventura corridor separately

The model combining the effects of population density, employment density and transit linkages show different outcomes. Vermont corridor station areas retain the significant variables, however for Ventura station areas only the transit linkages variable is significant.

Further explanation is due here. The relationship of population density and employment density is not simple. There seems to be non-linear relationship between the two variables that seem to have interacting effects while viewing the Vermont and Ventura corridor station areas separately. (see Figure X)



The population density increases with employment density up to an employment density of 10 persons per acre and above which population density falls with increasing employment density. This appears intuitive because of the economics of land use in the proximity of large employment centers. However the thresholds for these changes are different in the two corridors. It is much higher for the Vermont corridor.

Looking at the results of the model for the Ventura station areas, availability of transit infrastructure measured as transit linkages or metro rail station is only significant variable. Instead of density, increased connectivity increases transit ridership in the

² While using transit linkages instead of availability of metro rail, the variable was not significant.

Ventura corridor. Vermont corridor shows increases in ridership with increases in employment density and housing density. It is however important not to ignore the effects of decreases due to presence of residents with higher vehicle ownership. By attracting households with fewer cars and with the parking reductions given to housing developments along the transit corridor, we would add more transit riders. (in recommendations)

Predicted Transit Ridership

Amongst the several models we tested, we considered ones that showed consistency with relevant variables to predict ridership. There were variations in the increases in ridership levels in different models. One unit increase in the housing density models increased ridership levels more than twice that of the population density models. Furthermore the base ridership levels of bus stops close metro rail stations also are significantly higher.


Table 5.2 : Predicted Transit ridership in bus stops without metro rail

Housing Density	Metro Rail	Model 1	Model 2a	Model 2b	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5a	Model 5b	Model 6
2.6	0	1068	851	1128	2101	1889	687	1057	970
3.6	0	1218	1033	1270	2101	1889	860	1178	1098
4.6	0	1367	1215	1412	2101	1889	1033	1298	1227
5.6	0	1517	1397	1554	2101	1889	1206	1419	1356
6.6	0	1666	1580	1696	2101	1889	1379	1540	1485
7.6	0	1816	1762	1838	2101	1889	1552	1660	1614
8.6	0	1965	1944	1980	2101	1889	1725	1781	1743
9.6	0	2115	2126	2122	2101	1889	1898	1902	1872
10.6	0	2264	2308	2263	2101	1889	2071	2022	2001
11.6	0	2414	2490	2405	2101	1889	2244	2143	2130
12.6	0	2563	2672	2547	2101	1889	2417	2264	2259
13.6	0	2713	2854	2689	2101	1889	2590	2385	2387
14.6	0	2862	3036	2831	2101	1889	2763	2505	2516
15.6	0	3012	3218	2973	2101	1889	2936	2626	2645
16.6	0	3161	3400	3115	2101	1889	3109	2747	2774
17.6	0	3311	3582	3257	2101	1889	3282	2867	2903
18.6	0	3460	3764	3399	2101	1889	3455	2988	3032
19.6	0	3610	3946	3540	2101	1889	3628	3109	3161
Difference		150	182	142	0	0	173	121	129


Table 5.3: Predicted Transit ridership in bus stops with metro rail

Housing Density	Metro Rail	Model 1	Model 2	Model 2b	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5a	Model 5b	Model 6
2.6	1	1068	851	1128	2101	3293	2154	2461	2541
3.6	1	1218	1033	1270	2101	3293	2327	2582	2670
4.6	1	1367	1215	1412	2101	3293	2500	2702	2799
5.6	1	1517	1397	1554	2101	3293	2673	2823	2928
6.6	1	1666	1580	1696	2101	3293	2846	2944	3057
7.6	1	1816	1762	1838	2101	3293	3019	3065	3186
8.6	1	1965	1944	1980	2101	3293	3192	3185	3315
9.6	1	2115	2126	2122	2101	3293	3365	3306	3444
10.6	1	2264	2308	2263	2101	3293	3538	3427	3572
11.6	1	2414	2490	2405	2101	3293	3711	3547	3701
12.6	1	2563	2672	2547	2101	3293	3884	3668	3830
13.6	1	2713	2854	2689	2101	3293	4057	3789	3959
14.6	1	2862	3036	2831	2101	3293	4230	3909	4088
15.6	1	3012	3218	2973	2101	3293	4403	4030	4217
16.6	1	3161	3400	3115	2101	3293	4576	4151	4346
17.6	1	3311	3582	3257	2101	3293	4749	4271	4475
18.6	1	3460	3764	3399	2101	3293	4922	4392	4604
19.6	1	3610	3946	3540	2101	3293	5095	4513	4733
Difference		150	182	142	0	0	173	121	129

Predicted increase in Transit Ridership with no metro rail



Predicted increase in Transit Ridership with metro rail



Chapter 6: Design Proposal

Contents

1. Precedents	1
1.1. California Transit-Oriented Development-Case Studies	1
1.2. Housing Types, Density and Related Development	3
2. Physical Context of the Selected Intersections	12
2.1. Aerial Photos	12
2.2. Land Use	14
3. Urban Design Proposal	19
3.1. Guidelines	19
3.2. Proposed Development	20
3.3. Examples	22
3.3.1. Design Proposal for Vermont/ Florence Station Area	22
3.3.2. Design Proposal for Ventura/ Van Nuys Station Area	32
4. Conclusion	37
References	37

1. Precedents

1.1. California Transit-Oriented Development

This study examines the transit-oriented development in twenty-one station areas, most of which are located in the Bay Area and Southern California. The station area refers to an area of approximately one half mile radius around a transit station. The study subjects include land use, density, income and work commute way within the station area. The data shows that higher use of public transit is related to higher residential density, higher ratio of commercial land use and lower household income.¹

Figure 1:




Figure 1 indicates:

- Higher residential densities lead to substantial higher rates of transit ridership
- This relationship is stronger at lower ranges of density and weaker at higher levels. The greatest benefits come from low to moderate densities, say from an average of 6 to 14 units per acre.

Use of public transit	Residential Density
12%-32%	3.71-26.89
5%-12%	4.10-9.42
0-5%	2.91-5.07

The limited densities in the projects are usually thought of as a result of zoning limitations imposed by local government. Market demand and preference of the developers are other main factors affecting density.

¹ Data Source: California Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Searchable Database, <http://transitorienteddevelopment.dot.ca.gov/>, Feb. 2004.

Figure 2:




Figure 3:





Figure 2 and 3 show:

- Higher percentage of residential land use does not always yield higher use of public transit. (For example, the Wrigley Market Place, Village Green, Village of La Mesa).
- Higher ridership levels occur with higher commercial land use, which also means that more employment opportunities are provided in those regions.
- Transit oriented development will yield significant increase in use of public transit, if it is accompanied by other land use measures which attract employment growth or be large concentration of employment and mixed uses near stations. (Such as the Emeryville, Gateway Plaza- Union Station, Downtown Plaza- St Rose of Lima Park).

Figure 4:



Use of public transit	Median household income
12%-32%	\$13,000-\$63,000
5%-12%	\$26,000-\$70,000
0-5%	\$29,000-\$87,000

Figure 4 suggests:

- Higher use of public transit is associated with lower household income.
- With high residential density and low auto ownership, lower-income areas are natural markets for public transit services, and neighborhood retail and commercial services.

Generally, the above figures use comparisons between residential density, land use of cities, income and public transit ridership. However, in reality, these elements cannot fully control transit usage. Some other determinants of transit also play key roles in affecting transit usage. Such determinants may include employment density, size of a downtown, distance of a location to downtown, etc.

1.2. Housing Types, Density and Related Development

A remodeling of housing forms has been underway in the central cities and suburban communities in the United States. Increased housing price has generated the demand for higher-density housing forms because of soaring land cost, rising labor expense and higher housing demand. That is not simply a response to affordability issues, but reflects people’s increasing acceptance and preference.¹ Many people like to live within the city to reduce home-to-work commute and have more leisure time.

The purpose of building higher density housing is not only to deal with density successfully, but also to improve quality of the built environment. It is clear that each type of housing- single family, townhouse condominium, and apartment suggests certain density (see table 2). There are other factors that will influence the density of each type: the size of the building, the ratio of parking spaces required per unit, the type of parking, the amount of exterior space assigned to private dwelling units and to public use, the setbacks required by zoning, etc.

¹ Wentling, Density by Design, 1988, p2.

Table 2:

Building Types			Project	Location	Site Area (acres)	Total Units	Density (units per acre)	Parking spaces per unit
A. Single Family House	A1	Small-lot Villa	Villa D'Este at Sweetwater	Longwood, FL	6.8	30	4.4	4
	A2	Patio Homes	Fairway Pointe	Myrtle Beach, SC	8.9	24	2.6	2
	A3	Wide-lot Singles	Barcelona in WestPark	Irvine, CA	19.3	150	7.8	6
	A4	Cluster homes	Spinnaker Ridge	Gig Harbor, WA	16.2	58	6.5 (on developed site)	4
	A5	Zero-lot-line Houses	Arbor Creek	Garland, TX	8.37	50	5.97	3.8
B. Townhouse/ Condominium	B1	Attached Singles	Whitman Pond	Weymouth, MA	6	77	12.8	1.9
	B2	Stacked Townhouse	Riverplace	New Haven, CT	4.5	88	20	1.5
	B3	Townhouse Mews	Wycliff Condominiums	Dallas, TX	0.33	8	24.4	Not available
C. Apartment	C1	Eight-Plex Buildings	Woodbridge Apartment	Orlando, FL	9.32	168	18	1.75
	C2	Stacked Unit Infill Buildings	Charleston Public Housing	Charleston, SC	5.83	67	11.5	1.5
	C3	Courtyard Buildings	Bishops Park	Raleigh, NC	7.2	138	19.2	1.92
	C4	Terraced Buildings	Crane Place Senior Citizen Housing	Menlo Park, CA	0.99	93	93.94	0.41
	C5	Articulated Building	The Barony on Peachtree	Atlanta, GA	1.32	56	42.4	1.86
	C6	Senior Housing	Metro Senior housing & Citypark	Foster city, CA	3.64	102	28.0	1.3
	C7	Live/work Apartment	Site 17	Seattle, WA	0.5	97	194	0.86
	C8	Mixed-use Apartment	Paseo Colorado	Pasadena, CA	11 ²	387	35.2	Not available
	C9	Sculptured Tower	The Watermark Tower	Seattle, WA	0.3	94	300+	1


Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988
Steven Fader, *Design by Density*, 2000

Table 3:

Building Types

A. Single Family House

A1. Small-lot Villa



Villa D'Este at Sweetwater, Longwood, Florida, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

A2. Patio Homes



Fairway Pointe, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

A3. Wide-lot Singles



Barcelona in WestPark, Irvine, California, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

A4. Cluster homes



Spinnaker Ridge, Gig Harbor, Washington, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988


A5. Zero-lot-line
Houses



Arbor Creek, Garland, Texas, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

**B. Townhouse/
Condominium**

B1. Attached Singles





Whitman Pond, Weymouth, Massachusetts, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

B2.Stacked Townhouse



Riverplace, New Haven, Connecticut, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988


B3.Townhouse Mews



Wycliff Condominiums, Dallas, Texas, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988


C. Apartments

C1. Eight-Plex Buildings




Woodbridge Apartment, Orlando, Florida, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

C2. Stacked Unit Infill Buildings



Charleston Public Housing, Charleston, South Carolina, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

C3. Courtyard Buildings



Bishops Park, Raleigh, North Carolina, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

C4. Terraced Buildings




Crane Place Senior Citizen Housing, Menlo Park, California, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

C5. Articulated Building




The Barony on Peachtree, Atlanta, Georgia, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

C6. Senior Housing



Metro Senior Housing & Citypark, Foster city, California, Source: Steven Fader, *Design by Density*, 2000

C7. Live/ Work
Apartments




Site 17, Seattle, Washington, Source: Steven Fader, *Design by Density*, 2000

C8. Mixed-use
Apartment



Paseo Colorado, Pasadena, California,

C9. Sculptured Tower



The Watermark Tower, Seattle, Washington, Source: Wentling & Bookout, *Density by Design*, 1988

To create a coherent, well-defined built environment, new development should blend with existing neighborhood features. Moreover, higher-density housing will have better chances of being accepted when it is accompanied by community amenities, property maintenance, and other community services.

- Medium-density, single-family housing can blend into lower-density single-family neighborhood. It will support transit while addressing housing preference. Housing development such as small-lot villa (see table 3, type A1), wide-lot singles (type A3) and zero-lot-line houses (type A5) are obvious approaches to increasing density, while maintaining strong single-family home neighborhood.
- Compact, transit-supportive development can provide flexibility needed for infill sites. Neighborhood-scale commercial and public use should be encouraged to promote transit use and walking.
- Low-density single-family development and multifamily development can be combined in one community to achieve an average density that can support transit.
- The location selection and design concept play important roles for developing higher-density multifamily housing. Land surrounding commercial and employment center, or educational center, in designated mixed-use areas can be zoned for multifamily housing use. Housing types such as townhouses (see table 2, type B1, B2, and B3), courtyard and terraced apartment (type C3, C4), mixed-use apartment (type C8) can offer promise for successful integration into a community.

Design Characteristics

Housing developments having the same average density can appear very different, depending on design. Wentling concluded some common design characteristics that are helpful for higher-density housing types.²

- **Human Dimension.** Large building should be reduced to identifiable human-dimension elements with comfortable features that encourage interaction among residents.
- **Spatial Quality.** The standards of space quality have been paid more attention in higher-density projects. Continuity of street grid was promoted to facilitate public transit.
- **Regional Fit.** Housing forms were shaped by available building materials, climate, social traditions, ethnic heritage, and other local features. Higher density developments were better accepted by blending with the existing neighborhood features.

² Wentling, *Density by Design*, 1988, p171.

2. Physical context of selected intersections


We chose four intersections along Vermont Ave and Ventura Blvd as examples for further study. They are: Vermont/ Florence, Vermont/ Wilshire, Ventura/Van Nuys, and Ventura/ Laurel Canyon. The data shows a higher percentage of transit activity at the intersections of Vermont/ Wilshire, and Ventura/Van Nuys, and lower transit use at Vermont/ Florence and Ventura/ Laurel Canyon. There are also many differences at the four intersections in terms of land uses and built environment, which could be seen as opportunities to combine different types of land uses for future growth.

2.1 Aerial Photos


The following aerial photos show the physical context of the four intersections-- Vermont/ Florence, Vermont/ Wilshire, Ventura/ Van Nuys, Ventura/ Laurel Canyon. In the instance of Vermont/ Florence (Figure 5), the built environment is dominated by single- and multi-family housing, and commercial strips along Vermont Ave. and Florence Ave. In the instance of Vermont/ Wilshire (Figure 6), the majority of the buildings are large-scale commercial buildings and multi-family apartment buildings. On Ventura Blvd., the two station areas (Figure 7&8) show a mix of commercial strip shops and malls, and single- and multi-family housing. One common characteristic of these station areas is that there are many vacant lots along the corridors of Vermont Ave. and Ventura Blvd. These “missing teeth” affect the continuity of pedestrian activities and reduce retail’s appeal for pedestrians.

The yellow circle shows a quarter mile range from the intersection, a distance that can be walked by foot in approximately 5 minutes.

Figure 5: Aerial Photo of Vermont/ Florence




Source: <http://globexplorer.com/>
Figure 6: Aerial Photo of Vermont/ Wilshire




Source: <http://globexplorer.com/>

Figure 7: Aerial Photo of Ventura/ Van Nuys



Source: <http://globexplorer.com/>

Figure 8: Aerial Photo of Ventura/ Laurel Canyon




Source: <http://globexplorer.com/>

2.2 Land Use

The land use maps (Figure 9 through 12) show the various land uses around the station areas. Vermont/ Florence area has more residential use (including single- and multi-family) than commercial use. This indicates Vermont/Florence might be a potential candidate for denser transit-orient development. Vermont/Wilshire area is dominated by regional commercial use. Station areas such as Ventura/Van Nuys and Ventura/ Laurel Canyon have a complicated mix of residential and commercial use, at the same time, their special street grids and topographic characteristics also require different approaches for future development.

Table 2 and Figure 13 illustrate the circumstance of the built environment in the four station areas. The Vermont/ Florence station has lower density multi-family residential and commercial use, while Vermont/Wilshire presents a more developed built environment with 76.8 units/acre density for multi-family housing and 48.9 units/acre density for mixed-use. The Ventura/ Van Nuys and Ventura/ Laurel Canyon have similar moderate residential densities, but different circumstances of mixed-use development.

Figure 9: Land use map of Vermont/ Florence




Base Map: Zimas zone information and maps access system, <http://zimas.lacity.org/>

Figure 10: Land use map of Vermont/ Wilshire




Base Map: Zimas zone information and maps access system, <http://zimas.lacity.org/>

Figure 11: Land use map of Ventura/ Van Nuys



Base Map: Zimas zone information and maps access system, <http://zimas.lacity.org/>

Figure 12: Land use map of Ventura/ Laurel Canyon




Base Map: Zimas zone information and maps access system, <http://zimas.lacity.org/>

Table 2.

Street Intersection Areas	Residential			Commercial	Mixed-use	
	Multi-family		Single-family		FAR	Density (units/acre)
	FAR	Density (units/acre)	Density (units/acre)	FAR		
Vermont/Florence	0.25	11.2	7.6	0.27	-	-
Vermont/ Wilshire	1.36	76.8	-	1.47	1.11	48.9
Ventura/Van Nuys	0.59	26.0	6.0	0.45	0.53	28.4
Ventura/Laurel Canyon	0.50	26.3	6.0	0.56	0.52	9.0

Data Base: Zimas zone information and maps access system, <http://zimas.lacity.org/>

Figure 13.



Data Base: Zimas zone information and maps access system, <http://zimas.lacity.org/>

3. Urban Design Proposal

Based on the analysis of the station areas along the existing corridors, it is evident that transit-oriented development will help to improve mobility options there. New in-fill, mixed-use, higher density development will offer the possibilities of increasing bus transit ridership.

In this section, we will present several scenarios that propose compact, mixed-use development within the four station areas –Vermont/ Florence, Vermont/ Wilshire, Ventura/ Van Nuys, and Ventura/ Laurel Canyon. By bringing denser communities close to the station nodes, the new development aims to encourage people to ride mass transit more and drive their cars less.³ At the same time, the proposals intend to bring back the more traditional urban values of walkable neighborhoods by offering pedestrian-friendly environments.

3.1. Guidelines

Mixed use development

- Mixing retail, commercial and residential uses, which should mutually support each other
- Medium to high density development
- Mixing uses in districts or within the same buildings
- Providing safe, convenient connections between different uses

Transit-friendly environment

- Providing continuous, convenient linkages between residential and business development, public facilities, open spaces and transit stops

³ Bernick, *Transit Villages in the 21st Century*, 1997.

- Ensuring wide, safe sidewalks and crosswalks
- Accommodating both pedestrian and bicyclists in street
- Providing transit service amenities, such as shelter, waiting area, seating and lighting
- Improving the appearance of transit stops
- Avoiding blank facades of buildings along streets
- Providing street trees, landscaping and public open spaces

Transit-oriented parking

- Providing park and ride facilities adjacent to transit stops
- Encouraging ridesharing and offering incentives for ridesharing
- Encouraging shared and combining parking facilities
- Considering reduction for mixed-use development
- Providing clearly defined pedestrian path in parking lots
- Adding perimeter landscaping and screening for existing parking lots

3.2. Proposed Development

Based on the existing residential and commercial development and the allowable FAR by zoning regulations of Los Angeles, we forecast the possible future development for the four station areas.


The residential development (see table 3), uses FAR value of 2.0 and 3.0 respectively in scenario 1 and 2. The total developable area can be derived from the existing development area and the maximum total development area. With different ratio makeup of 1bedroom, 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom housing, we can estimate a range of future developable housing units and density. Figure 14 illustrates the average increase of density in the four street intersections. Vermont/Florence shows the most potential for higher density housing development.

Table 3.

Station Areas	Residential Development					
	Scenario 1			Scenario 2		
	Developable Area (sq.ft)	Density (units/acre)	FAR	Developable Area (sq.ft)	Density (units/acre)	FAR
Vermont/Florence	3,063,359	58~93	2.00	3,850,866	85-139	3.00
Vermont/ Wilshire	1,098,547	84~107	2.00	2,814,640	121~153	3.00
Ventura/Van Nuys	1,623,989	59~87	2.00	2,775,516	82~131	3.00
Ventura/Laurel Canyon	1,076,542	61~92	2.00	1,792,425	85~126	3.00

Data Base: Zimas zone information and maps access system, <http://zimas.lacity.org/>

Figure 14.



The future commercial and mixed-use development presents three scenarios for the four station areas. The three scenarios use 1.5, 3.0 and 3.0 for FAR value respectively, and they would provide exclusive commercial, mixed use with 1/3 commercial and 2/3 residential, and mixed use with 1/4 commercial and 3/4 residential respectively. Using the same approach as in Table 3, we can estimate the future developable commercial areas, housing units and corresponding density. Under the same conditions, the data show that Vermont/Florence and Venture/Van Nuys would become more developable for exclusive commercial use.

Table 4

Station Areas	Commercial and Mixed-use Development							
	Scenario 1 (exclusive coml.)		Scenario 2 (1/3 coml., 2/3 residential)			Scenario 3 (1/4 coml., 3/4 residential)		
	Developable Area (sq.ft.)	FAR	Developable Area (sq.ft.)	Density (units/acre)	FAR	Developable Area (sq.ft.)	Density (units/acre)	FAR
Vermont/Florence	1,422,754	1.50	3,158,383	49~84	3.00	3,158,383	55-95	3.00
Vermont/ Wilshire	901,505	1.50	3,624,276	27~47	3.00	3,624,276	31~53	3.00
Ventura/Van Nuys	1,405,041	1.50	3,406,974	40~74	3.00	3,406,974	45~84	3.00
Ventura/Laurel Canyon	1,036,665	1.50	3,809,771	38~72	3.00	3,809,771	43~81	3.00

Data Base: Zimas zone information and maps access system, <http://zimas.lacity.org/>

4.1. Examples

Among the four street intersections, we use two as examples for design proposals. Since data for Vermont/Florence and Ventura/Van Nuys shows higher developable areas (Table 3) than the other one on the same corridor, these two ones present stronger potential for higher-density development and future growth. Therefore, we have selected the intersections of Vermont/Florence and Ventura/Van Nuys as examples for design proposals.


The intent of these proposals is to show future scenarios of how urban redevelopment can occur in these intersection areas if land were used more efficiently to accommodate greater activities while making the new development fit with its context and to increase the quality of the built environment.

3.3.1. Design Proposal for Vermont/ Florence Station Area

Existing Built Environment


The Vermont/ Florence station area is a typical lower-density neighborhood that has primarily residential use coupled with commercial and retail use along the corridor (Figure 15, 16). The residential areas are: one-story single-family housing (with 7.6 units per acre in density) located west of Vermont Ave., and one- or two-story multi-family housing (with 11.2 units per acre in density) located east of Vermont Ave (Figure 17, 18). The major existing commercial/ retail use includes fast-food restaurant, grocery store, motel, gas station, car wash station, etc.

Figure 15. Existing Plan – Vermont/ Florence



Existing Plan -- Vermont/ Florence

Figure 16. Existing Building Model– Vermont/ Florence



There are certain vacant sites and neglected stores in the station area (Figure 19, 20). On the other hand, some substantial properties (Figure 21, 22) could help frame the street, such as the Theater & Church, the Pacific Bell building, and the grocery store on the southeast corner of Vermont/Florence. Because the nearest Blue Line rail station (Florence/Graham) is about 2.8 miles away from Vermont/Florence intersection, riding bus is the only choice of public mass transit for the transit-dependent population in the area (Figure 23).



Figure 17. Multi-family housing on north 74th St., facing east.



Figure 18. Single-family housing on north 69th St., facing west



Figure 19. Vacant Stores at east Vermont Ave., facing south



Figure 20. Vacant site at the east side of Vermont Ave.



Figure 21. Theatre & church at the east side of Vermont Ave is landmark building in the area



Figure 22. Pacific Bell new building at the east side of Vermont Ave



Figure 23. Bus stop on the east side of Vermont, facing north



Figure 24. Vermont Ave at Florence facing north.

Design Proposal

The plan proposes residential development coupled with mixed-use commercial and retail use in the station area. The intent is to create higher density housing along east of Vermont Ave, while providing housing above ground-floor retail along Vermont Ave and Florence Ave. Although majority of the existing multi-family residential and commercial area need to be remodeled, some substantial properties would be retained to continue serving the neighborhood (Figure 25, 26). Two types of design concepts are used, one is three to four stories of residential with underground parking, and the other is two to three stories of residential above ground-floor retail.

Figure 25. Proposed Plan-- Vermont/ Florence





Figure 26. Proposed Development Model – Vermont/ Florence



The structure of the urban space is remodeled to establish a hierarchy of spaces of different sizes that not only have individual enclosed space, but also are related each other. Therefore, this proposal selects courtyard housing as a major housing type to create a more humane, more community-centered urban environment. The courtyard enveloped by three or four stories apartments become a major organizing elements which connect the private dwelling units, the public streets and open spaces (Figure 27, 28).

Figure 27. Proposed Development Perspective 1 – Vermont/ Florence





Figure 28. Proposed Development Perspective 2 – Vermont/ Florence



Basically, the commercial and retail uses along the two streets will provide a variety of establishments to serve the surrounding community. The major programs would include restaurants, grocery, banks, cafés, laundry shops, bookstores, furniture stores, post offices, etc. Some buildings may consider combining small business offices such as personal and business services, amusement and recreation, hotel, health services, accounting, and other professions. At the northeast corner of the intersection, a cultural facility such as a library or movie theater is suggested. Given the proximity to bus stops, the library or theater and the plaza would become a major gathering place for the surrounding community.

Four types of prototypical blocks are proposed for the future development (Table 5). The type A, B and C are rental apartments with density in the range of 53-58 units per acre; while the type D is ownership condo with density of 32 units per acre.

Table 5. Prototypical Blocks

	A. Mixed-use Apartment	B. Mixed-use Apartment	C. Courtyard Apartment	D. Terraced Condo
Plan				
Model				
Section				
Application				
Site Area	173, 388 sq.ft.	152, 256 sq.ft.	178, 898 sq.ft.	38, 425 sq.ft.
Total units	197	194	239	24
Density	50 units per acre	55 units per acre	58 units per acre	28 units per acre
FAR	1.90	2.03	1.91	1.66
Building Coverage	49%	51%	41%	48%
Residential: Commercial	93: 7	94: 6	100: 0	75: 25
Residential Parking	197	194	239	36
Commercial Parking	68	50	-	45

Notes:

1. Mixed-use Apartment: Commercial on 1st Floor, residential above
2. Based on census data, average household size= 3.69 in the station area. So suggested average apartment area per unit: 1145sq.ft, average condo area per unit: 1500 sq.ft.
3. Parking:
 - Apartment: 1 space per unit
 - Condo: 1.5 space per unit
 - Commercial: 3 space per 1000 sq.ft.
4. Parking modes:
 - Commercial: above-ground parking including on-street and off-street parking
 - Residential: above-and below-ground parking

Using these prototypical blocks, the proposed station area would become a higher-density, mixed-use neighborhood with average density of 46 units per acre (Table 6). The streetscape would experience change once the higher density apartments are built (Figure 29). At the same time, the bus stop facilities need some improvement such as shelters, larger waiting areas, and more seating.

Table 6

Development Using Prototypical Blocks in Vermont / Florence Station Area							
Blocks	lot Area (sq.ft)	Multi-family Residential			Commercial		
		New development	Livable area	Units	Retained Area (sq.ft)	New development	Total development
1	168,237	261,024	208,819	182	0	11,456	11,456
2	155,478	271,767	217,414	190	0	19,912	19,912
3		-	-		0	-	-
4	126,668	225,137	180,110	157	0	12,883	12,883
5	173,742	249,714	199,771	174	0	22,766	22,766
6	160,284	152,884	122,307	107	110,000	0	110,000
7	151,938	191,824	153,459	134	0	14,188	14,188
8	132,158	225,337	180,270	157	0	13,886	13,886
9	28,839	39,492	31,594	28	0	13,164	13,164
10	29,131	40,158	32,126	28	0	13,386	13,386
11	29,199	40,158	32,126	28	0	13,386	13,386
12	60,677	114,475	91,580	80	0	26,537	26,537
13		-	-	-	-	-	-
14		-	-	-	-	-	-
15		-	-	-	-	-	-
16	58,449	104,286	83,429	73	0	22,549	22,549
17	338,624	404,622	323,698	283	52,960	42,674	95,634
18	346,690	619,343	495,474	433	0	39,781	39,781
19	349,464	419,115	335,292	293	11,522	38,120	49,642
20	349,611	575,332	460,266	402	0	36,425	36,425
21	165,609	254,064	203,251	178	0	19,509	19,509
22	27,508	57,228	45,782	40	0	19,076	19,076
23	25,574	46,152	36,922	32	0	15,384	15,384
24	29,429	54,888	43,910	38	0	18,296	18,296
25		-	-	-	-	-	-
Total (sq.ft)	2,907,309	4,347,000	3,477,600	3,037	174,482	413,378	587,860
FAR & Density (units/acre)		FAR= 1.70 Density= 46 units/acre					

Figure 29 Streetscape- Existing and Proposed



Existing



Proposed

The image shows visualization of a proposed transformation of the streetscape along Vermont Corridor.

Base Picture: the Bryson at Cityplace, Dallas, TX

3.3.2. Design Proposal for Ventura/ Van Nuys Station Area

Existing Built Environment

The Ventura/Van Nuys station area shows a more complicated mix of commercial strip shops and malls, and single- and multi-family housing (Figure 30, 31). Along Ventura Blvd. and Van Nuys Blvd., there are considerable parking lots which violate the continuity of the pedestrian paths and spaces. The two gas stations are significant properties just at the southeast and northwest corner of the Ventura/Van Nuys intersection (Figure 32, 33). They have become focal points of vehicular activity and have negative impacts for a pedestrian-friendly environment.

Although the network of pedestrian paths is not so continuous in the station area, the retail shops are attractive because of the rich façade decorations. The bus stops also welcome riders with well-designed shelters and significant symbols (Figure 34, 35).

Figure 30. Existing Plan—Ventura/ Van Nuys




Figure 31. Existing Building Model—Ventura/Van Nuys




Figure 32. Gas Station at northwest corner Ventura/ Van Nuys



Figure 33. Parking Lot on Vesper Ave



Figure 34. Retail shops on Ventura Blvd south.




Figure 35. Bus stop at southeast corner Ventura/ Van Nuys

Design proposal

This plan proposes in-fill development along the commercial and retail strips on Ventura Blvd., while adding more dwelling units above the commercial buildings. In the northeast portion of the station area, medium-density multi-family housing fills the existing parking lots. The housing provides a gradual transition between single-family residential and the more intense commercial/residential mixed development. The intent of this plan is to cluster mixed-use buildings and activities for increased continuity and convenience for a more transit-friendly environment.

Figure 36. Proposed Plan—Ventura/ Van Nuys



Proposed Plan-- Ventura / Van Nuys

Two or three stories of residential use is added to the existing commercial and retail buildings, which help form continuous street facade on both sides of Ventura Blvd. The sites of the gas stations and the parking lots are filled by higher-density courtyard housing and mixed-use development. All these proposed transformation are intended to attract more people to shop, live and work near the station area while improving their mobility options.

Figure 37. Proposed development model—Ventura/Van Nuys




Figure 38. Proposed development perspective 1—Ventura/Van Nuys





Figure 39. Proposed development perspective 2—Ventura/ Van Nuys



4. Conclusion

In this study we have explored the development opportunity for increased bus ridership along Vermont and Ventura Corridors. The higher-density, mixed-use redevelopment and infill-development illustrated the potential scenarios of how the two corridors could be used more efficiently to accommodate everyday activities, and especially public transit. We believe the design solutions could help people imagine the possible development in the future along the corridors, and help increase the quality of the urban built environment.

References:

Bernick, Michael & Robert Cervero. *Transit Villages in the 21st Century*. New York : McGraw-Hill, c1997

California Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Searchable Database,
<http://transitorienteddevelopment.dot.ca.gov/>


City of Los Angeles, *Generalized Summary of Zoning Regulations*, revised on 10/23/03

James W. Wentling and Lloyd W. Bookout (edit), *Density by Design*, the Urban Land Institute, 1988.

Morris, Marya(edit), *Creating Transit-supportive Land-use Regulations*, Chicago, IL: American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service, 1996.


Appendix

Chart 2.7- 8: Comparison of Corridors, Percentage Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, 1990, 2000



Source: Census 2000, 1990, SF1

Chart 2.9-10: Comparison of Corridors, Ethnicity, 1990, 2000



Source: Census 2000, 1990, SF1

Transit lines and stations map, Vermont corridor, 2003

Transit Stops Along Vermont Corridor

- Metro Rail Stations
- Metro Bus 204 Stops
- Other Local Metro Bus Stops
- Rapid Bus 754 Stops
- Rapid Bus 754 Route
- Metro Rail Blue Line
- Metro Rail Green Line
- Metro Rail Red Line
- Dash Routes
- Other Rapid Bus Routes
- Other Metro Local Bus Routes



Source: MTA, 2003

Table 4.1: Weekday Boardings per day, Rapid bus stop, Vermont corridor, 2003

Stop Name	Weekday Boardings- All Lines	Weekday Boardings- Rapid Line	Percentage
VERMONT & HOLLYWOOD	2710	1114	41.1%
VERMONT & SUNSET	2796	994	35.6%
VERMONT & SANTA MONICA	4984	1428	28.7%
VERMONT & MELROSE	2022	1184	58.6%
VERMONT & BEVERLY	3168	1456	46.0%
VERMONT & 3RD	5348	2240	41.9%
VERMONT & WILSHIRE	7550	3268	43.3%
VERMONT & OLYMPIC	3126	1596	51.1%
VERMONT & PICO	3569	1619	45.4%
VERMONT & WASHINGTON	3398	990	29.1%
VERMONT & JEFFERSON	1375	840	61.1%
VERMONT & MARTIN LUTHER KING	2846	1375	48.3%
VERMONT & VERNON	2345	1295	55.2%
VERMONT & 56TH	27	27	100.0%
VERMONT & SLAUSON	2967	1643	55.4%
VERMONT & FLORENCE	1899	1128	59.4%
VERMONT & MANCHESTER	2034	1120	55.1%
VERMONT & CENTURY	1531	764	49.9%
VERMONT & 120TH	672	565	84.1%

Table 4.2: Weekday Boardings per day Rapid bus stop, Ventura corridor, 2003


Stop Name	Weekday Boardings- all lines	Weekday Boardings- Rapid line	Percentage
VENTURA & TOPANGA CANYON	1322	31	2.3%
VENTURA & DE SOTO AV	306	19	6.2%
VENTURA & WINNETKA AV	701	43	6.1%
VENTURA & RESEDA	1031	267	25.9%
VENTURA & WHITE OAK AV	348	78	22.4%
VENTURA & BALBOA	293	64	21.8%
VENTURA & WOODLEY AV	283	71	25.1%
VENTURA & SEPULVEDA	1955	477	24.4%
VENTURA & VAN NUYS	1135	331	29.2%
VENTURA & WOODMAN AV	421	117	27.8%
VENTURA & COLDWATER CANYON AV	194	81	41.8%
VENTURA & LAUREL CANYON	849	257	30.3%
VENTURA & VINELAND	598	223	37.3%
UNIVERSAL CITY STATION	3955	3315	83.8%

Source: MTA, 2003

Figure 4.5: Transit lines and stations map, Ventura corridor, 2003

Transit Stops Along
Ventura Corridor

- Metro Rail Stations
- Metro Bus 150/240 Stops
- Other Local Metro Bus Stops
- Rapid Bus 750 Stops
- Rapid Bus 750 Route
- Metro Rail Red Line
- Dash Routes
- Other Rapid Bus Routes
- Other Metro Local Bus Routes



Source: MTA, 2003