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CASP: Our Community

Industrial, Residential, and Commercial Areas located next door to each other
CASP: Environmental Hazards

- 3 freeways
- Secondary highways
- Railways
- Bus yards
- Factories
Elevated Health Risks

Estimated cancer risk (per million)

- Glendale: 845
- Alhambra: 919
- CASP area: 1754
- Vernon: 1538

Source: SCAQMD Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study III Model Estimated Carcinogenic Risk
Racial and Ethnic Diversity

Race and Ethnicity

- Latino: 66%
- Asian: 29%
- White and Other: 5%

Linguistic Isolation

- Spanish Households: 37%
- Asian Households: 63%
CASP: Our Community

A Transit-Rich Area

- 110, 5, 101 freeways
- 16 metro bus lines
- 3 Gold Line rail stations
- Next to Union Station

With High Public Transit Use

- 40% of residents do not commute by car
- *Compared to 11.1% of LA County residents as a whole*
Goal #1: Increase Access to Open Space

CASP Strategies

1. 15% requirement for publicly accessible open space
2. Pocket Parks
Goal #2: Increase non-car usage

CASP Strategies

1. Improved bicycle and pedestrian mobility
2. Increase density near transit
Transit Development without Affordable Housing

Rent & Home Values Increase

Low Income Residents are Displaced by Higher income Residents

Neighborhood Income Rises

Car Ownership Increases

Public Transit Use Declines
High Need for Affordable Housing

Household Area Median Income

- Citywide: $70,000
- Lincoln Heights: $30,000
- Chinatown: $20,000
Spreading Gentrification

Source: Census
### What happens when you increase density?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base FAR</th>
<th>1.5 FAR</th>
<th>2.0 FAR</th>
<th>2.5 FAR</th>
<th>3.0 FAR</th>
<th>4.0 FAR</th>
<th>6.0 FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Value</strong></td>
<td>$3M</td>
<td>+$1.3 M</td>
<td>+$2.6 M</td>
<td>+$4M</td>
<td>-$6.8 M</td>
<td>-$26 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Equity (no contribution)</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROE w/25% contribution</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROE w/50% contribution</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable units gained @ 25% contribution/60% AMI</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5 units</td>
<td>10 units</td>
<td>15.1 units</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable units gained @ 50% contribution/60% AMI</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10 units</td>
<td>20 units</td>
<td>30.1 units</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis by Kathe Head of Keyser Marston Associates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAR Bank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASP Next Steps:

- Final Vote by City Council at the end of June
- Ensuring that CASP is implemented
- Transferring lessons/policies to other plans
What’s translatable?

Concepts:

• Increased density by itself achieves higher land values/gentrification
• Increased density with affordability incentives achieves smart growth and equity goals
• Land use planning as economic development
  • E.g. Compare base residential FAR (1.5) to industrial FAR (3).
• Policies informed by community input/data more likely to achieve equity & smart growth goals.
What’s translatable?

Policies:

• Achieving a balance of uses – residential, industrial and jobs rich.
• Using density to incentivize affordable housing
• Using density to incentivize open space
• FAR transfer is a land use concept that can help nonprofit developers raise dollars for affordable housing
Healthy Planning

“In addition to denying access to health-promoting amenities by the families who might benefit the most, this displacement can undercut residential stability and social cohesion, which are also tightly linked to resident health outcomes. To combat these effects, neighborhood improvements should be paired with policies...aimed at preserving the affordability of existing high-quality housing units and ensuring that low- and moderate-income families can afford a share of newly development housing in improved neighborhoods.”