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Land use classification (A)

• A1. The capital city of Helsinki
• A2. The suburbs in Helsinki metropolitan area, some biggest towns in other parts of Finland
Land use classification (B)

- B1. Area of city centre services
- B2. High density service area, good public transport
- B3. High density service area, adequate public transport
- B4. High density residential area, adequate public transport
- B5. High density residential area, tolerable public transport
Land use classification (C)

- C1. Scattered settlement along main roads
- C2. Scattered settlement along other roads, poor public transport
- C3. Scattered settlement along other roads, very poor public transport
Recognizing land use classes

Determining population shares

- **C3**: 5%
- **C2**: 6%
- **C1**: 6%
- **B5**: 19%
- **B4**: 10%
- **B3**: 9%
- **B2**: 14%
- **B1**: 32%
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Conclusions

• Classification combines land use and traffic system.
• Gives simple estimates of trip generation and traffic performance by mode and trip purpose for every class.
• Can be combined with additional geographic information and land use plans.
• One can test how different land use strategies affect on traffic.
• Easy to use; can be used when more precise traffic data or models are not available.