

\*\*\*\*\*

Office of the City Clerk, City of Los Angeles

This report was generated by the Council File Management System on 09/07/2025

\*\*\*\*\*

**Council File Number**

[25-0642](#)

**Title**

Off-Street Parking / Requirement Elimination / New Developments / Change of Use / Cost-Benefit Analysis

**Last Change Date**

09/05/2025

**Expiration Date**

08/26/2027

**Pending in committee**

Planning and Land Use Management Committee

**Mover**

BOB BLUMENFIELD  
NITHYA RAMAN

**Second**

KATY YAROSLAVSKY

**Action History for Council File [25-0642](#)**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>
09/05/2025	Community Impact Statement submitted by Palms Neighborhood Council.
08/26/2025	Planning and Land Use Management Committee approved item(s) .
08/23/2025	Community Impact Statement submitted by Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council.
08/22/2025	Planning and Land Use Management Committee scheduled item for committee meeting on August 26, 2025.
08/14/2025	Community Impact Statement submitted by Westside Neighborhood Council.
08/14/2025	Community Impact Statement submitted by Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council.
07/26/2025	Community Impact Statement submitted by Los Feliz Neighborhood Council.
07/23/2025	Community Impact Statement submitted by Sylmar Neighborhood Council.
06/10/2025	Motion referred to Planning and Land Use Management Committee.

## MOTION

Donald Shoup, a professor of urban planning at UCLA for 50 years, died on February 6, 2025. Shoup authored the landmark 2005 book The High Cost of Free Parking. His academic research and writing focused on the issue of parking and how arbitrarily-created, government-imposed minimum parking requirements both drive up the cost of development and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people.

This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths and injuries; buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of compact, walkable commercial districts; and more expensive housing.

Shoup's work has led many local governments to change their parking policies. It would be a fitting legacy for Los Angeles—the place where Donald Shoup spent his career—explore the feasibility of eliminating parking minimums for changes of use and for new development.

To be clear, Shoup did not contend that new development should not provide parking. Rather, he demonstrated that governments are ill-equipped to determine how many parking spaces a business actually needs; that parking requirements embedded in most zoning codes were either derived from studies at a handful of suburban or rural locations where virtually every visitor has no choice but to drive, thus overstating parking demand in areas where people have other travel options, or simply copied from another jurisdiction. For example, the City of Los Angeles requires five times as much parking for a gym than it does for a yoga studio; and twice as much parking for an art gallery than for a barber shop. Our parking requirements are not rational.

Shoup concluded that the people who develop properties and the institutions that finance development—who are literally deeply invested in the economic success of the properties, *i.e.*, their ability to rent apartments or commercial space—are best positioned to determine how much parking a project should provide.

More than 3,000 cities have adopted at least some of Shoup's suggested parking reforms, including Los Angeles. In response to the COVID pandemic, the City adopted the Emergency Ordinance, which promotes adaptive reuse of existing buildings by allowing changes of use without triggering additional parking requirements. This has worked well for both businesses and their customers, and has not had adverse impacts on neighborhoods.. Through legislation such as AB 2097, the State of California has eliminated parking requirements near major transit stops. However, many cities have gone beyond Los Angeles and eliminated parking requirements citywide, including San Francisco, San Jose, and Sacramento.

While it is true that most people in Los Angeles own cars and drive, it is not true that everyone does so. According to the American Community Survey, there are approximately 770,000 households in Los Angeles with zero or only one vehicle, more than half of all households. There are approximately 480,000 single-person households in the City of Los Angeles (31.5% of the total), who are unlikely to need more than one vehicle. Self-driving vehicles already provide transportation from Downtown to the ocean, and will continue to proliferate, reducing the need for personal vehicles. However, our standard parking requirements are based on the flawed assumption that nearly every household has at least two cars; and that everyone drives for nearly all of their trips. Just as we allow people to select how many

  
JUN 10 2025

bedrooms and bathrooms they want in the apartments they rent, we could allow them to select how many parking spaces they need.

Moreover, Los Angeles suffers from a severe housing affordability crisis. One of Shoup's most important contributions to the public discourse on parking requirements was to highlight just how much parking spaces can cost. Underground parking can cost more than \$50,000 per space to construct, and thus can add more than \$100,000 to the cost of a housing unit. We must find ways to reduce the cost of constructing new housing, and eliminating parking requirements is one way to do so. It bears repeating that those who construct new housing have every incentive to rent (or sell) that housing, and will provide the amounts of parking necessary for them to do so.

Brick-and-mortar retail stores and restaurants struggle to keep their doors open, due to economy-wide shifts toward on-line shopping and delivery services as well as local ordinances and policies. Amazon is not required to provide parking for its delivery vehicles that flood many of our neighborhoods, and neither are pop-up restaurants that operate under our sidewalk vending rules. We should level the playing field to support local businesses and neighborhood commercial districts.

Although State laws such as AB 2097 preclude the City from imposing parking requirements in areas near major transit stops, a citywide approach offers advantages. The routes and frequency of transit service can shift over time, which can be due to fiscal challenges at Metro or other transit providers rather than a change in demand. Instead of requiring a determination from Planning or Building & Safety about whether AB 2097 or some other exemption applies at some point in the process, a developer can—from the start—design a project based on its actual parking needs. In short, a citywide rule ensures consistency and predictability.

I THEREFORE MOVE that the Department of City Planning, in consultation with the Department of Building & Safety, be INSTRUCTED to report with recommendations regarding the feasibility and cost-benefit analysis of citywide elimination of off-street parking requirements for new development and changes of use.

PRESENTED BY:



BOB BLUMENFELD  
Councilmember, 3rd District

PRESENTED BY:



NITHYA RAMAN  
Councilmember, 4th District

SECONDED BY:



ORIGINAL



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

---

## Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-0642

---

**LA City SNow** <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>  
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>  
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, rosalieannp@hotmail.com

Thu, Aug 14, 2025 at 5:31 PM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the to Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at [empowerla@lacity.org](mailto:empowerla@lacity.org).

\*\*\*\*\* This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. \*\*\*\*\*

### Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Harbor Gateway North

Name: Rosalie Preston

Email: [rosalieannp@hotmail.com](mailto:rosalieannp@hotmail.com)

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(15) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 08/12/2025

Type of NC Board Action: Against

### Impact Information

Date: 08/15/2025

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 25-0642

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: Harbor Gateway North Neighborhood Council is opposed to any study of citywide elimination of off-street parking requirements for new development and changes of use. We already continually hear reports from our stakeholders throughout our Neighborhood Council area about the impact of current apartment buildings which have some on-site parking but not enough for the number of people now living in each unit. The result is vehicles that park into the R1-1 neighborhoods which they border. Most of our R1-1 and R2-1 neighborhoods were built in the 1920s and 1930s with narrow street widths. These neighborhoods are already very dense with many homes having ADUs on the properties and families doubling up in the housing. These streets are already lined on both sides with vehicles. People



keep their trash bins in front of their homes all week to secure a parking spot in front of their home and the lack of parking creates a lot of tension between neighbors and those from the apartments who need a place to park. The reality is that the public transportation system in Los Angeles in our area is not yet adequate to enable most residents to manage their work, shopping, and recreational activities without a personal vehicle. And we are already seeing a number of ED1 projects being approved that would have 40-50 units with no onsite parking located on streets with just a bus that people have to wait 20 minutes to board in neighborhoods without grocery stores or any other type of basic amenities.



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

## Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-0642

1 message

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>

Sat, Jul 26, 2025 at 8:38 AM

Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>

To: administration@lofeliznc.org, Clerk.CIS@lacity.org

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at [empowerla@lacity.org](mailto:empowerla@lacity.org).

\*\*\*\*\* This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. \*\*\*\*\*

### Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Los Feliz

Name: Misty LeGrande

Email: [administration@lofeliznc.org](mailto:administration@lofeliznc.org)

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(16) Nay(3) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 07/15/2025

Type of NC Board Action: For

### Impact Information

Date: 07/26/2025

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 25-0642

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: The Los Feliz Neighborhood Council supports the elimination of off-street parking requirements in Los Angeles. 14% of incorporated land in LA County is currently dedicated to parking. Government-imposed parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and exacerbate urban sprawl by preventing the development of compact, walkable communities. Removing parking minimums will empower local developers and stakeholders to make informed decisions about the parking needs associated with individual developments.



**TREASURER**  
Chase Puskar

**VICE PRESIDENT**  
Katie Barsotti - Communications

**PRESIDENT**  
Misty LeGrande

**VICE PRESIDENT**  
Olsen Ebright- Administration

**SECRETARY**  
Devin Homsey

## -COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT-

Council File: [25-0642](#)

Title: Off-Street Parking / Requirement Elimination / New Developments / Change of Use / Cost-Benefit Analysis

Position: Support

Summary:

The Los Feliz Neighborhood Council supports the elimination of off-street parking requirements in Los Angeles. 14% of incorporated land in LA County is currently dedicated to parking. Government-imposed parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and exacerbate urban sprawl by preventing the development of compact, walkable communities. Removing parking minimums will empower local developers and stakeholders to make informed decisions about the parking needs associated with individual developments.

**PASSED 16 - 3 - 0**



clerk CIS &lt;clerk.cis@lacity.org&gt;

## Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-0642

1 message

LA City SNow &lt;cityoflaprod@service-now.com&gt;

Fri, Sep 5, 2025 at 1:33 PM

Reply-To: LA City SNow &lt;cityoflaprod@service-now.com&gt;

To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, kay.hartman@palmsnc.la

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enable by the to Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or rResolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Councils rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at [empowerla@lacity.org](mailto:empowerla@lacity.org).

\*\*\*\*\* This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. \*\*\*\*\*

### Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Palms

Name: Kay Hartman

Email: [kay.hartman@palmsnc.la](mailto:kay.hartman@palmsnc.la)

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(4) Nay(3) Abstain(1) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 09/03/2025

Type of NC Board Action: For

### Impact Information

Date: 09/05/2025

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 25-0642

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: Palms Neighborhood Council supports the elimination of parking minimums for the City of Los Angeles. The housing and homelessness crisis is exacerbated when additional costs are passed on to all homeseekers and business owners for the use of private automobiles. Not only do parking minimums increase cost per unit built for all residences and businesses, but the physical environment is impacted due to the use of parking structures, parking lots, and podium-style buildings turning valuable land that could be homes, businesses, or community spaces into instead a piece of pavement. The ground floor of many businesses and multi-unit residential buildings are used for parking instead of retail



and business. These building designs are both aesthetically unappealing and fails to activate streets for businesses, pedestrians, bicyclists, and local residents. The 'Complete Steets' designs in the Mobility Plan 2035 and measure HLA ensure that as density increases residents and visitors alike will have multimodal access to local businesses. The late Professor Shoup of UCLA was one of many researchers dedicated to studying the impacts of parking minimums on cities such as Los Angeles. Their research can be found in works such as "the High Cost of Free Parking". The 40,000+ members of the community of Palms need continued investments into walkability, rideability, and lowered housing costs, not ensuring that people visiting Culver City can find a parking space in Los Angeles.



clerk CIS &lt;clerk.cis@lacity.org&gt;

## Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-0642 - Agenda Item Number: 21

1 message

LA City SNow &lt;cityoflaprod@service-now.com&gt;

Sat, Aug 23, 2025 at 12:41 PM

Reply-To: LA City SNow &lt;cityoflaprod@service-now.com&gt;

To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, willdrudi@mac.com

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enable by the to Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or rResolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Councils rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at [empowerla@lacity.org](mailto:empowerla@lacity.org).

\*\*\*\*\* This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. \*\*\*\*\*

### Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Coastal San Pedro

Name: Robin Rudisill

Email: [willdrudi@mac.com](mailto:willdrudi@mac.com)

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(11) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(1) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 08/18/2025

Type of NC Board Action: Against Unless Amended

### Impact Information

Date: 08/23/2025

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 25-0642

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date: 08/26/2025

Item Number: 21

Summary: Resolved, the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council opposes the City's motion regarding elimination of off-street parking requirements unless the requested feasibility study and cost-benefit analysis includes consideration of the effects of the reductions in parking availability due to Assembly Bill 2097, AI Fresco dining, Density Bonus projects, and ED-1 projects, an update of existing parking requirements that includes establishment of community-based parking

requirements based upon defined neighborhood characteristics, as well as any additional applicable objective factors, such as the need for adequate parking for medical office buildings and education facilities.



**Opposition Unless Amended--CF 25-0642 re. Elimination of Parking Requirements.pdf**  
398K



# COASTAL SAN PEDRO NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

**Doug Epperhart**  
President  
**Dean Pentcheff**  
Vice President  
**Sheryl Akerblom**  
Treasurer

1840 S Gaffey St., Box 34 • San Pedro, CA 90731 • [cspnclive@gmail.com](mailto:cspnclive@gmail.com)

---

August 22, 2025

Eunisses Hernandez, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD1  
[councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.hernandez@lacity.org)  
Adrin Nazarian, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD2  
[councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.nazarian@lacity.org)  
Bob Blumenfield, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD3  
[councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org)  
Nithya Raman, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD4  
[contactCD4@lacity.org](mailto:contactCD4@lacity.org)  
Katy Yaroslavsky, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD5  
[councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org)  
Imelda Padilla, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD6  
[councilmember.padilla@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.padilla@lacity.org)  
Monica Rodriguez, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD7  
[councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org)  
Marqueece Harris-Dawson, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD8  
[councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org)  
Curren Price, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD9  
[councilmember.price@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.price@lacity.org)  
Heather Hutt, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD10  
[heather.hutt@lacity.org](mailto:heather.hutt@lacity.org)  
Traci Park, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD11  
[councilmember.park@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.park@lacity.org)  
John Lee, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD12  
[councilmember.lee@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.lee@lacity.org)  
Hugo Soto-Martinez, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD13  
[councilmember.soto-martinez@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.soto-martinez@lacity.org)  
Ysabel Jurado, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD14  
[councilmember.jurado@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.jurado@lacity.org)  
Tim McOsker, Los Angeles City Councilmember, CD15  
[councilmember.McOsker@lacity.org](mailto:councilmember.McOsker@lacity.org)

Re: Opposition Unless Amended--City Council file 25-0642 re. Elimination of Parking Requirements

The following motion was approved by the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council Board at the August 18, 2025 Board meeting:

Whereas, the City Council has introduced a motion in Council File 25-0642, directing the Department of City Planning and Department of Building & Safety to report on the feasibility and cost-benefit analysis of citywide elimination of off-street parking requirements for new development and changes of use in Los Angeles;



Whereas, the motion recognizes that current minimum parking standards are often arbitrary, copied from other jurisdictions, and poorly attuned to local transit and development patterns—leading to over-provision in many cases (for example, the City requires five times more parking for a gym than a yoga studio, and twice as much for an art gallery as for a barber shop);

Whereas, Los Angeles remains a highly car-dependent city, with only 6% of residents using public transportation, and eliminating off-street parking requirements without a robust and accessible transit system risks stranding low-income and working-class Angelenos who rely on their vehicles to get to jobs, school, or medical care [1];

Whereas, studies show only 5% of jobs in Los Angeles can be reached within 60 minutes by transit, walking, or biking, making driving essential for most residents [1];

Whereas, the Los Angeles transit network “lacks service in many areas” of the city and often entails “much longer travel times” than driving by car; and a UCLA Transit Center equity study noted that poor residents face far longer transit trips to access basic services like healthcare and education, underscoring serious gaps in L.A.’s transit accessibility [1];

Whereas, removing parking minimums citywide will especially harm low-income and working-class residents who often need cars for multiple job sites, caregiving responsibilities, and school commutes, for which public transit is not a viable option [2];

Whereas, similar policies in cities like San Francisco have resulted in working-class tenants receiving thousands of dollars in parking fines and facing extreme inconvenience from the lack of accessible parking [3];

Whereas, street parking overflow is a predictable outcome of removing parking mandates and has led to serious quality-of-life complaints in neighborhoods that host zero-parking developments [5];

Whereas, the elderly, disabled, families with young children, and female residents are particularly disadvantaged by being forced to park far from home, raising safety concerns and mobility barriers [6];

Whereas, 53% of women nationwide report feeling unsafe walking alone near home at night, and eliminating close parking forces many into precisely these dangerous conditions [7];

Whereas, in cities like Culver City and Sacramento, parking reform was implemented in contexts with stronger or more localized transit infrastructure and still faced backlash and early signs of hardship for residents [8];

Whereas, older L.A. neighborhoods without existing garages or lots depend heavily on street parking, which is a public resource increasingly strained by new development [10];

Whereas, the assumption that eliminating parking requirements will reduce car usage is flawed in a city where most residents continue to depend on vehicles for daily life [11];

Whereas, City data shows 73% of fast-tracked affordable housing projects under Executive Directive 1 have no on-site parking, a trend that increases pressure on surrounding communities [12];

Whereas, policies that eliminate parking mandates without addressing real-world transportation needs may save developers money but effectively shifts costs to residents in the form of time, money, and personal safety risks [13];

Whereas, if parking becomes a luxury add-on, wealthier tenants can pay for it or maybe forego a car by using services like Uber, but a low-income worker might not have those options—a renter in a car-free

building may have to rent a spot in a nearby private lot, which could be an extra \$100-\$200 per month, which would strain their budget; thus, renters and lower-income residents bear the brunt of the inconvenience and extra costs associated with zero-parking developments, meaning that a policy with no parking requirements is an effectively regressive policy [3];

Whereas, neighborhood councils, such as Greater Wilshire, have raised red flags about spillover parking impacts from zero-parking developments, citing challenges for seniors, parents, and long-term residents [5];

Whereas, data from the Institute for Transportation & Development Policy indicates approximately 85% of L.A. households still own a vehicle, including among lower-income groups, demonstrating a persistent need for parking [14];

Whereas, cities like San Francisco and Sacramento, which removed parking minimums, still struggle with equity and accessibility issues due to limited transit options and continued car dependence [3][8];

Whereas, although existing Los Angeles parking requirements may be excessive in some areas, many have been removed by Assembly Bill 2097 (Effective 1-1-2023);

Whereas, Councilmember Nithya Raman herself has acknowledged that parking debates are among the most galvanizing issues for constituents, reflecting broad community concern [15];

Whereas, implementing such sweeping policy without a neighborhood-level, equity-centered outreach and analysis process risks deepening disparities among Angelenos [13];

**Resolved, the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council opposes the City's motion regarding elimination of off-street parking requirements unless the requested feasibility study and cost-benefit analysis includes consideration of the effects of the reductions in parking availability due to Assembly Bill 2097, Al Fresco dining, Density Bonus projects, and ED-1 projects, an update of existing parking requirements that includes establishment of community-based parking requirements based upon defined neighborhood characteristics, as well as any additional applicable objective factors, such as the need for adequate parking for medical office buildings and education facilities.**

Council File 25-0642

---

Sources:

- [1] TransitCenter Equity Dashboard (2021); <https://transitcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/LAFactSheet.pdf>
- [2] Medium.com – SCU Journalism, “California’s History of Poor Public Transit”
- [3] Strong Towns – “Is Parking Reform Hurting the Poor in SF?” (2023)
- [4] SFMTA – High-Density Parking Impact Study; <https://www.sfmta.com/projects/high-density-housing-impact-neighborhood-parking>
- [5] LAist – “New Homes with No Parking?” (2024); <https://laist.com/brief/news/housing-homelessness/los-angeles-parking-housing-apartment-development>
- [6] Greater Wilshire NC public comment; LAist interview
- [7] Gallup Crime Poll (2023); End Violence Against Women Survey (2021)
- [8] Remy Moose Manley blog on Sacramento & AB 2097; BOMA on Culver City Reform
- [9] LA Times Editorial (2021); UCLA Study on Bundled Parking Costs
- [10] Mission Local / Strong Towns; Culver City Crossroads (2022)
- [11] ITDP – “Not Everyone in Los Angeles Drives” (2020); <https://itdp.org/2020/06/23/not-everyone-in-los-angeles-drives>
- [12] LA City ED1 Report via LAist; <https://laist.com/news/housing-homelessness/los-angeles-parking-housing-apartment-development>
- [13] Ronen Pestes public comment to City Council (2025); [https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2025/25-0642\\_PC\\_PM\\_06-16-2025.pdf](https://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2025/25-0642_PC_PM_06-16-2025.pdf)
- [14] ITDP and SCAG vehicle ownership data
- [15] LAist – Councilmember Raman’s statement on neighborhood opposition to parking reform

Please contact Robin Rudisill, Chair of the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council Planning, Land Use & Transportation Committee, at 310-721-2343 should you have any questions related to this letter and motion.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Douglas Epperhart". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending from the end.

Doug Epperhart, President  
On behalf of the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council Board

cc:

Anissa Raja, Legislative Director, CD-15

[anissa.raja@lacity.org](mailto:anissa.raja@lacity.org)

Nicholas Chavez, Legislative Deputy, CD-15

[nicholas.i.chavez@lacity.org](mailto:nicholas.i.chavez@lacity.org)

Pamela Thornton, Planning Director, CD-15

[pamela.thornton@lacity.org](mailto:pamela.thornton@lacity.org)

Drew Leach, San Pedro Field Deputy, CD-15

[drew.leach@lacity.org](mailto:drew.leach@lacity.org)

Kevin Brunke, Senior Legislative Deputy, CD-11

[Kevin.Brunke@lacity.org](mailto:Kevin.Brunke@lacity.org)

Craig Bullock, Planning Director, CD-11

[Craig.Bullock@lacity.org](mailto:Craig.Bullock@lacity.org),

Jeff Khau, Planning Deputy, CD-11

[Jeff.Khau@lacity.org](mailto:Jeff.Khau@lacity.org)

Diana Nave, Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council

[diananave@gmail.com](mailto:diananave@gmail.com)

Lamar Lyons, Central San Pedro Neighborhood Council

[lamar.lyons@centralsanpedronc.org](mailto:lamar.lyons@centralsanpedronc.org)



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

## Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-0642

1 message

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>

Wed, Jul 23, 2025 at 1:35 PM

Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>

To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, peter.postlmayr@sylmarnc.org, commission@empowerla.org, CPC@lacity.org, APCNorthValley@lacity.org

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at [empowerla@lacity.org](mailto:empowerla@lacity.org).

\*\*\*\*\* This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. \*\*\*\*\*

### Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Sylmar

Name: Peter Postlmayr

Email: [peter.postlmayr@sylmarnc.org](mailto:peter.postlmayr@sylmarnc.org)

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(16) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(1) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 06/26/2025

Type of NC Board Action: Against

### Impact Information

Date: 07/23/2025

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees, City Planning Commission, Area Planning Commission - North Valley, Board of Neighborhood Commissioners

Council File Number: 25-0642

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date: 06/10/2025

Item Number:

Summary: Re: Council File: 25-0642 CIS Off-Street Parking / Requirement Elimination / New Development / Change of Use / Cost-Benefit Analysis Last month, The Sylmar Neighborhood Council voted 16 to Oppose; 0 to Support; 0 Abstained, and 1 Ineligible. We urge the City to listen to their constituents and VOTE AGAINST THIS ITEM. SNC thinks this is a terrible idea and if approved, will have huge negative impacts on neighborhoods. It will further degrade the quality



of our community lives; take away the rural openness we value and create congestion on our streets Households still need a form of transportation to go to work, pick up groceries, medications, doctor's appointments etc.... Most households have at least 1 if not 2 or more vehicles. This is evident in Sylmar where there are existing apartments with extracars taking up all street parking for blocks. □ Modern transportation options are not available to many. □ Public transportation is inconvenient, time-consuming and unable to take you the last mile. □ Car services like Lyft and Uber are unaffordable for many. □ Elderly, handicapped, and others find it difficult to walk very far therefore unable to use other forms of transportation leaving a personal vehicle their only choice. □ Bicycles are not always an option given weather, physical ability, hilly conditions, dangerous streets and need to pick up items for use at home. Consider bags of groceries, lumber, paint and yard care items. We urge the City to VOTE AGAINST 25-0642!



**SNC CIS 25-0642 Parking Requirement Elimination June 2025.pdf**

205K



Officers

*President: Kurt Cabrea-Miller*  
*Vice President of Administration: Andres Rubalcava*  
*Vice President of Communications: Jose Velasquez*  
*Treasurer: George Ortega*  
*Secretary: Kathy Bloom*

July 23, 2025  
Los Angeles City Council  
City Hall  
200 N. Spring St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Council File: 25-0642 CIS Off-Street Parking / Requirement Elimination / New Development / Change of Use / Cost-Benefit Analysis

Last month, The Sylmar Neighborhood Council voted 16 to Oppose; 0 to Support; 0 Abstained, and 1 Ineligible. We urge the City to listen to their constituents and **VOTE AGAINST THIS ITEM.**

SNC thinks this is a terrible idea and if approved, will have huge negative impacts on neighborhoods. It will further degrade the quality of our community lives; take away the rural openness we value and create congestion on our streets

Households still need a form of transportation to go to work, pick up groceries, medications, doctor's appointments etc.... Most households have at least 1 if not 2 or more vehicles. This is evident in Sylmar where there are existing apartments with extra cars taking up all street parking for blocks.

- Modern transportation options are not available to many.

- Public transportation is inconvenient, time-consuming and unable to take you the last mile.
- Car services like Lyft and Uber are unaffordable for many.
- Elderly, handicapped, and others find it difficult to walk very far therefore unable to use other forms of transportation leaving a personal vehicle their only choice.
- Bicycles are not always an option given weather, physical ability, hilly conditions, dangerous streets and need to pick up items for use at home. Consider bags of groceries, lumber, paint and yard care items.

We urge the City to **VOTE AGAINST 25-0642!**



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

---

## Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-0642

---

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>  
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>  
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, wncseat18@gmail.com

Thu, Aug 14, 2025 at 11:06 PM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at [empowerla@lacity.org](mailto:empowerla@lacity.org).

\*\*\*\*\* This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. \*\*\*\*\*

### Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Westside

Name: Joseph Roth

Email: [wncseat18@gmail.com](mailto:wncseat18@gmail.com)

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(11) Nay(0) Abstain(3) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 08/14/2025

Type of NC Board Action: Against

### Impact Information

Date: 08/15/2025

Update to a Previous Input: Yes

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 25-0642

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: In a regular monthly meeting of the Westside Neighborhood Council, the board voted to oppose Council File #25-0642 because it considers eliminating off-street parking requirements – a policy proposal which would negatively impact our community.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sandra Geraghty

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 12:56 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a stupid, stupid proposal. Parking must be required for all new development. To assume that people will just take public transportation if they don't have parking where they live is wishful thinking. Public transportation is completely inadequate for getting around this very widespread city. And for things like grocery shopping, taking children around to school and other activities, transporting the disabled, etc. Our residential neighborhood is already inundated with parked cars from apartment buildings blocks away, resulting in requests for permitted parking. Public policy should be based on the reality that exists, not some maybe hopeful idea that cars will disappear.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** J H

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 05:08 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** parking requirements are needed . No more ADU's

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/29/2025 08:49 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am opposed to this. All new buildings should have parking spaces for residents and some for visitors.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Timothy Weir

**Date Submitted:** 07/01/2025 06:48 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a foolish idea and deserves to be dumped. You have managed to do away with off street and covered parking requirements and created disastrous conditions in residential neighborhoods. It creates third world conditions. Vote NO on this.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gilberto Mendez

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 07:32 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** We are in the year 2025, let the past be the past. We have seen the damage and effects that automobile manufacturing companies and big oil have had on our climate which contributes to the decline of our overall health. We must move away from fossil fueled modes of transportation and get back to more simple and healthier ways of travel such as walking, bicycles, and sustainably powered trains and buses. We don't need more gigantic, heat trapping parking lots. We need clean air from trees, native plants, and mini ecosystems. The majority of people are tired of looking at city landscapes of pavement and buildings and cars. We have lost and buried the beauty of the natural land. We must repair what we have destroyed and re-wild the planet so that we can continue to live full healthy lives.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Colin Warn

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 08:19 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support this motion. This motion does not implement changes, this motion recommends a cost-benefit analysis to study the pros and cons of removing parking requirements. There are 6 parking spots for every housing unit, 3.3 parking spots for every car. It's time for the city to full understand the tradeoffs it's making by prioritizing parking over parks, and housing for cars over housing for people. It's time to see what benefits/tradeoffs could be gleamed by designing a city for people, and not cars.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Wole Parks

**Date Submitted:** 09/02/2025 04:41 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I think the loosening of parking minimums is a good thing. We keep saying that we need more affordable housing but then add more regulations, which only increase costs for tenants. If a developer builds a 25 unit complex with 20 parking spots, obviously the five apartments without parking will be cheaper to rent. There are people who would prefer the cheaper units to save money and either use street parking or public transportation. Give THEM the option. We need to stop having a one-size-fits-all mentality in Los Angeles because it's not working.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Edward Casson

**Date Submitted:** 09/02/2025 06:21 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am against the proposal to reduce or eliminate currently required car parking spaces in new housing developments. It might be nice if we had an alternative to cars, such as an expanded and improved public transportation system, but we don't, and most people are not going to ride bicycles. Eliminating parking space requirements will not result in fewer cars. I will result in a parking nightmare on city streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/14/2025 05:15 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Let's get real. Do the Councilmembers really believe that all project developers give a hoot about the long-term livability of our neighborhoods? Too many are here to make a quick buck as seen by the cheap, ugly and boxy projects that are built across the City. It is no wonder that neighborhoods get up in arms when learning about new proposed projects for their area. They have no voice with most projects now being processed as "ministerial" or "by-right." Think about it. When projects are an asset to the community, they will garner community support. Instead, the City has looked for ways to remove community input from the process -- the very voices that have made projects better when vetted by those who know the community best. The City needs to do more than care about incentivizing housing production. It needs to care about fostering the development of neighborhoods that people want to live in. Sadly, LA is a long way off from that goal. And, in fact, housing and density incentive programs are actually destroying what were naturally occurring walkable neighborhoods by allowing (requiring) that some new projects have housing on all floors -- including at ground sidewalk level where pedestrian amenities are needed (and where they existed before demolition). How crazy is that? Removal of parking requirements harms those who are disabled by eliminating handicapped accessible spaces. It makes it difficult for people to adopt electric vehicles for the lack of charging stations for home use. Those details appear to have been lost in the implementation of AB 2097 and are likely being ignored by the Shoupinistas advocating for this measure. Where did this motion come from? LA certainly is not San Francisco or the other cities mentioned in the CF motion. SF is a small, water-locked city with a very extensive public transit system that reaches far into distant suburbs. Making comparisons to cities in northern California who are so very different from LA is not helpful (or realistic). They haven't the geography of LA with our valley and city separated by a mountain range. They do not come near to LA's size. Their transit programs are far advanced and have coverage that LA does not enjoy. It is important to note that analysis of the impacts of AB 2097 have not been done and should be done before any additional programs removing parking requirements are introduced. Sacto and LA electeds are in the habit of extending measures without evaluating their success

and/or needs for refinements. The number of housing-related bills adopted over the past few years is insane. Where are the reviews that seek to determine the policies that have made a positive difference and those that should go away?

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ronen Pestes

**Date Submitted:** 06/16/2025 03:11 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Councilmember Raman, Members of the City Council, and City Planning Officials, I am writing as a resident of Los Angeles, a housing provider, and a community stakeholder to strongly oppose the proposed citywide elimination of parking requirements in new developments. While I support the need to address the housing crisis, the motion introduced by Councilmembers Raman and Blumenfield, as reported by LAist on June 11, fails to reflect the real needs and daily challenges faced by the residents of Los Angeles. It promotes a vision that is out of step with the city's current public transportation limitations, public safety concerns, and widespread car dependency—especially among working and low-income Angelenos. Rather than wait for yet another taxpayer-funded “feasibility study,” I am submitting this letter to save the City the time and money. A deep review of public data, academic research, city reports, and real-world outcomes from cities like San Francisco and Sacramento shows that removing parking requirements harms the very residents this policy claims to help: Public Transportation Is Not a Viable Alternative Angelenos cannot simply “ditch their cars.” In many parts of the city, transit is unreliable, indirect, or non-existent—especially for parents, seniors, and shift workers. A commute that takes 15 minutes by car can take over 50 minutes by public transportation, as is the case for my own son's school. Street Parking Is Already Overwhelmed New zero-parking buildings are being approved in areas where street parking is already limited or restricted by permit zones—often benefiting wealthier single-family homeowners while burdening multi-family renters. My own community has experienced this firsthand, and attempts to engage with your office for solutions have yielded little progress. Public Safety Concerns Are Being Ignored Women, families with children, and elderly residents regularly express concern about walking several blocks from their cars to their homes at night. I manage a 28-unit complex, and this is consistently cited as the #1 quality-of-life and safety concern—especially for female tenants. Eliminating on-site parking exacerbates this fear and undermines public safety in a city already grappling with homelessness and rising crime. Unintended Financial Burdens on Working-Class Tenants While developers may save on construction costs, tenants still need cars. Instead of reducing housing costs, this policy will

push working-class renters into time-consuming and expensive street parking conflicts, towing fees, and increased fines—creating a hidden and regressive cost of living. The argument that eliminating parking mandates will dramatically improve affordability is not backed by lived experience or real-world data. In fact, similar policies in other cities have produced confusion, congestion, and frustration—especially for working families and communities of color. For your reference, I’ve attached a detailed research document outlining my concerns and supporting evidence: *Arguments Against Eliminating Parking Requirements in Los Angeles A Better Way Forward: Real Community Input*. Rather than continue to pursue policy built around ideological planning agendas, I urge the Council to establish a Public Interest Committee within the City Planning Department—staffed by city employees who are tasked with direct, proactive outreach to neighborhoods, including renters, building managers, small landlords, essential workers, and seniors. This department should listen to real people’s concerns—not just consultants or advocacy groups with narrow agendas. The residents of Los Angeles deserve housing that works in real life, not just on paper. Any meaningful housing policy must be grounded in transportation realities, community safety, and economic equity. I ask you to reject this motion, pause any further research expenditures on it, and instead reinvest in neighborhood outreach, improved transit infrastructure, and parking equity strategies that benefit everyone. Sincerely, Ronen Pestes Sherman Oaks



## 1. Public Transit Accessibility in Los Angeles: Challenges for Working Families and Low-Income Communities

- **Car-centric reality vs. transit gaps:** Los Angeles is extremely car-dependent – only about 6% of residents use public transportation <sup>1</sup>. The transit network “lacks service in many areas” of the city and often entails “**much longer travel times**” than driving by car <sup>2</sup>. In fact, even where transit exists, it typically reaches only a small share of jobs and people within a reasonable time frame. One analysis found that only *5% of jobs* and *4% of residents* in Los Angeles are accessible within 60 minutes via transit, walking or biking, which helps explain why so many Angelenos drive <sup>3</sup>.
- **Inaccessible for essential trips:** For many lower-income residents, the current transit system “**falls short**” of their needs. For example, on a weekend morning it takes nearly **four times longer** to reach the nearest hospital by transit than by car, and over **three times longer** to reach the nearest college <sup>4</sup>. This kind of delay can be untenable for working families. A UCLA TransitCenter equity study noted that poor residents face far longer transit trips to access basic services like healthcare and education, underscoring serious gaps in L.A.’s transit accessibility <sup>4</sup>.
- **Working families often need cars:** Many low- and middle-income Angelenos juggle multiple jobs, school drop-offs, and errands that public transit simply cannot accommodate on their schedule. One Los Angeles mother described that “**public transportation isn’t even an option**” for her daily routine – she has to take her three children to different schools in opposite directions and then commute to work, something no transit route could feasibly cover in a timely way <sup>5</sup>. *“It doesn’t make sense for me to take the train...their schools are the complete opposite direction of where I work... it’s still way more convenient to drive,”* she explained, noting that driving is the only way to get everyone where they need to be on time <sup>5</sup>. These kinds of logistics are common for working-class families in L.A., who often rely on cars out of necessity.
- **Transit usage skewed by income:** Those who *do* ride transit in Los Angeles tend to be disproportionately low-income (the median household income of an Metro transit rider is very low, around ~\$18,000 per year in past surveys). Yet even among low-income Angelenos, many still depend on cars due to the city’s sprawl and irregular transit coverage. Surveys confirm that while low-income households have lower rates of vehicle ownership than wealthier households, the vast majority still use cars when they can – only about 15% of Los Angeles residents walk, bike or use transit to commute <sup>6</sup>. In other words, most working people, including those of modest means, feel compelled to drive because the transit system doesn’t reliably connect them to jobs and daily needs. Critics of eliminating parking mandates argue it is *especially* unfair in this context, because **Los Angeles’ “lack of public transit and sprawling landscape” make it difficult to go car-free** – alternatives just aren’t practical for many residents <sup>2</sup>.

## 2. Removing Parking Requirements: Impacts on Street Congestion and Parking Availability

- **Overflow into street parking:** Neighbors and community groups fear that new developments without on-site parking will flood nearby streets with additional cars, worsening an already fierce competition for curb space. In car-dependent L.A. neighborhoods, residents worry an influx of renters with no dedicated parking will turn the hunt for a street spot into a **“bloodsport”**, as one news analysis put it <sup>7</sup>. Even today, certain areas are so parked up that locals describe parking as *“almost impossible...completely inconveniencing residents who live on adjacent streets”* <sup>8</sup>. They warn that adding new buildings with zero parking will only exacerbate this congestion – *“the wrong place for more development,”* as one resident wrote in opposition <sup>8</sup>.
- **Strain on permit parking systems:** Los Angeles has many neighborhoods with preferential parking districts or time-limited street parking, and these systems could be overwhelmed by spillover cars from parking-light developments. San Francisco’s experience is instructive: after eliminating parking minimums, SF officials observed that **“new, higher-density development is creating greater demand for on-street parking than what the [Residential Permit Parking] program was designed to address.”** Traditional permit restrictions can’t meet the diverse needs of residents, visitors, and workers all competing for the same curb space <sup>9</sup>. In other words, when buildings don’t provide enough off-street parking, the overflow onto public streets can defeat the purpose of local permit programs and lead to frustration for existing residents.
- **Families, seniors and the disabled affected:** The lack of guaranteed parking near one’s home particularly impacts vulnerable groups. If street parking becomes scarce, **existing residents may end up needing to park many blocks away**, noted Conrad Starr, president of the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council, in reference to projects with no parking <sup>10</sup>. *This poses “real challenges for senior citizens or families with young children,”* Starr explained <sup>10</sup>. Elderly or disabled residents cannot easily walk long distances from a distant parking spot to their home, and parents with small kids would struggle with groceries, strollers, etc. when forced to park far away. As Starr put it, if an apartment family **“have small kids...it may not be feasible for them to park several blocks away”** from their residence <sup>11</sup>. These quality-of-life concerns are a major reason many community members oppose one-size-fits-all removal of parking requirements.
- **Community backlash is predictable:** Time and again, *parking* is the number one issue that galvanizes neighborhood opposition to new housing. LA City Councilmember Nithya Raman herself acknowledged that the **parking debate “always brings people out”** to public meetings <sup>12</sup> <sup>13</sup>. In areas already seeing zero-parking projects (such as those fast-tracked under Mayor Bass’s affordable housing directives), neighbors have lodged a flurry of complaints about street parking overflow. In one case, a record turnout at a neighborhood council meeting in Larchmont was driven by anger over a 52-unit development with no parking; opponents flooded the council with letters protesting that **“parking is almost impossible”** in the area and that the project would worsen an already dire situation <sup>14</sup> <sup>8</sup>. This kind of pushback highlights the on-the-ground reality: eliminating on-site parking may save developers money, but the *costs* are shifted onto the community in the form of congested streets and conflict over limited curb space.

- **Traffic and circulation issues:** Beyond the difficulty of finding parking, more cars circling for spots means more traffic on local streets. Studies have shown that drivers hunting for cheap street parking contribute significantly to congestion in busy areas <sup>15</sup>. If new buildings don't accommodate their residents' vehicles, those residents will be driving around the block repeatedly, adding to gridlock and increasing emissions. Los Angeles already suffers from notorious traffic; forcing more cars onto the street due to lack of private parking could worsen travel times and frustrate drivers and transit users alike. In sum, removing parking minimums without robust transit in place risks "free riders" overwhelming public streets and effectively privatizing public space for spillover parking, as some critics point out <sup>16</sup> <sup>17</sup>. This outcome is precisely what parking requirements were created to prevent, and many fear a repeal will bring these problems to the surface.

### 3. Safety Concerns: Crime, Homelessness, and the Need for On-Site Parking

- **Personal safety, especially for women:** In today's Los Angeles, public safety is a pressing concern – and it's directly relevant to parking and how far people must walk from their cars. Walking alone at night can be frightening, **especially for women**. Nationwide surveys show over **half of women (53%) are afraid to walk alone at night near their home**, compared to about 26% of men <sup>18</sup>. This fear is not unfounded, given rising crime rates in many cities. Councilmember Traci Park, speaking after a series of violent attacks in Venice, voiced the community's frustration: *"People in Los Angeles are sick and tired of feeling unsafe... No woman, no visitor, no family should be unsafe walking in any neighborhood in the city of Los Angeles."* <sup>19</sup> This statement highlights how vital it is for residents to feel secure coming and going from their homes – something that attached or on-site parking can significantly aid. If parking requirements are eliminated and residents must routinely park down the street or around the corner, many (again, especially women) will have to walk alone at night through dark or isolated areas, increasing their anxiety and potential exposure to danger.
- **Crime and homelessness considerations:** Unfortunately, parts of Los Angeles are grappling with increases in certain crimes and a visible homelessness crisis, which together contribute to a sense of street disorder. Neighborhoods have seen incidents of car break-ins, thefts, and even assaults in parking structures or on sidewalks. **Half of Americans worry about their car being stolen or broken into** – a record high level of concern <sup>20</sup> – and Los Angeles has experienced a wave of vehicle break-ins in some communities. Secure, on-site parking (such as a gated garage or lot) can help protect residents from becoming victims of property crime and avoid confrontations with individuals who may be loitering near vehicles. By contrast, having to park on public streets means **vehicles are more exposed** (potentially leading to vandalism or theft), and residents must physically be out on the street late at night, sometimes near encampments or poorly lit areas. Many Angelenos simply do not feel safe in those conditions.
- **Peace of mind and convenience:** The availability of attached parking (say, a garage or an on-site lot where one can park close to home) is more than just a luxury – it's a safety amenity. It allows a person to go from their car to their doorstep with minimal risk, rather than walking a distant stretch of street. Particularly for women coming home from work in the evening, parents with children in tow, or anyone carrying groceries and distracted, this can be crucial. Without a guaranteed parking spot, residents might resort to parking illegally closer to home, or circling in frustration – which can itself lead to risky situations if someone is desperate. A lack of parking could also mean residents

choose to park in more isolated or dimly lit blocks when everything near their home is taken, again raising safety issues. Simply put, **attached parking provides a controlled environment** and reduces the “friction” of getting from car to home. In a city where, as Councilmember Park noted, “*unstable and potentially dangerous*” individuals are roaming the streets <sup>21</sup>, providing a secure place for people to park and quickly get inside is a matter of public safety.

- **Examples of safety incidents:** Sadly, there have been real incidents underscoring these concerns – women attacked in parking areas or walking to their cars, confrontations in neighborhoods like Venice and Hollywood, etc. While these crimes are not caused by parking policy, they highlight why residents (justifiably) prioritize feeling safe when coming home at night. They shouldn’t have to choose between an affordable apartment and a safe place to park. Eliminating parking requirements without addressing safety means ignoring a basic need for security. As one advocacy group’s data showed, **1 in 2 women feel unsafe walking alone after dark on a quiet street near their home** <sup>22</sup> – a staggering statistic. City leaders must consider that reality. Women, seniors, and others will understandably oppose policies that make them *more* likely to be stuck walking alone at night or parking far away in order to live in a new development. Any comprehensive housing policy must factor in the personal safety dimension.

## 4. Financial and Equity Concerns for Renters and Low-Income Residents

- **Potential added costs for renters:** Removing parking requirements is often justified as a cost-cutting measure for developers (and by extension, for renters). It’s true that building structured parking is very expensive – studies in California show each parking space can add **\$36,000–\$50,000** to the cost of an apartment unit <sup>23</sup> <sup>24</sup>. However, *eliminating* parking mandates doesn’t magically make the need for parking disappear; it often just shifts the cost burden onto those residents who *do* own cars. Developers can “unbundle” parking, charging for spaces separately from rent. Research from UCLA found that when parking is bundled with apartments it raises rents by about **\$200 per month** (on average) for tenants <sup>25</sup> <sup>26</sup>. If parking is unbundled, tenants without cars save money – but those **with cars will effectively pay that ~\$200 premium** out of pocket to secure a space. For a low-income renter, \$200/month is a significant expense. There’s a real concern that low-income households who rely on cars (often older vehicles) will be financially squeezed: they might have to pay high monthly fees for a private parking spot, or suffer frequent tickets and towing costs if they gamble on street parking. In San Francisco’s Mission District, after parking minimums were eliminated, some working-class residents ended up **racking up thousands of dollars in parking fines** because they had no choice but to park on the street and constantly move their cars for time limits and street cleaning <sup>27</sup>. This is essentially a regressive tax on people who can least afford it.
- **Renters still need cars in many cases:** A fundamental equity issue is that many lower-income and middle-income residents *must* maintain a car in Los Angeles to access jobs and opportunities. It is often argued that parking requirements make housing less affordable by forcing car infrastructure on those who don’t need it. But in L.A., the people living in affordable or modest housing *often do need a car*. For instance, a service worker or tradesperson might work a late-night shift in an area with no bus service, or a caregiver might have to drive between multiple client locations in one day. These working-class Angelenos cannot simply “choose” transit or biking in many cases – their livelihoods depend on driving. Data from San Francisco (which has better transit than L.A.) found

**47% of households earning under \$100k/year have at least one car, and 22% of low-income San Franciscans commute by car** for work <sup>28</sup> (often because their jobs aren't transit-accessible or involve carrying equipment) <sup>29</sup>. In Los Angeles, car ownership rates among low-income households are likely even higher. The Institute for Transportation & Development Policy notes that about **200,000 households in the City of L.A. (largely in communities of color) do not have a car**, which implies roughly 85% of households **do** have at least one vehicle <sup>30</sup>. Low-income families frequently have older cars because they are cheaper than paying for ride-shares or navigating an inconsistent bus network. **Removing parking requirements doesn't remove their need for a car** – it just makes their life harder if that need isn't accommodated.

- **Disparate impact on those already struggling:** If parking becomes a luxury add-on, wealthier tenants can pay for it or maybe forego a car by using services like Uber. But a low-income worker might not have those options. Consider a renter in a new “car-free” building who *does* own a car: they might end up parking on the street and getting ticketed repeatedly because they can't afford a pricey garage. Or they may have to rent a spot in a nearby private lot, which could be an extra \$100–\$200 per month that strains their budget. For a family, not having on-site parking could mean they simply can't consider living in that building – effectively excluding them from the very housing that's supposed to be made more “affordable.” There's also the scenario of informal arrangements (renting someone's driveway space, etc.) which introduces new hassles and inequities. All of this adds up to a risk that **renters and lower-income residents bear the brunt** of the inconvenience and extra costs associated with zero-parking developments. As one urban policy expert observed, policies that force low-income people to rely on cars but then don't provide for parking *are* effectively regressive <sup>31</sup>. It's not fair to tell a 60-year-old delivery driver (whose shifts start before transit runs) to live in a building with no parking and just “figure it out.” These are real people, often on tight incomes, who could end up **“losing hours of their lives”** moving cars and juggling chaotic logistics due to lack of parking <sup>27</sup>.
- **Equity in public streets:** Another angle is that when on-site parking is lacking, residents will occupy public street parking for free (or for a nominal permit fee), which is a public resource. Arguably, this benefits those who have cars at the expense of those who don't (since curbside space could have other uses). But in many older L.A. neighborhoods, street parking is already a lifeline for existing low-income residents in older buildings with no garages. If new developments flood the street, it could displace the parking of long-time residents. Some of those residents might be renters in affordable units who have no option but street parking. The result could be conflicts between old and new residents, or even between businesses and residents, over the scarce curbside space. From an equity standpoint, this could pit low-income groups against each other. Meanwhile, more affluent areas often have driveways and secure garages and won't feel the change as acutely. In short, a citywide elimination of parking minimums without safeguards might have unintended inequitable outcomes, burdening certain communities more. This is why some advocates urge a more nuanced approach (for example, keeping some requirements in transit-poor areas or for family-sized units, etc., or investing in better transit **before** removing parking). Without careful implementation, what starts as a cost-saving measure for housing could translate into *externalized costs* (time, money, safety) for those who can least absorb them.

## 5. Lessons from Other Cities: Negative Outcomes and Critiques of Similar Policies

- **San Francisco – a cautionary tale for working-class residents:** San Francisco removed all parking minimums citywide in 2018, and while it has produced more housing, it also revealed challenges that are directly relevant to L.A. A local SF news report by *Mission Local* documented how **working-class tenants in new affordable buildings with zero parking struggled greatly** with the no-parking situation <sup>27</sup>. Residents in one Mission District complex had to **wake up in the early hours to move their cars** for street cleaning, spend hours circling for a legal spot, and many received **hundreds or even thousands of dollars in parking tickets** because there was simply nowhere secure to leave their vehicle <sup>27</sup>. This despite San Francisco being one of the easier cities to live car-free. It turned out that a large share of those low-income tenants *did* own cars (many jobs in SF still require it), and when the building provided no parking, the burden fell entirely on the residents. **Nearly half of SF households under \$100k own cars, and 22% of low-income San Franciscans drive to work** <sup>28</sup> – so the assumption that affordable housing residents wouldn't bring cars did not hold true. The result has been frustration and unexpected hardship for those residents. While San Francisco's policy succeeded in building more units, community organizations there have noted that it *feels* inequitable when the poorest have to play "musical chairs" with street parking. The San Francisco experience suggests that simply eliminating parking requirements can **"accidentally worsen"** the day-to-day inequalities if complementary measures (like improved transit or shared parking arrangements) are not in place <sup>32</sup>.
- **Sacramento – concerns about transit-poor areas:** Sacramento's city council voted in January 2021 to abolish parking minimums as part of a broad zoning reform to spur infill housing. This was lauded by urbanists and environmental groups, and indeed Sacramento hoped to use the change to reduce car trips and encourage transit use <sup>33</sup> <sup>2</sup>. However, even supporters acknowledged a key concern: **areas without good transit**. Critics of Sacramento's policy (and of California's new state law AB 2097) argued that if you eliminate parking mandates in places where **public transit is lacking**, you could hurt residents who have no alternative to driving <sup>2</sup>. This concern is one reason some California cities were initially hesitant to go as far as Sacramento. Essentially, Sacramento's bet is that by cutting parking, it will "create" demand for transit – but if the transit isn't there yet, there's a risk of short-term pain. Los Angeles is a prime example: as the Remy Moose Manley law analysis noted, "*Los Angeles' lack of public transit and sprawling landscape... make it more difficult*" to implement an abolition of parking requirements citywide <sup>34</sup>. The state law AB 2097 only bans parking minimums near major transit stops (half-mile), precisely to avoid dumping car-centric projects in transit deserts. If L.A. extends this to the entire city, it would go beyond what state law requires, and places like the far San Fernando Valley or Harbor area – with limited transit – could see negative effects. In summary, Sacramento's experience is still unfolding, but the key takeaway is the importance of transit context: what works in a downtown or midtown may not work the same in a peripheral neighborhood. That lesson should temper Los Angeles's approach.
- **Culver City – contentious but unproven:** Culver City, a smaller city in west LA County, **eliminated its parking minimums citywide in late 2022** (in a 3–2 council vote) <sup>35</sup> <sup>36</sup>. The move aligned with trends in Berkeley, San Diego, and other California cities, aiming to permit more housing and reduce car dependency. Leading up to the decision, there was public debate but reportedly only a relatively small group of vocal opponents by the final vote <sup>37</sup>. Proponents cited the usual reasons (cost

savings, climate benefits), and even referenced UCLA Professor Donald Shoup's work on the "High Cost of Free Parking" to justify the change <sup>38</sup>. It's been about two years since that policy took effect. While it's perhaps too soon to see full impacts (as projects under the new rules are still being built), Culver City's situation does raise some flags. First, Culver City has modest transit (mainly buses and one light rail stop on its edge) – most residents and visitors still drive. The **potential drawback acknowledged even by policy supporters** is that **Los Angeles County is one of the most car-dependent regions**; if multiple cities remove parking requirements but people don't significantly shift to transit, **"problems could arise."** <sup>1</sup> This was noted by the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) of Greater LA in their commentary on Culver City's change: only ~6% of residents use transit countywide, so the worry is an eventual crunch in parking and more congestion if development outpaces transportation changes <sup>1</sup>. We haven't yet seen high-profile news of parking chaos in Culver City, but importantly, Culver City is geographically small and adjacent to Los Angeles – meaning any overspill could just push parking into bordering L.A. neighborhoods. It's worth monitoring as a microcosm of what a larger citywide policy might bring.

- **Other cities and emerging data:** Many cities that have eliminated parking minimums (Minneapolis, Seattle, etc.) often have done so in tandem with strong investments in transit or with expectations of future behavior change. The early evidence is mixed. For example, a UCLA study of San Diego's reduced parking requirements found that developers did not always max out parking – some built less, but many still built close to what they thought the market demanded (meaning they voluntarily include parking to attract tenants) <sup>39</sup> <sup>40</sup>. In other words, eliminating the *mandate* doesn't mean parking goes to zero; it just becomes a market decision. In Los Angeles, developers themselves admit they **"are still looking to sell or lease units, and there are a lot of people for whom parking is really important"**, so they will likely continue to provide some parking if the market compels it <sup>40</sup>. However, affordable housing projects, which operate under different economics, have a strong incentive to provide no parking (to maximize units and because their tenants are assumed to have fewer cars). L.A.'s own data shows **73% of affordable housing projects fast-tracked under Executive Directive 1 featured no on-site parking** <sup>41</sup> <sup>42</sup>. That's a dramatic shift, and the *true* test will be when those buildings are occupied: Will their residents indeed not own cars, or will they own cars and park in surrounding streets? Early indications (from other cities and anecdotal evidence) suggest many will still have cars, meaning the impact will be felt on the streets.
- **Balancing housing and cars – finding the sweet spot:** The experience of these other cities yields a clear message: **extremes can have consequences**. Requiring too much parking has well-documented downsides (higher housing costs, more sprawl, etc.), but **requiring none at all can also backfire** if local conditions aren't ready for it. San Francisco's story shows the human cost on low-income drivers; Sacramento's policy reminds us one size may not fit all locales; and even in progressive Culver City the vote was split, indicating reasonable people differ on how to balance these issues. Los Angeles can learn from these cases by crafting a policy that addresses our city's unique challenges. This might include, for example, *gradually* reducing parking requirements or setting different rules based on a project's location and target residents (transit-rich vs. transit-poor areas, senior housing vs. family housing, etc.), and aggressively improving transit and neighborhood safety concurrently. The key is to avoid simply copying another city's policy without mitigating measures. As one planning commentator put it: *the real goal is to prioritize "housing for people over housing for cars,"* but it must be done in a way that doesn't inadvertently punish those very people we're trying to help <sup>43</sup> <sup>44</sup>. That means acknowledging that in Los Angeles, for now, **cars are a**

**necessity for many – and completely eliminating parking requirements *citywide* could further disadvantage those who have no choice but to drive.**

#### Sources:

- Los Angeles Transit Accessibility and Usage – TransitCenter Equity Dashboard (2021) <sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup> ; Medium (SCU Journalism) on CA transit issues <sup>45</sup> <sup>5</sup> ; ITDP report on L.A. transit (2020) <sup>3</sup> <sup>46</sup> ; Remy Moose Manley law blog on parking reforms (2022) <sup>2</sup> .
- Community Perspectives on Parking Congestion – *LAist* reporting on L.A. zero-parking developments (2024) <sup>7</sup> <sup>8</sup> <sup>10</sup> ; SFMTA study on high-density parking impacts (2021) <sup>9</sup> ; *LAist* interview with Neighborhood Council leaders (2025) <sup>13</sup> <sup>11</sup> .
- Safety and Parking – Gallup Crime Poll (2023) on walking alone at night and car theft fears <sup>18</sup> <sup>20</sup> ; ABC7 News (Traci Park quote, 2024) <sup>19</sup> ; End Violence Against Women survey (UK, 2021) <sup>22</sup> .
- Equity and Low-Income Impacts – StrongTowns analysis “Is Parking Reform Hurting the Poor in SF?” (2023) <sup>27</sup> <sup>28</sup> ; L.A. Times Editorial Board (2021) <sup>26</sup> ; Mission Local (Annika Hom’s reporting, 2023) via StrongTowns <sup>27</sup> ; ITDP “Not Everyone in LA Drives” (2020) <sup>30</sup> .
- Other Cities’ Outcomes – StrongTowns (on San Francisco) <sup>27</sup> <sup>28</sup> ; Remy Moose Manley blog (on Sacramento and state law) <sup>2</sup> ; BOMA GLA on Culver City (2022) <sup>1</sup> ; Culver City Crossroads news report (2022) <sup>35</sup> ; *LAist* news on L.A. parking policy motion (2025) <sup>40</sup> <sup>41</sup> .

---

<sup>1</sup> Culver City Eliminates Parking Requirements - BOMA on the Frontline

<https://www.bomaonthefrontline.com/2022/10/31/culver-city-eliminates-parking-requirements/>

<sup>2</sup> <sup>33</sup> <sup>34</sup> More California Cities Eliminate Parking Minimums to Promote Low Carbon Transportation and Affordable Housing - Remy Moose Manley

<https://www.rmmenvirolaw.com/more-california-cities-eliminate-parking-minimums-to-promote-low-carbon-transportation-and-affordable-housing/>

<sup>3</sup> <sup>6</sup> <sup>30</sup> <sup>46</sup> Not Everyone in Los Angeles Drives - Institute for Transportation and Development Policy

<https://itdp.org/2020/06/23/not-everyone-in-los-angeles-drives/>

<sup>4</sup> FactSheets.pdf

<https://transitcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/LAFactSheet.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> <sup>45</sup> California’s History of Poor Public Transit Affects the Working Class | by SCU Journalism | Rewriting the Culture | Medium

<https://medium.com/rewriting-the-culture/californias-history-of-poor-public-transit-affects-the-working-class-f970da280df3>

<sup>7</sup> <sup>8</sup> <sup>10</sup> <sup>14</sup> <sup>23</sup> <sup>25</sup> <sup>41</sup> <sup>42</sup> No Parking?

<https://laist.com/brief/news/housing-homelessness/los-angeles-parking-housing-apartment-development-street-ed1-affordable-transportation-cars>

<sup>9</sup> High Density Housing--Impact on Neighborhood Parking | SFMTA

<https://www.sfmta.com/projects/high-density-housing-impact-neighborhood-parking>

<sup>11</sup> <sup>12</sup> <sup>13</sup> <sup>40</sup> <sup>43</sup> <sup>44</sup> New homes with no parking? LA City Council considers ending parking requirements | *LAist*

<https://laist.com/news/housing-homelessness/los-angeles-city-council-end-parking-requirements-housing-development-raman-blumenfeld>



15 **How Parking Reform Is Helping Transform American Cities**

<https://e360.yale.edu/features/free-parking-reform>

16 **The Best Argument for Parking Mandates (Is Still Wrong)**

<https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2024/2/7/the-best-argument-for-parking-mandates-is-still-wrong>

17 **What are the defenses for residential minimum parking minimums?**

[https://www.reddit.com/r/Urbanism/comments/1g32lry/what\\_are\\_the\\_defenses\\_for\\_residential\\_minimum/](https://www.reddit.com/r/Urbanism/comments/1g32lry/what_are_the_defenses_for_residential_minimum/)

18 20 **Personal Safety Fears at Three-Decade High in U.S.**

<https://news.gallup.com/poll/544415/personal-safety-fears-three-decade-high.aspx>

19 21 **Suspect Anthony Jones arrested in violent attacks on 2 women near Venice canals, LAPD says - ABC7 Los Angeles**

<https://abc7.com/suspect-anthony-jones-arrested-in-violent-attacks-on-2-women-near-venice-canals-lapd-says/14652759/>

22 **New data shows extent to which women feel unsafe at night | End Violence Against Women**

<https://www.endviolenceagainstwomen.org.uk/new-data-women-feel-unsafe-at-night/>

24 26 **Editorial: Eliminate parking requirements - Los Angeles Times**

<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-04-26/editorial-eliminate-parking-requirements-housing-people-is-more-important-than-housing-cars>

27 28 29 31 32 **Is Parking Reform Hurting the Poor in San Francisco?**

<https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2023/5/9/is-parking-reform-hurting-the-poor-in-san-francisco>

35 36 37 38 **City Council Removes Parking Requirements – Culver City Crossroads**

<https://culvercitycrossroads.com/2022/10/26/city-council-removes-parking-requirements/>

39 **In These US Cities, Parking Reform is Gaining Momentum**

<https://itdp.org/2024/02/01/in-these-us-cities-parking-reform-is-gaining-momentum/>

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 04:59 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is unacceptable, a complete disregard for everyone's safety and only serves yourselves. This is by far not the worst idea that comes out of this council but that's only because no good ones ever do. Passing this motion would be the end of any pedestrian safety, ADA compliance and traffic efficiency left in this city. You guys are absolute failures, at that, you actually do succeed.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** richard

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 05:16 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** understand the urgency to get housing in this area and efforts are being made, but most of those who can pay any rent have some form of personal transportation or access to repeat personal transportation. I am of the opinion that some parking SHOULD be available for renters. the streets in those multi tenant dwelling areas are overload as is, double parking rampant.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** George Walsh

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 03:48 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a horrible idea. This will disproportionately affect low income people in disadvantaged communities who are limited on where they can live by cost. Can you imagine having a newborn baby, and no place to park your car? Places with no parking have more traffic because people are traveling around the block more than once just looking for a place to park. This circling also contributes to increased carbon emissions and air pollution. Please vote no.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** John  
**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 07:02 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** We cannot allow builders and lenders to determine necessary parking. They don't make money on the parking. Only the living spaces. Less parking equates to more living spaces which equates to more money. There are so many housing projects planned with "affordable" units along with retail and "unaffordable" units. Traffic will be even more of a nightmare if residents don't have sufficient assigned parking. The residents of these new housing projects will be forced to infiltrate neighboring neighborhoods and take up their spaces

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 08:56 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please do not go forward with your plan to eliminate parking for new developments. This would hurt the elderly and people who have to cart small children with them as they do their errands. This decision would change our everyday life in ways which should not be allowed to be decided by any governing body without a vote from the people who live in the city! This is for the benefit of developers only. It does not serve the public!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Robert Meer

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 10:56 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** You must realize that parking is already an issue in many neighborhoods and will only get worse if you add housing without sufficient parking. It is quite possible that there may be violent arguments over parking spaces and vehicle damage through vandalism. Public transportation is insufficient in most areas, especially in the San Fernando Valley. Don't make life tougher, especially with the Governor and his henchmen proposing to add a 65 cent increase in the price of gas. This is bad policy and will turn your constituents against you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** North Valley Coalition of Concerned Citizens Inc.  
**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 11:00 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0642  
**Comments for Public Posting:** The elimination of all parking requirements for all new developments is insane. Every development has its own environmental impacts and having sufficient parking is one of them. Failure to address this critical issue would be a failure to comply with CEQA.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Veronica Castillo

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 09:22 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Eliminating parking will be disastrous to families and community. I/we already have no parking in the street, people leave their trash bins on street to “save parking”. People double park on street so save parking. Eliminating parking will cause confrontation, conflicts, harassment and possible assault if people have to fight for parking spots. Please do not eliminate the parking requirements. On a separate note- why are all the new luxury buildings going up and most of them are vacant.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 01:57 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** The parking is already very hard to find, adding more people and not requiring parking will only make this worse. Some streets in the area are already almost impassable with all the parking, and you have to park long distances from your own home. This is not something any of us want. Vote NO.

## **Communication from Public**

**Name:** Abundant Housing LA

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 02:21 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Abundant Housing LA strongly supports CF 25-0642



6/23/2025

Los Angeles City Council  
200 N Spring St., Los Angeles  
cc: Los Angeles Department of City Planning,

**Re: CF 25-0642 (eliminating off-street parking requirements)**

Dear Los Angeles City Council Members,

Abundant Housing LA proudly supports evidence-based strategies to lower the cost of housing, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve the livability of our communities. That is why we write to express strong support for CF 25-0642, which would study the elimination of off-street parking requirements for new development and changes of use.

It is fitting that the motion for this item begins by honoring Donald Shoup, a Los Angeles legend, whose academic work paved the way for a new generation of evidence-based best practices in urban planning. As Shoup showed us, the costs posed by onerous parking standards are prohibitive, often totaling \$50,000 or more per space, thus making new development both more expensive and more challenging. These factors, in turn, increase local housing costs, costs that ultimately get passed along to residents. These unnecessary standards additionally limit the forms of housing construction we see. They preclude, for instance, the construction of bungalow courts and other housing typologies that are quintessentially LA and a part of what makes this city such a special place to live. Many beloved pre-war-era apartments would be illegal to build today, under current codes, in part because of such requirements. Parking minimums are also bad for our transportation network; they incentivize solo car trips (including for those who would not otherwise choose to drive), reduce transit ridership, and increase traffic on our streets, all of which leads to increased carbon emissions and dirtier air.

There is a myth that everyone in LA drives everywhere. In actuality, many Angelenos lead car-free or car-light lifestyles. The Metro system saw 311 million bus and rail boardings last year, an 8% increase over 2023 annual ridership numbers and the highest numbers seen since the Covid-19 pandemic. Importantly, eliminating parking minimums does not forbid new parking spaces; it just allows builders to right-size their parking allotments to the needs of a given development and its future residents.

Emboldened by the evidence, California's government leaders, at the state and local levels, have already begun to chip away at parking requirements across the state. Through AB 2097 (Friedman), the State of California already eliminated parking requirements near major transit stops in 2022. Many local jurisdictions have gone above and beyond this and pursued deeper reforms. Last year, for instance, the County of Los Angeles loosened parking requirements for multifamily development. The Cities of San Francisco, San Jose, and Sacramento have gone further still, eliminating them altogether. Los Angeles has an opportunity to do the same and join these cities in leading on this issue.

We urge you to advise the Department of City Planning, in consultation with the Department of Building & Safety, to report back with recommendations regarding the feasibility and cost-benefit analysis of citywide elimination of off-street parking requirements for new development and changes of use.

This is a meaningful step forward toward a more equitable, sustainable and livable future in Los Angeles and a sign that an ever better LA is possible.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Azeen Khanmalek', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Azeen Khanmalek  
Executive Director  
Abundant Housing LA

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joyce M.Prescott

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 02:46 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I live one block north of the Orange line. When “someone” determined that multiple ADU’s could be built on what used to be a one house lot, we lost any parking on our street. One address has 3 residential properties, 8 vehicles and ONE parking space on the property. Another one also has three units, two parking spaces, and 5 vehicles. Reducing parking restrictions even further will make it even worse. Just drive through these streets some evening where restrictions were already lifted to allow multiple units and you will see. Think about trash pickup with additional cars and cans! It is a nightmare. Please don’t allow this to happen!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dan Glick

**Date Submitted:** 06/23/2025 03:11 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** We all see the cars parked on our streets outside of homes that used to have garages and now have ADU's with no provided parking. Our neighborhood streets are being lined with parked cars, narrowing the roadways and creating unsafe driving conditions as these streets were not designed to be parked on...the homes all came with garages and driveways. Putting up an apartment complex with no parking requirements, building a retail center with no parking available, continuing to allow those who build ADU's to not provide parking continues the creation of the decay that is ruining Los Angeles and its suburbs. This is not the way to make more housing. It will create turmoil, traffic, violence as folks jockey over non-existing parking and contribute to the already unsightly nature of our declining city streets. We have not been paying property taxes for our lifetime to have our streets taken from us and our neighborhoods destroyed by short term thinking. How about fixing a sidewalk or cleaning our streets again...restore services and stop allowing the ruin of our neighborhoods. Please do not pass this horrible, ill-conceived bill. Thank you, Dan Glick

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mindy

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 07:51 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please stop destroying our once beautiful city! Building large apartment buildings with no parking and no parking restrictions will cause mass chaos, accidents and much more driving. You are pushing our citizens to the brink and none of the city Council members will be voted Back for the next election unless you start to consider the citizens that voted for you. We feel Betrayed. Stop passing legislation without sending to popular vote. We do not want to live in chaos anymore.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 09:26 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Eliminating or decreasing public parking will not be the answer. Los Angeles and various counties are vast and growing. Apartment buildings are constantly being built and families are growing. The need for a car is for travel needs in a big county and decreasing public parking spaces will warrant more people fighting for public parking, decrease friend and family gatherings, an already tough convenience will seem impossible just to drive and park. Instead of decreasing parking, increase traffic signs, build more parks, and more public spaces where communities can join and support each other. Decreasing public parking will make parking even more scarce in LA and areas with more apartments.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** DAVID BONILLA

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 10:19 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I do not think this is a good idea for the City. Parking is horrendous everywhere. As well as with trailers parked around the city. Very little enforcement is done, that could step up and garner more fees for the city to collect on. This is a move that only benefits builders to do the minimum effort when creating housing or commercial areas. Do not give away parking areas. This idea does not work to solve issues, it would create many more.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** LWS

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 11:23 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This will make traffic worse, congestion worse, air pollution worse. Removing parking requirements HURTS us. We are not going to start taking public transit because you make parking worse. You are just going to make parking harder. Already in my area people start parking during antigridlock periods with hazards on just to find a spot.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Fred Truex

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 12:24 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Do not eliminate parking requirements for all new developments in the city of Los Angeles. DO NOT LEAVE IT TO BUILDERS OR DEVELOPERS TO DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES NEEDED. Builders and developers CANNOT be trusted with such an important feature of developments. I would like to see the number of REQUIRED parking spaces for a development BE INCREASED not only by the number of, but also increase the SIZE OF THE SPACES both width and depth.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** S Jackson

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 12:47 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Council Members, Please do NOT vote to remove parking restrictions for new developments in LA. We are already an overcrowded city. I live in an area where double-parking occurs constantly, not just by individual drivers but just as often by delivery trucks (including postal workers), service people (maintenance, repair, etc.), ride-share vehicles, school busses, elderly transports, etc. Our streets become dangerous to drive on, and heaven forbid an emergency vehicle needs to get through. Building more structures with multiple tenants who have nowhere to park (nevermind their visitors, clients, service people, etc.) makes zero sense. It also doesn't necessarily translate into more people in the area walking or using public transportation ... that would be ideal, but often not practical. We certainly need more affordable housing in LA, however making it more challenging for people to park where they live or where they work will not will not make such housing more available for those who need multiple jobs to make ends meet if there is no parking. The solutions to our city's problems are challenging, and I appreciate your efforts to find them, but passing this would not be an effective solution. Thank you for listening to residents of LA!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Natalie

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 11:42 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This city is spread out with economic opportunities often SEVERAL miles away from where we live. Using public transportation due to the city turning unfriendly to personal vehicles is an utter insult to residents that pay have been paying high taxes for street repairs. It's not logical nor practical for families and angelinos everywhere. With most families needing 2 incomes to get by, time is of the essence and needing to give more time to find parking or to using public transportation already takes away from the hours spent commuting to work to provide for their families. Time that can be spent with their children! Money that can be saved due to picking kids up earlier from already expensive childcare. Our current public transportation does not support realistic travel for Angelinos. I urge you NOT to pass this motion. We need the little free parking we currently have. We have a right to it. This is not New York.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** John Priebe

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 11:53 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please don't consider scrapping required off-street parking without the needed improvements to public transit.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cherie Gigliotti

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 04:24 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Most People living in the Los Angeles area need a car to survive. How are people supposed to get to work, go shopping, (ie: Costco or grocery) or have any entertainment. Most people don't live in an area that is in walking distance to get to their destination. This isn't NYC. This is another move trying to demand what citizens must do to comply to ridiculous regulations in Los Angeles and California. These ideas are radical and make zero common sense.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Marsha Pottash

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 04:26 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking requirements are already inadequate, with too few parking spaces required for retail and residential establishments. No matter what elected officials think and hope for, Angelenos travel by car. Public transit does not go where people need to go. Lack of parking impacts surrounding areas badly. There will be more traffic accidents, including with pedestrians who will need to park further from their destinations. Many times, I have not gone to individual stores or restaurants because I could not find parking. Please do not eliminate off-road parking requirements. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Luis Michael Suarez

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 05:13 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Ending parking requirements is RIDCULOUS!! The Valley is already too crowded; they keep building and there is nowhere for people to park. if you build a little AUD in the backyard and that person has 5 cars, where are they going to park them? Not in my driveway. and, it would be nice to have space in front of my house in case I should have company. But people have to many cars, and they park them and leave them, maybe only driving one. I heard that there are 2 Council members who are trying to get this motion pushed through, I'll bet that they don't live in the valley, and they have a stack in whatever construction company that needs this law implemented. They are lining their pockets with money while making lives of all of us who have to live with what they're doing! SHAME ON THEM!!! Do not approve this for the money grubbing people that only want to make our lives more difficult!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 05:25 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please vote NO on this ridiculous idea or open it up for public vote. Residential neighborhoods are already short of street parking since ADUs have become more common. You live in a dream world if you think people will give up their cars when L.A. is so spread out and public transportation is lacking in many ways.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** JG

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 05:59 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** The idea of removing parking space requirements for new developments is ridiculous. As a long time resident of the San Fernando Valley, I have observed the increase in parking congestion and cannot believe how bad it is in other areas (Santa Monica, and areas closer to the city). People, including apartment dwellers, need parking for many reasons. Our transit system simply does not meet most people's needs, such as multiple school and activity drop-offs, work commutes, errands, shopping, etc. The length of time for single trips is often several times as long, let alone multi-stop trips many people make every day. Street parking is already difficult in areas with many apartment buildings probably because people have even more cars than spaces currently provided. This would make it even worse. Also, it is not safe for people with small children, handicapped or elderly people who don't have handicapped permits to walk long distances from wherever they find a space, and unloading groceries, etc? - impossible! What about a person who gets home from work after dark? It certainly isn't safe walking alone. There are many more problems laid out in other citizens' comments. Perhaps number requirements, especially for businesses, can be looked at, or charging separately for parking from rent, giving people a choice, and allowing those who don't drive to save the money on rent that this proposal claims it would do. But overall, it is obvious, most people need a space, and most units probably need 2. Please do not approve this horrible idea. We do not have the transit system (or enough cyclists) that would be required to make this work.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Leo Frincu

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 06:59 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** E need more parking enforcements, not less. Los Angeles and the surrounding suburbs have become an impossible place to live due to the traffic congestions and lack of parking regulations.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Leah Daniel

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 08:02 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a terrible idea! Virtually everyone that moves into one of these buildings has a car - two if it's a couple. You are creating a nightmare for those poor people if you don't require developers to include parking, and you are stabbing the residents nearby in the back, as well. Building housing is important but creating density without quality of life considerations will ensure no one wants to live there!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jennifer

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 08:50 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** We already have a tremendous problem with the lack of parking all over the City and the Valley. Not requiring parking is terrible. Though we have public transportation, it is not convenient for most people and crimes are being committed regularly. 1 parking space for each unit should be the minimum amount required.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lisa Case Wojciechowski

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 10:17 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is an absolutely horrible idea and very poor planning. The good people in the valley who have worked hard to own or rent a modest home choose to live out here because they opted get away from overcrowded areas where there is no parking. I live in quiet Lake Balboa where there is lovely tree lined streets and ample parking. This was one of the benefits of moving out here, while the downside was that I have to commute farther to work. And yet here you are trying to destroy what little quality we have. Your abysmal plan will flood our quiet suburban neighborhoods with overflow parking and bring undesirable activities into our neighborhoods. Additionally, building Apartments with no parking spaces will force people who live in these places to find parking on the streets, i.e. in our quiet suburban neighborhoods. It is ludicrous to think that people will live in your apartment buildings and not drive any cars or trucks. Absolutely absurd! This is going to create more crime opportunities and it's also creates dangerous situations. The renters who have vehicles will have to drive around looking for parking and then walk a distance at night from their cars to their homes, leaving their cars exposed to catalytic converter theft and break-ins, and they themselves will be targets for robbery and other crimes. I used to live on the west side and left that area of Los Angeles because THERE WAS NO SAFE PARKING! I lived in a nice apartment building close to work but where my guests would drive around for an hour or more looking for parking. And then they would have to walk a distance to my home and when they got back to their cars would find their windows broken. Your proposal is a horrible idea, it's poor urban planning and should absolutely not pass through the city council. Shame on any you for even thinking of passing this. Your actions have consequences and elections are coming. I respectfully request that you do not pass this initiative.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jeff Schermer

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 12:27 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** YOU'VE GOT TO BE KIDDING! NO parking requirements? Are you nuts! please don't let this go through. Providing more units this way will not lower the prices.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shelley

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 10:48 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please please consider parking! No more ADU's!!! They have ruined our neighborhood with over crowding. My neighborhood is now impossible with parking because of this. People are also parking on the corners now also because of the parking situation This is very dangerous as cars come around the curb and can't see head on into others. Please you must consider parking as it's become a mess now with the ADU's in the once single family residence areas. Thank you very much!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Simpson

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 05:12 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** To encourage the creation of affordable units that can match the scale of need in the City, Councilmember Raman introduced a motion, adopted by the City Council in 2021. A quote by her homepage itself. Id like to ask how is it that opting out parking for tenants is matching the scale of need in this city? There is a parking scarcity everywhere. This is just going the wishes of developers and is not for the good of the city

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michelle S

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 07:39 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please consider what happens when there is an emergency or natural disaster. Parking lots and streets MUST have limits and regulation! In the event of such emergency, please consider the liability to the city without any restrictions. If you are feeling the city is taking on too much liability now. This will exacerbate the problem. Thank you for listening and your consideration for a NO.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 05:04 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This change in parking for new construction is a very bad idea. There isn't enough parking now with all the ADU's and apartments that have been constructed in the last few years. You people on the city council have NO idea what the rest of the citizens go through when it comes to parking. Not even counting going back and forth to work or the grocery store. This is a very bad idea. You, the city council members, have to do better for the citizens. Don't make the citizens pay the price because you feel you need to suck up to the developers.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 06:06 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I believe there must be some way to make housing developers provide adequate parking for tenants of their new developments. Already there isn't adequate parking for existing apartments and businesses. Renters park in surrounding streets far from their dwellings already. And now they cannot park within fifteen feet of any corner intersection regardless if the curb is painted red or not further exasperating congested parking on neighboring streets. Fix mass transit and make it close to anyone within a ten minute walk and then you'll see less need for parking developments.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Franklyn

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 06:40 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** It's insane to not require parking for new construction in LA. It's also irresponsible and will only lead to bigger problems that will be unsolvable later.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Alma Vorst

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 02:15 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Do not pass this new ordinance. New developments should have to include parking.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Deborah Gonzales

**Date Submitted:** 06/26/2025 08:18 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is appalling to know that eliminating parking requirements for new development and ADUs is even being considered! This kind of policy completely disregards the realities and needs of existing neighborhoods, especially single-family communities. Our streets are becoming increasingly crowded with parked cars, often from homes that once had garages but have since converted those spaces into ADUs without providing any replacement parking. What were once quiet, open, and safe residential roads are now narrow and difficult to navigate, creating dangerous driving conditions and increasing frustration among neighbors. The cumulative effect of approving apartment-style developments, commercial centers, and ADUs without adequate parking is contributing to the decline of our communities. This approach prioritizes density over livability and is not a sustainable solution to the housing crisis. It breeds traffic congestion, elevates tensions as residents compete for limited street parking, and strips away the aesthetic and functionality that once defined our neighborhoods. We have paid property taxes for decades with the expectation that our local quality of life would be preserved, not diminished. Instead of pushing through shortsighted legislation that ignores critical infrastructure needs, we ask that you focus on restoring basic services—cleaning our streets, repairing our sidewalks, and protecting our residential character. Please oppose this bill and any future measures that continue to erode parking requirements. The peace, safety, and integrity of our neighborhoods depend on thoughtful, balanced planning—not blanket exemptions that lead to chaos.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ruth Doxsee

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 07:03 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** New developments need adequate parking requirements. In my dictionary, adequate parking is at least two vehicle (not bicycle or moped) spots per bedroom of unit.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/25/2025 09:43 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is my understanding that the LA Council is considering a motion to eliminate parking requirements for all new developments. This is quite unacceptable, as it will add more congestion, due to an over abundance of vehicles coming to the neighborhood where the development would be built. In addition, the construction of high rise buildings adds significant carbon to the atmosphere and this occurs thru the construction process and the materials used, steel and concrete. High rise buildings are extremely carbon intensive adding large amounts of carbon to the atmosphere, thus creating a very unhealthy environment for the public, (families in the neighborhood, and others). Please reconsider your proposal to eliminate parking requirements for these buildings. Also, it is very important that the location of these buildings, if you must build them, be in locations that are away from family neighborhoods. Families, with children, of all ages cannot ride their bikes, nor can they walk in an environment meant for other purposes. Older adults would also feel encumbered by the amount of traffic. Please re-evaluate your decision on this matter.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/26/2025 01:09 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** The perimeter around a private property has already disappeared, and now you want to deregulate parking as well. Anybody voting for this will certainly never receive my vote to continue being a representative! This is just another of many of the liberal, socialistic changes that are happening against my will. I still have voting rights, however, and may it ever be!!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Saima S.

**Date Submitted:** 06/26/2025 02:52 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am in favor of this motion "to report with recommendations regarding the feasibility and cost-benefit analysis of citywide elimination of off-street parking requirements for new development and changes of use". Other public commenters are acting like voting in favor of this motion automatically removes the parking requirements. I see no reason not to further explore our options and conduct a cost-benefit analysis. People wax poetic about how LA and the San Fernando Valley used to be...50 years ago. We cannot keep legislating as if the population has not quintupled since 1970. The roads ARE more congested. Housing IS becoming scarce. Parking IS becoming more limited. These are all just attributes of an urban environment; one which we all continue to choose to live in. The SFV used to be suburbia, but LA's sprawl is quickly filling in and becoming more densely populated. It's not suburbia anymore. This is why we need to reevaluate how we build, where we build, and what barriers we put in place in order to do so. It's just not realistic to have 2 parking spaces for every person, and we need to build a lot more affordable housing in order to accommodate people. Anyone who's owned property in LA knows just how absurdly difficult it can be to build or renovate ANYTHING here. Permits and codes take over your life and make you want to tear your hair out! Making it easier and cheaper to build is necessary to address the growing population, and if we discover that removing the parking requirements can actually help, that would be GOOD news! Now if we could just do something to address how ugly most of the new construction is...but I guess that's a different conversation for another time.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christina Fenimore

**Date Submitted:** 06/26/2025 03:56 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Donald Shoup has been pushing this matter for 50 years in classrooms and I totally disagree with his idea. We have a terrible public transportation system that does not cover Santa Clarita, Lancaster, Palmdale, the San Fernando Valley. There is one train system and an express bus to get to DTLA. I live in Northridge and drive to Downtown LA, because public transportation is for the San Fernando Valley is terrible. The city has made a mess with North Hollywood and all those apartments with no required building parking. No building should go up without parking for tenants. Eliminating the parking requirement is terrible for the disabled person. This is a bad idea!!!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael Smith

**Date Submitted:** 06/26/2025 05:18 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** No building permits should be approved without adequate parking included in the proposal. This should apply for ADU construction as well as commercial buildings. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Julie B

**Date Submitted:** 06/27/2025 10:17 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to urge the Los Angeles City Council to vote NO on the motion to eliminate the parking requirements for new development. Our streets which are meant for commuting have become free public parking lots. Some streets, when cars are parked on both sides, have become impassable for two-way traffic due to double parking of ride share drivers waiting for their fares, to extended parking and/or street storage of extra or nonfunctional cars, and to the abundance of delivery Amazon, FedEx, and USPS delivery trucks since COVID. Parked cars take up traffic lanes at certain times on main SFV thoroughfares, as residents who used to park in their garages or driveways have turned these spaces into ADUs, with even more residents now street parking. You'll be driving along in right lane, and you will then then have to brake and change lanes due to a parked car in traffic. The city has created dangers driving conditions in the SFV (the lack of left turn lights and collisions at all major intersections is a whole other topic!) If you drive around CSUN or Granada Hills Charter, there streets are lined with parked cars and trash, as street sweepers cannot clean due to all of the parked cars. Parking enforcement is a rare sighting. Los Angeles, no matter how many times you try to deny it, is a COMMUNTING city. We do NOT have the public transportation infrastructure required to eliminate private commuting and parking needs. Eliminating parking requirements will exacerbate an already significant problem. Please vote NO or be prepared to be voted OUT.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Simpson Lopez

**Date Submitted:** 06/24/2025 05:05 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Street parking has already been taken by bicycle lanes that are very dangerous both to cyclists and motorists. The bus lanes impede traffic and now there is no on-site parking. There is already no street parking.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/26/2025 05:44 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Loss of parking requirements will simply choke our streets and lead to illegal parking on streets which will result in unsafe residential streets for walking and impossible access for residents as ADUs suck up any currently available street parking. Please don't degrade our living space. Please don't make it unsafe for our children to walk to the store or the school bus.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Beatriz

**Date Submitted:** 06/26/2025 06:49 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a care provider to my disabled husband and our young child, I implor you to rethink not enforcing parking spaces in new buildings. I can not tell you needed our parking is. I would have to double le park in an unsafe corner to leave my husband with his wheelchair then go find parking, because we can't double park, he would need to wait for me to get into our apartment. This is just a small scenario. Like taking my kid to school. Taking the extra time to find parking to get to my disabled husband is unsafe for him. When I have a designated parking eliminates all of this. My husband would be able to come with us and enjoy the everyday. Instead of just waiting at home because there's no parking anywhere for him to easily come with. Please take this into consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/26/2025 07:01 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is ridiculous. It's not bad enough that we have a ton on ADU's that park and clog up all our streets. We have street vendors that have people blocking streets, making it hard to get in and out of parking lots. Now you want to have more reduced parking. Making the city a mess.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Maria Diaz

**Date Submitted:** 06/27/2025 05:12 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** WE, the Community, do not want this!!!!!! We want our single family home neighborhoods! Getting rid of parking requirements is the opposite of what We, the Community, wants!! These are our neighborhoods and we need parking. If Developers are not required to provide parking it may be more difficult sell or rent out their units. They certainly won't be able to ask for as much in rent for a unit without parking as they would for a unit with parking. Not requiring parking WILL NOT make people take the bus! It will just lead to even more congestion on our streets and more crime because cars are not protected at night. So PLEASE, PLEASE DON'T DO THIS!! Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lloyd Pilch

**Date Submitted:** 06/27/2025 05:34 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** The idea that are to be no parking requirements for new developments DOES NOT MAKE SENSE! Developers will only increase density to their advantage and our streets will become only clogged beyond imagination. This is no way to run a city. Please vote against this change in requirements.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Robin L Daskin

**Date Submitted:** 06/28/2025 12:50 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is a terrible mistake to eliminate parking space requirements for all new developments at this time. Our public transportation is not yet up to speed. Landlords have been using this as an excuse to charge new tenants on existing properties for parking. Furthermore, parking on the streets subjects cars to theft and vandalism. Much as we would like to see better alternatives to cars? we are not there yet!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Marcy Polsky

**Date Submitted:** 06/28/2025 09:50 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** We reside in the Noble Estates Community part of CD4. I am opposed to having more access to parking on our neighborhood street. This endangers pedestrians and property owners. We already have had several vehicle collisions on Hatteras Street between Kester Avenue and Sepulveda. Drivers disregard stop signs and speed through Hatteras. This would be extremely dangerous on Hatteras Street because it is difficult to back up from our driveways located on Hatteras with parked vehicles obstructing safe views of oncoming traffic. We have already sent the following message to Councilperson Raman's office and have not received a response: Dear Councilmember Raman, I live at the NW corner of Lemona Avenue and Hatteras Street in Sherman Oaks. There have been several serious collisions at this intersection because drivers do not observe the 4-way Stop Signs as well as the other 4-way Stops at Nobel and Columbus Avenues. We also have speed humps on Hatteras Street. There has also been an injury for a bicyclist where the car did not stop. Most recently, a vehicle ended up on the sidewalk very close to hitting another's property. This section of Hatteras is between Kester Avenue and Sepulveda Blvd. Drivers use this way to access these streets, Target, or bypass Burbank Boulevard. This is a neighborhood of all ages including young families walking with strollers, walking with their families, walking dogs, and exercising. We would like to know what you propose to mitigate this serious problem. Some neighborhoods have prohibited traffic between 7 - 10 am and from 4 - 7 pm. Others have cameras that capture drivers running stop lights and stop signs. These are two options that could help our neighborhood. We look forward to hearing from you soon. Sincerely, Marcy and Andrew Polsky



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/29/2025 10:56 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Eliminating parking requirements for new developments in Los Angeles is absurd. Where do you expect the residents to park? There certainly isn't enough parking available on the street, and the demand for parking is only going to increase. Please start to consider the people that you represent when making these kinds of decisions.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lloyd Pilch

**Date Submitted:** 06/27/2025 05:37 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please vote against a new requirement not to have parking requirements for new developments. Our streets are way over crowded now.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Tansy

**Date Submitted:** 06/28/2025 10:12 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This proposal to eliminate parking requirements for all new construction are ridiculous. The majority of citizens, and huge amount of tourists and visitors, use cars to get around the huge Los Angeles area. Every time you build a building, especially large occupancy ones, you are impacting everyone in that neighborhood. It's bad enough that the state and city have colluded to allow everyone to build an ADU in their garage and back yard, but now you have approved the building of 100+ unit buildings without parking in highly congested areas, and in peaceful residential single family home areas. This will only make things unbearable. But people will not give up their cars, nor drive Ubers to their work and appointments. "The Los Angeles multifamily market has an overall vacancy rate of 5.1%, consistent with earlier 2020 CoStar data. This rate applies to market-rate multifamily units, with approximately 357,153 units tracked in prior CoStar reports. Using this figure, about 18,255 vacant market-rate apartments are estimated in the City of Los Angeles (5.1% of 357,153)." This data indicates that there is not a shortage of empty Apartments here in the city of Los Angeles and the need for all of these ADUs is a bit overhyped. This should be put to a public vote !

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Diana

**Date Submitted:** 06/29/2025 08:37 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Eliminating parking requirements will increase traffic and congestion in our already overcrowded city. The parking situation will increase and cause great stress, mentally and physically on hard-working citizens who pay their fair share of taxes and should have the right to be able to park without having to walk great distances to their own dwelling. This greatly impacts families with small children, those with physical disabilities, senior citizens to name a few. I've owned my house for over 20 years and have seen the streets get more and more crowded with parking from renters who have turned their garages into ADUs and an overflow of people from other rentals, such as apartments or rooms because that lack the appropriate amount of parking. There are times that my daughter is unable to find parking near our house at night after work and will need to walk two blocks just to find a parking spot. This is unacceptable. Especially with the amount of crime that I keep reading about on a daily basis! This is the opposite of adding to the quality of life. This is yet another step towards ruining the city and making it more and more unappealing, which intern will also devalue our properties. Please do not pass this motion.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Pixie

**Date Submitted:** 07/01/2025 02:07 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please do not pass this. Parking is obviously an issue throughout the city, and permit parking makes the situation worse. Our public transit has safety issues and is not nearly significant enough. This will potentially only add to the problems.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 07/01/2025 04:00 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a terrible idea, finding parking is already a nightmare almost in every city. I ask that this is not approved as it will negatively affect all of us.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** L. Toribio

**Date Submitted:** 07/01/2025 10:51 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please reconsider as this will overwhelm our already over crowded city. All new buildings should have parking spaces for residents and visitors.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Linnie Jean Murphy

**Date Submitted:** 06/27/2025 08:04 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Why would the City cut off a revenue source like this? Unless the City isn't as insolvent as has been reported.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael Wojtowicz

**Date Submitted:** 07/02/2025 08:55 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I disagree with the concept of not requiring new developments to provide parking as part of the development. Parking is already at a premium in a great percentage of neighborhoods.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Agnes Lewis

**Date Submitted:** 07/02/2025 10:08 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** this is a disastrous Motion. Even with the current parking requirements for apartment buildings, often the streets around are full of parked cars, making it difficult to drive through. Where do you think all the cars belonging to the residents will go, if you eliminate at least a basic requirement? VOTE FOR COMMON SENSE. VOTE NO

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Antoine Wakim  
**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:12 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0642  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities. Let's try to figure out how to eliminate parking minimums in newly constructed homes

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nick Cron-DeVico

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:16 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I'm here to voice strong support for the motion to begin eliminating parking minimums in Los Angeles. Parking minimums are outdated policies that make housing more expensive, encourage car dependency, and undermine our efforts to create walkable, sustainable neighborhoods. By requiring developers to include excessive parking, we force them to use valuable land and resources on car storage instead of homes, parks, or local businesses. Eliminating these mandates is a critical step toward addressing our housing affordability crisis and climate goals. It will allow for more flexible, community-oriented development and help reduce traffic congestion and emissions by making alternatives to driving more viable. I urge the committee to support this motion and prioritize a city that puts people, not cars, first. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Clayton Becker

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:21 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums are unnecessary, distort the housing market, drive up costs, make it harder to different types of business to occupy space when the previous tenants close, and are antithetical to the city's climate goals. I strongly support removing parking mandates and allowing builders to build the amount of parking they feel the project requires. They have a clear incentive to build the right amount of parking. If they don't build the amount of parking that is demanded, then they'll simply lose out on money from those for whom parking is a crucial amenity. These mandates only serve to force builders to provide parking even when it is not necessary.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:21 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** no more parking minimums! Make this a city for PEOPLE not for cars!

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:22 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking mandates increase the cost of housing and make it harder to build the affordable, sustainable communities Los Angeles desperately needs. By requiring developers to build costly parking structures, we are prioritizing cars over people, even as many Angelenos struggle to pay rent or would prefer to live in walkable, transit-friendly neighborhoods. We know that parking minimums lead to more driving, more traffic deaths, and more dangerous streets. They also leave us with buildings surrounded by asphalt instead of housing, green space, or small businesses. Removing parking minimums is a proven step cities around the country have taken to lower housing costs, improve street safety, and reduce emissions. This is about equity as much as sustainability. Many residents cannot afford cars and rely on walking, biking, or transit. Parking mandates force them to subsidize car storage, even though they don't benefit from it. Eliminating these mandates makes Los Angeles fairer, safer, and more affordable for everyone. I urge you to eliminate parking minimums. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brooke Wirtschafter

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:24 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I urge the council to support the motion today today instructing the Department of City Planning to report with recommendations regarding the feasibility and cost-benefit analysis of city-wide elimination of off-street parking requirements for new development and changes of use. Parking minimums drive up the cost of building housing. They encourage car ownership and dedicate public space to private parking use. They make neighborhoods less walkable and mass transit less feasible. We need to lower the cost of building new multi-family housing and incentivize people to use public transit, to walk and bike. In the process, we will make LA more livable for everyone.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Alexander Bell

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:28 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities. Let the developers decide if and how many parking spaces they need.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Seneca J. Velling

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:29 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Removing off-street parking minimums is a practical, pro-housing, pro-services reform that will help Los Angeles add homes, strengthen public finances, and improve everyday city life. Parking mandates quietly raise the cost of every home. Building structured parking routinely runs tens of thousands of dollars per stall—often \$30k–50k+ for structured/underground spaces—costs that get baked into rents and sale prices whether residents need a stall or not. Research also shows that “bundled” parking raises rents by ~17% (about \$1,500-1,800 per year) and imposes hundreds of millions in deadweight costs on car-free renters. Furthermore, when cities lift minimums, developers right-size parking and build more homes. In Buffalo, the first major U.S. city to repeal minimums, nearly half of major projects provided fewer spaces than the old code demanded, cutting excess parking by ~20% and freeing land and financing for housing instead. Interviews with developers after repeal found parcels near transit and walkable amenities became more attractive, confirming that flexibility encourages infill where a car isn’t essential. When we remove parking minimums, we can better support public services. Surface lots and overbuilt garages consume valuable land while generating little tax value per acre compared with mixed-use buildings; shifting land from low-productivity parking to housing, shops, and mixed-use zones will grow the tax base. This is absolutely essential for LA given its dire budgetary position. More compact development also lowers per-capita infrastructure costs—with multiple studies finding sprawling urban/peri-urban environments spend far more on streets, sewers, and utilities per resident than denser places. LA’s current budget woes reflect this: Los Angeles spends nearly \$888 per resident on water and sewer, far above Chicago’s \$481 or New York City’s \$194, while allocating just \$59 per resident for streets (compared with \$165 in NYC and \$544 in Chicago, though Chicago’s figure includes large grant-funded capital investments). This imbalance underscores LA’s budgetary inefficiency (and looming fiscal cliff). The city is bearing sharply higher utility costs without the density or tax base to justify it. On top of that, LA faces a nearly \$1-billion ongoing budget deficit. Those savings can be redirected to core services like transit, safety, parks, and libraries, thereby improving everyday life for

Angelenos. Beyond tax revenue and good planning policy, it is worth observing that travel behavior in our community is changing—especially among younger Angelenos. National licensing data show only about 69% of 19-year-olds and 77% of people aged 20–24 are licensed, far below older age groups and down markedly from the 1980s. That trend, paired with more delivery/telework, on-demand mobility like rent-a-bikes and scooters, means fewer households will demand a space per unit, particularly in walkable, transit-rich neighborhoods and if they do it will be for storage of small more mobile vehicles, not parking lots/garages for cars. Finally, Los Angeles is expanding high-quality transit, which makes homes without parking more desirable over time. The Regional Connector opened a year and a half ago in June of 2023, simplifying cross-county trips, and the D Line subway is extending to Westwood, with new stations slated to open in 2026 & 2027. Measure M has invested roughly \$120 billion over four decades to build out the network—meaning more households will live a short walk from frequent service; while the recent HLA measure is improving multi-modal transportation, thereby reducing demand for automobiles. State law already recognizes this shift: California’s AB 2097 prohibits cities from imposing minimums within a half-mile of major transit stops. Removing remaining minimums citywide would align LA’s zoning with this transit future and accelerate the production of homes near jobs and schools. In sum, parking minimums are an expensive, outdated mandate that suppress housing supply, inflate rents, and divert land and tax capacity from better uses. Ending them will let builders provide the right amount of parking where it’s truly needed, while enabling more homes, more neighborhood amenities, safer streets, and stronger city services—exactly the ingredients of a more affordable, livable Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Leo Shahbazian

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:33 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support removing parking minimums. Parking minimums make it more expensive for things to get built, and make it more difficult for people to choose a car-free or light lifestyle due to the direct and indirect costs parking minimums impose.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jay Deuby

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:33 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I wholeheartedly support removing parking minimums for housing and commercial buildings in Los Angeles. An across the board rule no longer makes sense for the population density of present-day Los Angeles and increases the cost and therefore price of housing. In areas where limited parking is an issue, other more targeted solutions should be found rather than an across the board mandate. The city has long suffered a housing crisis and had little impact on remedying it. It's more than time to remove hurdles like parking minimums. Thank you for your attention and consideration to this matter.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** AM

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:37 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking is a societal burden! No parking minimums, no free parking. Yes to more housing and public transit instead.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sara Siegal

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:37 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a comment on item 21. Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities. Please approve this motion to eliminate parking minimums. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael  
**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:43 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0642  
**Comments for Public Posting:** NO PARKING MINIMUMS



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Andrew Adams

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:48 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums do nothing to improve quality of life, and only get in the way of progress. It makes building the absolutely necessary housing of all types more expensive without noticeable benefit. Build homes for people not cars. If people don't like a project, let them challenge on the merits. No more hiding all manner of objections to progress and the building of then city we all need in these amorphous traffic or parking requirements. We all pay the high cost for these parking minimums and the City doesn't need to do obstructionists' work for them.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Yonatan Ahituv

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:48 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** To the city council, I am highly in favor of the motion to begin to remove parking minimums in the city of Los Angeles. This would place LA in the same path as other cities in improving walkability and affordability; instead of enforced car dependency.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Carey Bennett

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:57 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities. Please eliminate parking minimums!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Hans R Vermy

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:57 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please vote in favor of removing parking minimums. Housing and people first. The city should not be beholden to car companies and policies that enrich Car culture and coddle those who chose to drive. I travel 26 miles round trip on public transit and hate how much I subsidize car culture and get no safe streets or bike lanes in return. End minimum parking.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Luke Klipp

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 04:02 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** You're going to hear that people need a car in Los Angeles. However, (a) not *\*everyone\** needs a car, (b) not *\*every\** new home needs parking, and (c) there's plenty of other, and better, ways to tackle parking challenges that don't involve requiring tons of parking in new housing and commercial buildings. At a time when housing costs are skyrocketing and people are being pushed onto the streets, the one thing LA makes sure we still have is parking. Parking in absolute abundance. And parking is the single-greatest reason for, and perpetuator of, auto dependence. Any member of the City Council who cares about the environment knows LA's auto dependence is the largest contributor to our greenhouse gas emissions. What's more, auto dependence makes LA less affordable, in several ways. For starters, "everyone driving on their own" is the most expensive way for people to get around, period, and nothing comes close (except maybe if we're all trying to get around in flying drones). On top of that, the sheer amount of space that LA sets aside for parking is incredibly expensive in a city where land is already at a premium. And what's more, parking minimums both reduce the amount of housing that gets built and also cause the housing that DOES get built to be even more expensive. But here's the kicker: all these parking requirements are just made up. There's absolutely no science behind any of them. Mostly they're just "here's what people do elsewhere" so we do it here too. They may seem logical, but why do we require 4 parking spaces for 1,000 square feet of commercial space? Why not 3 spaces? Or 10? Or 2? Truth is, no one can give you a good answer. Go ahead and look at the code for all these minimums and it starts to read like a children's magic spell, complete with references to all kinds of uses you probably never even knew existed. Every single parking space takes up 300-350 square feet, when you include access and the space itself. That means those 4 parking spaces for 1,000 square feet of commercial are taking up MORE space for parking than the actual use itself (1,200-1,400 square feet for parking for 1,000 square feet of commercial space). For a restaurant, Los Angeles requires 10 parking spaces for 1,000 square feet of use, that's THREE TIMES the amount of space for parking as the restaurant itself. And that includes space for the kitchen, so we see restaurateurs trying to limit kitchen size because the parking

requirements are so onerous. Sorry, LA, but this is bonkers. For all things good and holy, please just approve Council File 25-0642 and move on. It doesn't even get rid of these ridiculous requirements yet, just saying let's see how we could do it. You could do like San Francisco and just eliminate the entire section of parking requirements out of the city's planning and zoning code. Just nix it out. Voila. And anyone who says "but then they'll never build more parking" either doesn't understand how these things work or literally thinks that parking only gets built because the City requires it. Anyone who takes two minutes to talk to lenders who finance new housing or commercial projects will be disabused of that idea very quickly, because they demand parking too as a condition for financing new construction. So, yeah, please just do this. Since I first studied these issues and realized what a crockpot science they are and how they make everything more expensive I've now gone completely gray and am a couple decades closer to my own grave. It's beyond bonkers to me that we're still even debating the rationale of parking requirements that make about as much sense in 2025 as would requirements for telephone jacks or cable television hookups. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elizabeth O'Brien

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 04:08 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, I support eliminating parking minimums. No one in my family has a car, since we live in west LA where we are well served by transit and taking an occasional ride share is cheaper than having a car. When I pay rent I don't want to pay for parking I don't use. We need to make it cheaper and easier to build housing and we need to prepare for a more resilient climate future with less car dependency. Build LA for people, not cars! Thank you, Elizabeth O'Brien Associate Professor, UCLA

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sameer Erramilli

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 11:04 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** It's time to eliminate legal parking minimums. The numbers set for parking minima today are largely based on ill-evidenced studies from decades ago that are hardly relevant in the modern day. More importantly, parking space allocation should be left up to business owners, instead of forcing them to use up most of their land on parking instead of more valuable and efficient causes.



## **Communication from Public**

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 11:34 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support eliminating parking minimums (25-0642).

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ian Lundy

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 04:28 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to support the elimination of parking minimums. We have to move away from prioritizing costs and space on cars instead of people. LA needs to become a City for people.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elijah Lopez

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 04:39 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I plea as your constituat to support the elimination of parking minimums. As parking minimums do nothing but worsen the California housing crisis, and ensure that are communities are made more unsafe for our children and elderly.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Courtney Davis

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 04:42 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing in SUPPORT of eliminating parking minimums. Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kelly Marie Martin

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 04:51 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am in support of the motion to eliminate parking minimums. Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 05:16 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums make housing unaffordable. LA is at a turning point and needs to start building for the future, where many people are car-free and do not want to pay for a parking space with their rent. Our land is valuable and too much of it is car storage today. Moving away from car culture and parking minimums, which are a large part of that culture, will improve public health, air quality, the environment, and the wellbeing of our community. I live near Hollywood/Vine station and live a very comfortable life without a car. Please remove parking minimums to encourage our residents to be thoughtful about whether they actually need a car instead of making it the default choice. Thanks!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Angelo Mike

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 06:28 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi, I went from a car chauvinist who refused to ride public transportation and hadn't ridden a bike in over twenty years to losing two cars to overnight hit and runs, both while parked on the street overnight in LA at different times, and going car free. I was already supportive of the urbanist movement but had no idea how beneficial going car free would be to my life, despite the over abundance of parking and lack of transit and housing to make transit hubs viable. And I see how homeless people suffer for the abundance of parking. Someone's got to give up their chance to be housed to make space for parking, but nobody wants to be inconvenienced for it. So that's what I was for 2 1/2 years when I was homeless: nobody. I could always find hundreds of free parking spots while homeless to sleep in my car, but couldn't get housing. Sex predators love this system. They prey on people like me, homeless or housing insecure, to lure them to their homes to sexually abuse them. Happened with my first landlord when I was sleeping on my friend's couch after I left my home due to domestic violence. I rented a dirt cheap room from William Wagner, a retired Baptist pastor. He didn't require a deposit and I had little earning ability, working as a bouncer after having been disabled for 9 months. Two weeks into living with him, he asked if he could get in the shower with me. It was disgusting and outrageous, and he got worse from there. Predators preyed on me later when I moved into my car. They'd pretend to be my friends. They knew I was homeless. And they rely on the city of LA to keep people like me homeless. Because where are you going to go if you're far from home with a predator? If you don't have a home? Or, as I found when I went to work in Hollywood and got housed, the scarcity of housing and abundance of parking meant that an IT guy was able to sexually harass me for six months and get away with it because the company knew as a rule that most people wouldn't complain. So when I did, they counted on me not complaining too hard. And when I still did, they shuffled me out of the company, and my social safety of savings due to being car free saved me the indignity of signing their ridiculous severance agreement which meant I couldn't sue them. Most people will not have that benefit. Most people pay huge portions of their meager paychecks for rent. I'm in the veritable 1% despite being one hospital visit away from going broke again and homeless. I'm one

of the lucky ones in that I recovered from my disability, and the torture that sexual abuse and the isolation of being poor caused me hasn't completely destroyed me. We can have a healthy, happy, joyous city if we stop kicking up free money for Elon Musk's Teslas to park and for parking when we need housing closer to where people work so they don't need cars to commute. When we need housing for people who have to work two or three jobs and drive around the city, keeping them broke and burdening the city's congestion, air quality, and infrastructure. We need less parking for people to take viable alternatives to driving when they can, which I didn't realize I could do and which improved my life immeasurably. We need it to save lives. So many people in my former neighborhood of Koreatown have been killed as pedestrians in hit and runs. Two people outside cars were hit and killed by my job in Culver City. Several more were hit down the street from there in multiple other incidents. Two days ago, my roommate in Palms was hit on his bike while out for his job doing Door Dash deliveries. This over dependence on cars and parking means people are driving who shouldn't be in every sense of the word - who aren't safe enough to drive, who could benefit from commuting without a car, and who don't want to drive or can't drive. That's up to you. But this system of an abundance of parking is unsustainable, both financially and as far as where the younger generation is going. They're the least likely to own cars because it's unaffordable. Elon Musk gets free parking for cars he sells, but people don't have dignity in the form of quality food, housing, jobs, social connections, and healthcare. Getting out of our cars brings all those things closer to us. So get rid of parking minimums and save our city a lot of pain and needless deaths. Thanks, Angelo Mike 90034



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Yuval

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:08 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Strongly support eliminating parking minimums. They are unnecessary and force us to build for cars, not people! Developers can choose to build as much parking as they like, but they shouldn't be required.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/22/2025 03:10 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please eliminate parking minimums! This recent heatwave should serve as an example living in a car-oriented concrete jungle is not a way to live. Removing parking minimums allows for cheaper housing and greater support for walkable neighborhoods!

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 11:53 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support eliminating parking minimums in Los Angeles. Parking mandates make housing more expensive, add tens of thousands of dollars in unnecessary construction costs, and force renters to pay for parking they may not need. They also make our city less walkable and more dangerous by prioritizing cars over people. Los Angeles should join other California cities in removing these outdated rules. Ending parking minimums will help create more affordable housing, reduce traffic deaths, cut pollution, and build safer, people-oriented neighborhoods. This is not about banning parking—it's about letting builders provide the right amount of parking based on actual demand. Please move forward with Council File 25-0642 and make Los Angeles a leader in smart, people-first planning. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gabbie Metheny

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 04:40 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I urge the council to move forward with citywide elimination of off-street parking requirements for new development and changes of use. Reading the community impact statements has only cemented my opinion: our city is too large, and its transportation needs too diverse, to impose a single strict requirement on all 99 neighborhood council zones. This will not take away anyone's parking, it will merely allow flexibility. Developments near transit, such as in much of my neighborhood of Highland Park, will obviously have different parking needs than Sylmar, the Westside NC, or Harbor Gateway North, but parking minimums currently hold us all to the same parking standard. My family of 4 is car-free and exclusively uses walking and Metro for our transit, and we are not anomalies. Highland Park is a dense, walkable neighborhood with good access to transit, and while my NC did not submit a community impact statement, I can tell you that like Los Feliz, which is also near transit, the limited space in our neighborhood could be put to better use by eliminating parking minimums. Additionally, neighborhoods with crowded street parking should consider implementing permitted street parking. Just within 3 blocks of my apartment, I routinely walk past an abandoned Nissan with broken windows that has been in Highland Park longer than the 12 years I have, and a single family home whose owner's classic car collection takes up the better part of a city block. Vehicle collections and abandoned cars contribute to a perceived lack of parking in many neighborhoods, and implementing permitting could potentially free up more street parking than would be lost by eliminating off-street parking minimums. We need room to be creative in our land use in such a large, diverse city as Los Angeles, and the city should absolutely move forward with this resolution.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jonah Henry

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 04:41 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support this motion. Government-mandated parking minimums disincentivize housing development and perpetuate our inequitable and unsustainable car-centric urban planning regime. I believe that private developers know better than government agencies what the parking demand will be amongst their future tenants. It is long past time that our government reconsider these requirements.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Allen Natian

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 05:53 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nathan Schilling

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 06:58 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the legacy of Donald Shoup in moving that the Department of City Planning, in consultation with the Department of Building & Safety, be INSTRUCTED to report with recommendations regarding the feasibility and cost-benefit analysis of citywide elimination of off-street parking requirements for new development and changes of use. Parking minimums are heavy-handed and do not reflect the parking that businesses actually need. Businesses should determine the parking they need

## Communication from Public

**Name:** NANCY L MATSON

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 07:27 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** We must end parking minimums, which are not calculated from any real data to begin with. This will allow us to move towards a less car centric and more affordable future here in Los Angeles.  
Thanks!



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Eddie Navarrette

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 02:40 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** See attached IHC letter of support CF 25-0642 Item 21



August 23, 2025

Los Angeles City Council  
Planning and Land Use Management Committee  
200 N. Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Re: Letter of Support – Council File 25-0642 Agenda Item# 21  
Feasibility of Eliminating Off-Street Parking Minimums Citywide**

Dear Honorable Chair and Committee Members,

On behalf of the **Independent Hospitality Coalition (IHC)**, representing over 800 independent restaurants and hospitality businesses across Los Angeles, I write in **strong support of Council File 25-0642**.

This motion honors the late Donald Shoup, whose groundbreaking research revealed the hidden costs of free parking and how outdated minimum parking requirements suppress small businesses, inflate housing costs, and weaken our neighborhoods. His vision—that cities thrive when people, not cars, are at the center—aligns directly with the urgent needs of Los Angeles today.

### **The Restaurant & Small Business Perspective**

For independent restaurants, parking mandates are more than an inconvenience:

- **They raise costs dramatically** for tenant improvements and adaptive reuse, often requiring property owners to pursue infeasible upgrades before a restaurant can open.

- **They block business growth** by making older buildings or smaller spaces unusable, cutting off the very fabric of neighborhood-serving commerce.
- **They tilt the playing field against small operators**, while delivery giants and e-commerce businesses operate freely without mandated parking.

We have seen firsthand how **emergency parking relief measures under Council File 20-0380 (and its extensions)** offered a lifeline during the pandemic. By exempting the first 5,000 square feet of tenant space from additional parking requirements, those provisions allowed restaurants to open, adapt, and survive at a time when every dollar mattered. After five years in effect, these measures have proven successful, with **no negative impacts on infrastructure or neighborhood quality of life**—only thriving businesses and more active streets.

## Why This Reform Is Needed Now

Los Angeles is at a crossroads:

- Our **local economy remains fragile**, with small businesses still reeling from the pandemic, wildfires, strikes, and inflation.
- The City itself faces **budget shortfalls**, and maintaining outdated, labor-intensive parking enforcement costs both staff time and potential revenue.
- With the **2026 FIFA World Cup and 2028 Olympics** on the horizon, Los Angeles must present itself as a modern, business-friendly city prepared to welcome the world.

**Eliminating parking minimums citywide would reduce costs for both the City and small businesses.** Developers and operators—those with the most at stake in their projects' success—are best positioned to determine how much parking is truly needed.

## A Proven, Competitive Policy

Other cities across California—San Francisco, San Diego, Sacramento, Oakland, and Berkeley—have already embraced parking reform. Los Angeles risks falling behind if we do not make our own temporary provisions permanent and expand them citywide.

## Conclusion

The Independent Hospitality Coalition urges swift passage of this motion. Eliminating outdated parking minimums will:

- Lower costs for small businesses and housing development.
- Free up LADBS and Planning resources for higher-priority work.
- Level the playing field for independent restaurants.
- Honor the legacy of Donald Shoup by making Los Angeles a leader in people-focused urban policy.

We are prepared to support this effort through continued stakeholder engagement, legislative input, and community mobilization. Thank you for your leadership in advancing this critical reform.

Sincerely,  
Eddie Navarrette

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Navarrette', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Executive Director  
Independent Hospitality Coalition

[www.ihcla.org](http://www.ihcla.org)

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Roghan Weafer

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 11:32 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Removing parking minimums supports a more affordable, environmentally sound, and economically sound LA. Keeping parking minimums works against all those goals. Living in an LA neighborhood with many walkable businesses and amenities is great, and by eliminating parking minimums and supporting public transit we can make that better while also helping to keep rent burdens down.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 08:55 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please remove parking minimums, they unnecessarily drive up the cost of construction and aren't grounded in reality. Just because we get rid of minimums, doesn't mean that parking won't be built, it will just be more aligned with market-demand in the context of the new construction which is much more efficient.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Graham Messadieh

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 11:28 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the elimination of parking minimums. Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 05:06 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident of Lincoln Heights, I am writing to support Council File: 25-0642, since this allows more transit oriented developed, people first cities, helps decrease the skyrocketing price of home building in Los Angeles, and reverse the negative impacts by cars in the city. Allowing more land by removing parking spots allow transit agencies to use the area previously reserved by parking to be used for transit centers and bus stops. This means that the land can be used for other purposes such as more wider sidewalks, and this helps promote a car-lite lifestyle, since people can look into more forms of transportation. Also, the less area that is reserved for cars means that people can use more area for the building itself which includes more rentals and to increase the supply of business openings and homes. Also, parking lots cause the heat island effect which is caused by having asphalt and concrete being exposed to the sun, and increasing the area of the parking lots means more heat hitting the surfaces which cause hot air to rise to increase the temperature. Overall, for a more environmentally future, make sure to support Council File: 25-0642.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joshua Kayn

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 05:46 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums are an artefact of days when we didn't the understand human and economic costs of building the city around cars. The motion is well-worded and absolutely correct. I strongly support this motion.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brian G.

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 11:48 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, my name is Brian G., and I'm a resident of Los Angeles. I'm writing in strong support of the motion to begin the process of eliminating parking minimums citywide. Parking minimums make housing more expensive and less accessible by forcing every project to include costly car storage, regardless of whether residents need it. At a time when Los Angeles is facing a severe housing crisis, we should not be mandating rules that inflate costs and discourage the kind of affordable, people-oriented housing we urgently need. Removing parking minimums will also help create safer, healthier neighborhoods. Too often, our communities are designed around parking lots and car traffic instead of walkable streets, local businesses, and public spaces. Eliminating these outdated requirements will help us move toward a more sustainable city with fewer traffic deaths, less pollution, and a stronger sense of community. I urge the committee to advance this motion. Brian G. 90013

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jake Whitney

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 09:01 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the Planning and Land Use Committee: I support the motion taking necessary steps to eliminate parking requirements city-wide. Parking requirements have been shown to radically increase the cost of development, housing, and goods and services, meanwhile actively working against our climate and transit goals. The city would be well served by adopting sensible parking reform that eliminates arbitrary minimums and allows the market to determine how much parking can and shall be provided. The built environment is the single biggest factor influencing whether a patron drives to a location or takes alternative modes. By reducing the oversupply of parking and encouraging alternatives, LA can build a city that is less polluted, more healthy, and more resilient. Please vote to support this motion. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Karen Stasevich  
**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 02:38 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the motion to eliminate parking minimums as a way to move Los Angeles forward to a future as a city that actually works. This is so important as the Olympics and World Cup approach -- we have a chance to change the world's perspective of Los Angeles and convince Angelenos that a future where they don't have to rely on cars can be a reality here. The goal should be for all commercial and multi-family neighborhoods of LA to be Transit Oriented Communities. But eliminating parking minimums must be preceded by an aggressive expansion of public transit and active/micro-transit infrastructure for this to work, otherwise people will have no choice but to continue to endure the increased financial and logistical hardships of owning a vehicle.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 02:55 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support eliminating parking minimums. Eliminating parking minimums reduces housing and business costs by removing the mandate to build excess parking that often goes unused. It is sad to see the majority of businesses have more space dedicated to parking than the business itself.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christophe LaBelle

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 03:07 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a Hollywood resident and work in Westwood. Thank you to the authors of this motion and the PLUM Committee for bringing the elimination of off-street parking requirements forward as a citywide policy to consider. I support policy measures, like the elimination of parking minimums, that can facilitate more efficient, affordable and sustainable development in our communities.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Justin Carrus

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 03:46 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** It's clear that parking minimums do increase the cost of housing, especially dense housing in areas with access to vibrant commercial spaces and public transit. And it's clear that the people of Los Angeles want more affordable housing in those very neighborhoods. For this reason, I strongly support the elimination of a city-wide parking minimum. Some other neighborhood councils have expressed concern since their neighborhoods do not yet (or choose to not) have these types of vibrant communities where residents can live life without needing a car to perform basic tasks like getting to and from work and grocery shopping. I'd like to point out that this motion is simply to remove a minimum requirement and would likely have no effect in their neighborhoods. Rather, it is the other neighborhoods (those in support of the motion) that are voting to eliminate a city-wide policy that is not relevant and is currently harmful for the denser, more walkable neighborhoods of LA.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Allon Percus

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 09:45 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support item 21, which will help move toward the elimination of parking minimums. A parking minimum encodes the expectation that people will drive. Decades ago, this expectation might have been a reasonable one. Today it is not. People want a choice in how they get from one place to another. Walking, biking, and taking public transportation are just as valid a choice as driving. Let's build our neighborhood with that in mind, not with the outdated idea that going anywhere requires a car and requires a place to store it. It's time we stopped forcing people to pay for parking real estate that they neither want nor need.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chase Puskar

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 11:36 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am strongly in support of Los Angeles removing parking minimums. Parking minimums increase the cost and environmental impact of development. We are facing an urgent climate crisis and must act quickly to fix the broken systems in our city that mandate urban sprawl.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 12:10 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I urge the Council to lift parking minimums. As a driver, cyclist, and pedestrian living in Venice, I'd love to see the city prioritize the use of space to provide housing and enrich civic life, rather than to reinforce a car-first culture that is not well-suited to the needs of our city in the twenty-first century.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chris Rhie

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 12:27 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Councilmembers, I support this motion to study the elimination of off-street parking minimums citywide. This reform is critical for addressing both our climate crisis and our housing affordability challenges. Parking mandates force developers to overbuild parking, which encourages car dependency, increases greenhouse gas emissions, and paves over land that could support housing, trees, or small businesses. Large surface lots also worsen urban heat and air pollution. At the same time, each structured parking space can add tens of thousands of dollars to the cost of a home, making housing less affordable. Eliminating parking requirements does not prevent developers from building parking. It simply allows them to determine the market-appropriate amount, just as they do with bedrooms, bathrooms, and other amenities. This approach has worked in other cities and will allow Los Angeles to align with its climate goals while reducing unnecessary costs and creating more walkable, people-centered neighborhoods. I urge you to support this motion. Respectfully,  
Chris Rhie Co-Chair Urban Environmentalists Los Angeles

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Morgan Goodwin

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 01:44 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I wholeheartedly support this motion. Please remove parking minimums from the city's code. Our development should be more about people and less about cars. The many residents who do not drive should not have to pay for parking spaces to be created.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 10:52 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums is an outdated concept that destroyed the fabric of cities for decades by being a key reason for sprawl and an increase in housing prices. Housing for cars should not be prioritized over housing for people. Los Angeles is the second most populated city and should take inspiration from other high population, high density cities domestically and internationally and eliminate parking requirements. We are in a decades-in-the-making housing crisis that will not be solved overnight but it will never be solved with things like parking minimum still in effect.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** David Welch

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 09:54 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Council Members, I strongly support the motion to eliminate parking minimums in Los Angeles. This evidence-based policy change will meaningfully address our housing affordability crisis while producing minimal negative impacts. Housing Affordability Benefits Research by UCLA Professor Donald Shoup and other experts demonstrates that parking requirements impose substantial hidden costs on housing development. A single parking space in a structure can cost \$50,000 or more to build, and studies show that including garage parking can dramatically increase rents. These mandatory minimums force all residents — including those who don't own cars — to subsidize parking they may never use. Proven Success in Other Cities Los Angeles would join a growing movement of successful cities that have eliminated parking minimums. Early results show promising outcomes with more housing and appropriately sized parking based on actual demand rather than arbitrary minimums. Minimal Negative Impacts Contrary to concerns about parking shortages, eliminating minimums doesn't eliminate parking — it allows market-driven solutions. Developers will still provide parking where there's genuine demand, but won't be forced to overbuild expensive spaces that sit empty. Environmental and Economic Benefits Reducing excess parking supports LA's climate goals by decreasing impervious surfaces that create heat islands and stormwater runoff. It also allows more efficient land use, enabling more housing units on the same footprint while reducing development costs that get passed on to renters and buyers. This reform represents smart, evidence-based policymaking that will help address our housing crisis while supporting sustainable development. I urge you to pass this motion. Thank you for your consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** D-J Haanraadts

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 09:05 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I hope we can get rid of the minimum parking demands so that there will be more incentive to create spaces for pedestrians and other more humane ways of transportation. Thank you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ellen Schwartz

**Date Submitted:** 08/24/2025 04:04 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I'm writing in support of the motion to study the elimination of off-street parking requirements. I have a car, and I enjoy finding free parking. But not at the cost of: • Affordable, abundant housing options • Fairness and opportunity for people who don't drive • Thriving small businesses and strong local economies • Healthy, active neighborhoods • Parks, gardens, and green space • Clean air, smooth traffic, and great public transit • Beautiful, walkable streets safe for all ages Off-street parking requirements were created with good intentions. Requiring abundant, excessive parking was supposed to save drivers from wasting time and fuel searching for a space. However, research has shown (and the City's cost-benefit analysis will surely confirm) that this policy creates and contributes to far worse problems than the one it solves. There is a better solution. In *The High Cost of Free Parking*, Donald Shoup suggested managing parking demand with smart pricing. The City can raise prices on any blocks that are always full and lower them on blocks with more than 1-2 empty spaces. This way, public parking spaces will be easy to find, but still well-used. We know how to manage parking in a way that is efficient and equitable, a way that even generates new revenue for neighborhoods. There is no need to continue wastefully mandating an ever-increasing supply of parking at the expense of everything else we care about.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Narayan

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 04:31 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council, I encourage you to eliminate parking minimums across the City of LA. Parking minimum policies eat up valuable urban land and practically force people to drive everywhere, and thus worsen the multiple problems that LA has, such as housing and homelessness, traffic and transportation, and climate change and air quality. For that reason, cities across America are rethinking and eliminating parking minimum policies. It is time for LA to do the same. Thanks!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Matthew Litwiller

**Date Submitted:** 08/23/2025 05:11 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Why are we inflating the prices of homes in the midst of a housing crisis for the sake of parking. Cities are for people. Give valuable real estate to housing for people, not parking spaces.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Vincent Busam

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 11:16 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Removing parking minimums is a great, important step to improving our communities. Another important part of Shoup's plan is pricing parking correctly to avoid hoarding of street parking spots, which should also be included in these studies.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Carrick Moore Gerety

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 04:02 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities. The safest, most livable cities are ones that were built before cars. The least livable are the ones built after cars, and after parking minimums specifically. Time to end the scourge of the modern city once and for all.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Griffin

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 10:29 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, My name is Griffin Faye, and I would like to endorse this proposal to remove parking minimums from Los Angeles. Parking minimums drive up the cost of housing and result in cities that are oriented toward cars rather than people. This results in unsafe streets and increased traffic deaths, as well as buildings surrounded by parking lots instead of walkable communities. We have the opportunity to build a better Los Angeles that encourages all modes of transportation, makes our streets safer, and improves our air quality. I strongly urge the council to consider ending parking minimums and make our communities safer. Thank you, Griffin faye

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Benjamin Hudnut

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 10:30 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** Parking minimums stand in the way of an affordable, sustainable, and vibrant Los Angeles. It is crucial now more than ever to overturn parking minimums.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dillon Foster

**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 08:28 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0642

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support ending parking minimums as a practice in building new housing in the City of Los Angeles. Parking minimums make housing more expensive and encourage urbanism that is more oriented around cars (not sustainable urbanism) than the needs and safety of Angelenos in day to day life. At a time where the climate crisis is causing expensive and devastating disasters, the UN is mandating environmentally friendly action, the housing crisis is at boiling point, and traffic violence is still an issue specifically for young people, this is a good step (and non-controversial. So non-controversial that North Carolina unanimously at 107 to 0 vote, ended parking minimums) that municipalities in blue and red areas of the country have taken to move in the direction of building sustainable, human oriented, and safer cities than they previously have. Parking minimums mean that we are requiring space that can be used for housing or parks in areas that do not have enough parks or housing to be used for cars instead while said housing becomes more expensive with parking being required. At this moment, Los Angeles is one of the most expensive and unaffordable cities in the entire world while simultaneously being one of the wealthiest economic engines in the world and much of that is due to urban policy which has long been hostile to renters in a city that is over 70 percent renters. This council made a fit of epic proportions just last week with some council members claiming that building housing near high quality public transit would result in people being evicted which is not true but it also brings me to a point of questioning that I feel must be asked. If the City and more specifically this council are trying to build housing to meet the demand set out by the housing crisis without evicting people than why has it taken so long for the city to even consider ending parking minimums which are a much more inefficient use of built environment (regardless of whether that parking is built vertically or horizontally) as compared to green space (to reduce urban heat island effect) or more units of housing (to increase stock and affordability)? In a city devoid of both, we must change our policies. Los Angeles and our leaders tend to say that we lead the way and the rest of the world follows but in this moment, many municipalities (both in the United States and around the world) have beaten us to urban policy solutions around sustainability and housing affordability. Furthermore, it is

no secret that Angelenos are at risk of suffering illness or death from extreme heat events that are only getting worse as the climate crisis gets worse. It is the top climate related killer that Angelenos have to endure and our urban policy makes it worse. Parking minimums make for unnecessary built environment and more asphalt which only increases the chances of Angelenos suffering from the effects of extreme heat and the urban heat island effect. While ending parking minimums is not the whole extent of taking on this issue it must be a part of the solution and we must eliminate built environment where we can, not only because it is better for the health of Angelenos but because each and every council member is charged with keeping Angelenos safe and that must include from the effects of extreme heat and that solution must go further than calling a library a cooling center and saying that you did what you could to keep Angelenos safe from extreme heat when you could have done more. Many Angelenos can't spend their entire day hanging out at a library and not doing more about the issue such as but not limited to ending parking minimums and reducing built environment that makes Angelenos more susceptible to extreme heat is inequitable. Many Angelenos have to work and some even have to work outside and can't hangout in a library. The solution to the urban heat island effect should include solutions to reduce built environment + increasing vegetation. Furthermore, ending parking minimums is a small step in reducing car dependency which is necessary to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the cities transportation system and to cool the planet and reduce the risks that Angelenos face with severity and number of occurrences with extreme heat. In other words, urban policy changes like this but not limited to this is a great way that council members can carry out their duty to keep Angelenos safe as is spelled out in the City charter. To make a point further on the inequity of parking minimums in regard to unnecessary built environment, the asphalt that is used for the cars to park increases the chances of flash flooding (lack of permeable surfaces) as well as pollutants that are byproducts of cars to run off into bodies (lack of drainage and filtration system) of water that are used for drinking supply and recreation. If not for affordability or sustainability, the council should move to end parking minimums to keep people safe.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Isaac Poplin  
**Date Submitted:** 08/25/2025 10:09 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0642  
**Comments for Public Posting:** I support ending parking minimums