

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 07/29/2024 03:39 PM

Council File No: 23-0914

Comments for Public Posting: I moved to Los Angeles in 1970 and I try to keep up with important issues. I am having trouble understanding this motion and what it will do and where RVs will not be able to park and where parking with services will be allowed. The motion says that RVs will not be allowed to park in areas that are sensitive uses, but it doesn't say what sensitive uses are. I don't know if sensitive uses means parks, schools, libraries and child care centers, or would it also include much larger areas we hear sometimes hear referred to as sensitive uses. Councilmembers often refer to fire zones, coastal zones, and many other areas as sensitive uses, so I am wondering what it includes. I am not okay with saying RVs cannot park in huge areas of the city, and that the streets where RVs can park and where services will be provided also cannot be in huge areas of the city. I think the committee should make it clear what sensitive uses includes before voting on this motion.

Communication from Public

Name: Katherine C. King

Date Submitted: 07/29/2024 06:17 PM

Council File No: 23-0914

Comments for Public Posting: VOTE NO ON MOTION 23-0914 Although I have long lobbied for Safe Parking for all vehicles used as dwellings by unhoused residents of Venice and Los Angeles, I take issue with several items in this motion. I ask that the motion be re-written before you consider passing it. The first thing that I ask you to do is to de-couple the directive to recommend “streets where oversize vehicle dwellings can park with access to services” from the directive to “restrict oversize vehicle dwelling in residential areas, commercial corridors and other sensitive uses.” As written, the motion seems to prioritize restricted parking over safe parking, a morally dubious hierarchy. Please create a separate motion for safe parking. Second, I am disturbed by the focus of the first two paragraphs, which seem to lose sight of “habitability issues for the vehicle occupants” in favor of listing “a host of challenges along the residential and commercial corridors where they park.” The resolution talks about space management challenges at Official Police Garages...; a zoning code that restricts where salvaged vehicles can be stored; lack of safe parking lots with water and power connections and proper turn radiuses; and a sense among oversized vehicle dwellers that they don’t consider themselves to be homeless.” Before I address “habitability,” I need to point out that, according to grassroots surveys, the last statement is patently untrue for most vehicle dwellers. Though “water and power connections” are essential habitability issues, there are others nearly as important that do not appear to be of concern. Not mentioned is the need for vehicle dwelling families to be near their established jobs*, schools and medical services. Not mentioned is the need for nearby public transportation. Not mentioned is the need for human beings, children and adults, to be near green spaces, breathe clean air, have parks and playgrounds and cafes in which to play and socialize. That is, the need to be in residential areas. [*44% of RV dwellers are employed, according to the recently released Rand LEADS study.] I am therefore alarmed by the first item in the list of things the CLA and CAO are directed to recommend for a safe parking program: “Locations in each Council District where oversized vehicle dwellings can park on the public right of way, outside of residential areas, commercial corridors and other sensitive uses.” I fear that there may be a desire to park our less fortunate neighbors in polluted

industrial areas that are unhealthy for children, their parents, and those already mentally challenged by homelessness and addiction. The CD11 Coalition for Human Rights has already submitted to each of you a report that details many parking lots in Venice that could be used for safe parking (February 2, 2024 Response to the October 12, 2023 CAO Report). I hope that you will take it into account as you re-write this motion to 1) focus solely on safe parking and 2) include more habitability issues key to human life.
Katherine C. King Homeowner, Venice

VOTE NO ON MOTION 23-0914

Although I have long lobbied for Safe Parking for all vehicles used as dwellings by unhoused residents of Venice and Los Angeles, I take issue with several items in this motion. I ask that the motion be re-written before you consider passing it.

The first thing that I ask you to do is to de-couple the directive to recommend “streets where oversize vehicle dwellings can park with access to services” from the directive to “restrict oversize vehicle dwelling in residential areas, commercial corridors and other sensitive uses.” As written, the motion seems to prioritize restricted parking over safe parking, a morally dubious hierarchy. Please create a separate motion for safe parking.

Second, I am disturbed by the focus of the first two paragraphs, which seem to lose sight of “habitability issues for the vehicle occupants” in favor of listing “a host of challenges along the residential and commercial corridors where they park.” The resolution talks about space management challenges at Official Police Garages...; a zoning code that restricts where salvaged vehicles can be stored; lack of safe parking lots with water and power connections and proper turn radiuses; and a sense among oversized vehicle dwellers that they don’t consider themselves to be homeless.” Before I address “habitability,” I need to point out that, according to grassroots surveys, the last statement is patently untrue for most vehicle dwellers.

Though “water and power connections” are essential habitability issues, there are others nearly as important that do not appear to be of concern. Not mentioned is the need for vehicle dwelling families to be near their established jobs*, schools and medical services. Not mentioned is the need for nearby public transportation. Not mentioned is the need for human beings, children and adults, to be near green spaces, breathe clean air, have parks and playgrounds and cafes in which to play and socialize. That is, the need to be in residential areas. [*44% of RV dwellers are employed, according to the recently released Rand LEADS study.]

I am therefore alarmed by the first item in the list of things the CLA and CAO are directed to recommend for a safe parking program: “Locations in each Council District where oversized vehicle dwellings can park on the public right of way, **outside of residential areas, commercial corridors** and other sensitive uses.” I fear that there may be a desire to park our less fortunate neighbors in polluted industrial areas that are unhealthy for children, their parents, and those already mentally challenged by homelessness and addiction.

The CD11 Coalition for Human Rights has already submitted to each of you a report that details many parking lots in Venice that could be used for safe parking (February 2, 2024 Response to the October 12, 2023 CAO Report). I hope that you will take it into account as you re-write this motion to 1) focus solely on safe parking and 2) include more habitability issues key to human life.

Katherine C. King
Homeowner, Venice

