

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 ¹. The transit network “lacks service in many areas” of the city and often entails “**much longer travel times**” than driving by car ². 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 ³.
- **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 ⁴. 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 ⁴.
- **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 ⁵. *“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 ⁵. 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 ⁶. 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 ².

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 ⁷. Even today, certain areas are so packed up that locals describe parking as *“almost impossible...completely inconveniencing residents who live on adjacent streets”* ⁸. 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 ⁸.
- **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 ⁹. 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 ¹⁰. *This poses “real challenges for senior citizens or families with young children,”* Starr explained ¹⁰. 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 ¹¹. 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 ¹² ¹³. 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 ¹⁴ ⁸. 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 ¹⁵. 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 ¹⁶ ¹⁷. 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 ¹⁸. 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."* ¹⁹ 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 ²⁰ – 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 ²¹, 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** ²² – 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 ²³ ²⁴. 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 ²⁵ ²⁶. 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 ²⁷. 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 ²⁸ (often because their jobs aren't transit-accessible or involve carrying equipment) ²⁹. 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 ³⁰. 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 ³¹. 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 ²⁷.
- **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 curb 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 curb 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 ²⁷. 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 ²⁷. 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** ²⁸ – 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 ³².
- **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 ³³ ². 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 ². 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 ³⁴. 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) ³⁵ ³⁶. 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 ³⁷. 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 ³⁸. 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."** ¹ 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 ¹. 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) ³⁹ ⁴⁰. 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 ⁴⁰. 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** ⁴¹ ⁴². 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 ⁴³ ⁴⁴. 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) ⁴ ¹ ; Medium (SCU Journalism) on CA transit issues ⁴⁵ ⁵ ; ITDP report on L.A. transit (2020) ³ ⁴⁶ ; Remy Moose Manley law blog on parking reforms (2022) ² .
- Community Perspectives on Parking Congestion – *LAist* reporting on L.A. zero-parking developments (2024) ⁷ ⁸ ¹⁰ ; SFMTA study on high-density parking impacts (2021) ⁹ ; *LAist* interview with Neighborhood Council leaders (2025) ¹³ ¹¹ .
- Safety and Parking – Gallup Crime Poll (2023) on walking alone at night and car theft fears ¹⁸ ²⁰ ; ABC7 News (Traci Park quote, 2024) ¹⁹ ; End Violence Against Women survey (UK, 2021) ²² .
- Equity and Low-Income Impacts – StrongTowns analysis “Is Parking Reform Hurting the Poor in SF?” (2023) ²⁷ ²⁸ ; L.A. Times Editorial Board (2021) ²⁶ ; Mission Local (Annika Hom’s reporting, 2023) via StrongTowns ²⁷ ; ITDP “Not Everyone in LA Drives” (2020) ³⁰ .
- Other Cities’ Outcomes – StrongTowns (on San Francisco) ²⁷ ²⁸ ; Remy Moose Manley blog (on Sacramento and state law) ² ; BOMA GLA on Culver City (2022) ¹ ; Culver City Crossroads news report (2022) ³⁵ ; *LAist* news on L.A. parking policy motion (2025) ⁴⁰ ⁴¹ .

¹ Culver City Eliminates Parking Requirements - BOMA on the Frontline

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

² ³³ ³⁴ 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/>

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

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

⁴ FactSheets.pdf

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

⁵ ⁴⁵ 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>

⁷ ⁸ ¹⁰ ¹⁴ ²³ ²⁵ ⁴¹ ⁴² No Parking?

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

⁹ High Density Housing--Impact on Neighborhood Parking | SFMTA

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

¹¹ ¹² ¹³ ⁴⁰ ⁴³ ⁴⁴ 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/

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/>