



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

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

1 message

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

Sat, Aug 23, 2025 at 12:41 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.

***** 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

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

August 22, 2025

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



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

cc:

Anissa Raja, Legislative Director, CD-15

anissa.raja@lacity.org

Nicholas Chavez, Legislative Deputy, CD-15

nicholas.i.chavez@lacity.org

Pamela Thornton, Planning Director, CD-15

pamela.thornton@lacity.org

Drew Leach, San Pedro Field Deputy, CD-15

drew.leach@lacity.org

Kevin Brunke, Senior Legislative Deputy, CD-11

Kevin.Brunke@lacity.org

Craig Bullock, Planning Director, CD-11

Craig.Bullock@lacity.org,

Jeff Khau, Planning Deputy, CD-11

Jeff.Khau@lacity.org

Diana Nave, Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council

diananave@gmail.com

Lamar Lyons, Central San Pedro Neighborhood Council

lamar.lyons@centralsanpedronc.org