

Communication from Public

Name: Katherine King

Date Submitted: 08/03/2026 07:11 PM

Council File No: 26-4118-S7

Comments for Public Posting: Vote N0 on this resolution to establish seven additional 41.18 zones in CD11. The Municipal Code behind these zones, 41.18c(4), demands that specific reasons regarding public safety be given. The examples the law gives (threat of serious bodily harm, repeated violent crime, and fire) represent severe dangers, not just, for example, difficulty of passage, an unwashed body, or unsightliness. Of course, I have no idea why the Office of CD11 has "submitted / posted to the File relevant documentation, as further detailed in the Code, that the circumstances at this location poses a particular and ongoing threat to public health or safety" because CM Park has not submitted that documentation as part of the resolution. The public has a right to know that each and every location designated as a no-sitting/sleeping/storing property-zone has been fully justified; we deserve to know the details. Such transparency is all the more important since such zones are proliferating all over the city and especially in CD 11 where I live. Each designation should be proposed in a separate motion in which the details could be part of the "Whereases" that lead up to the resolution. In addition, the public should be given free and easy access to the files that contain such documentation if they contain more details that appear in a Whereas. The current lack of transparency makes it appear that criminalization of poverty is the real aim of such designations. It also appears to be illegal.
Katherine King CD11 homeowner

Communication from Public

Name: Scott Sale
Date Submitted: 08/03/2026 06:08 PM
Council File No: 26-4118-S7
Comments for Public Posting: Please vote NO on this agenda item.

Communication from Public

Name: Peggy Lee Kennedy

Date Submitted: 08/03/2026 10:15 PM

Council File No: 26-4118-S7

Comments for Public Posting: Please post the attached pdf file comment. CD11 has now uploaded a last-minute “Findings” document to CF 26-4118-S7, apparently in response to concerns that the resolution lacks the specific documentation and findings required by LAMC § 41.18(c)(4). The new document does not cure those defects. Instead, it underscores them. Please read attachment.

Dear Councilmembers,

Councilmember Park has now uploaded a last-minute “Findings” document to CF 26-4118-S7, apparently in response to concerns that the resolution lacks the specific documentation and findings required by LAMC § 41.18(c)(4). The new document does not cure those defects.

Instead, it underscores them.

The submission claims to summarize LAPD and LAFD “statistics and data,” but contains no statistics or data. It provides no dates, incident numbers, records, counts, descriptions, or other documentation supporting its boilerplate references to “numerous emergency incidents” and “encampment fires.” Nearly identical language is repeated for all seven locations without establishing the particular and ongoing threat required at each one.

Community members who regularly observe these locations and conduct outreach to unhoused neighbors also dispute the submission’s basic factual claims.

At 604 Rose Avenue, outreach volunteers report that no one has been maintaining an encampment on the designated side of the street. St. Joseph Center security has reportedly prevented anyone from setting up a tent on the designated side. In fact, St Joseph security wrongly won’t let people even stand there! People have sometimes stayed across the street, but packed up their belongings every morning. That side had the sidewalk power-washed daily when the people left. But currently there doesn’t seem to be any encampment there at all.

Outreach volunteers likewise report that there has not been an encampment at 720 Rose Avenue. An encampment previously existed across the street, outside the Whole Foods parking lot, but it was cleared in 2024 and has not returned. Recent reporting by L.A. Material corroborates that account: Whole Foods hired Ghost Town Consultants in early 2024, and Ghost Town participated in preventing residents from returning following a March 2024 City cleanup. When the reporter recently visited, there were no tents around the Whole Foods perimeter.

This is directly at odds with the submission’s claim that “numerous individuals have consistently maintained an encampment at 720 Rose Ave” for the past year. The reporting places the former encampment across the street, documents its clearance before Councilmember Park’s stated May 2025 to May 2026 data period even began, and reports that the area remained clear during a recent visit.

If the submission’s basic claims are this inconsistent with readily observable conditions at the first locations community members have examined, Council cannot reasonably accept its remaining assertions on faith. The document provides no underlying records with which to verify any of them. These factual contradictions undermine the credibility of the entire submission and demonstrate exactly why § 41.18(c)(4) requires specific documentation rather than boilerplate representations from a council office.

The submission also applies the wrong legal standard. It repeatedly claims that sleeping “within 500 feet” of each address is “unsafe, unhealthy, or incompatible with safe passage.” That

language and geographic framework come from subsection (c)(2), which governs overpasses, bridges, washes, railways, and similar infrastructure. This resolution invokes subsection (c)(4), which does not authorize a 500-foot exclusion zone. It requires Council to designate a particular section of street, sidewalk, or other public right-of-way based on specific documentation of a particular and ongoing threat. Neither the resolution nor the new submission identifies the section of public right-of-way being designated.

The timing is also telling. This last-minute submission is itself an acknowledgment that § 41.18(c)(4) requires documentation in the council file. A review of the City's other (c)(4) council files shows that they were similarly adopted without the required supporting evidence. Although this submission still does not meet the ordinance's "specific documentation" standard, its filing confirms the broader defect: the City has been adopting (c)(4) designations without satisfying a mandatory prerequisite imposed by the law. Those prior designations are therefore invalid, and Council should not add another invalid resolution to the list.

Please vote no on CF 26-4118-S7 and request a review of all existing § 41.18(c)(4) designations for compliance with the ordinance.

Thank you.

Peggy Lee Kennedy

Venice Justice Committee

Communication from Public

Name: Rick Garvey

Date Submitted: 08/03/2026 11:01 PM

Council File No: 26-4118-S7

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Councilmembers. I am a 30-year resident of Venice and I have been a public health researcher at the RAND Corporation working with unhoused populations for over 20 years. I have worked with the unhoused population in Venice since 2003 and am aware of where people congregate and where they don't. For over four years my team conducted regular counts of the unhoused populations in Venice and our conclusions are that the people left "sleeping rough" on the street are going to require significant effort to help. Please see our most recent findings here: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA4903-1.html Her policies are doing the opposite. I have watched as Councilwoman Park has undone much of the good work that had been done under her predecessor started to help people who have the least among us. I can attest firsthand that the policies she has worked so hard to implement have had devastating consequences for actual people. - The Bridge Housing program at Sunset and Main she shuttered leaving no shelter beds anywhere in Venice. - The Venice Dell permanent supportive housing project she has illegally tried to prevent from opening and wasted hundreds of thousands of my tax dollars fighting in the process. - The constant sweeps that do nothing to house people but only make people less visible, more vulnerable, and harder to help. It's no wonder that over 7 people are dying on the streets of Los Angeles every day. - The fencing off of sidewalk areas, pagodas on the boardwalk and her removal of benches from the Venice Recreation Area. Now there is her desire to use 41.18 to turn the entire Venice area into illegal space, where no one can rest, even though she provides nowhere else for people to go. The areas she is trying to designate as "a public safety issue" include the Venice Family Clinic, which as a Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHC) provides comprehensive primary care and support services to underserved populations, offering care regardless of patients' ability to pay; a Permanent Supportive Housing project she opposed, and the headquarters of St. Joseph's Center, which serves as the LAHSA designated SPA 5 provider for the Coordinated Entry System. It is a blatant effort to stop these important service providers from helping people and it must be stopped. Ms. Park lied in her filing that there are active encampments at these sites. There are not, nor have there been for a long time. Please come see for

yourselves and then vote no. Do not let her get away with her continued intimidation of those who have the least. Best regards,
Rick Garvey 234 Horizon #5 Venice, CA 90291