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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STUDY AREA

Reseda is a fully urbanized, primarily residential, neighborhood of the City of Los Angeles located in the West San Fernando Valley (Council District 3). Increased interest in redevelopment in and around the neighborhood’s Central Business District (CBD), centered along Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard, and has prompted Councilmember Bob Blumenfield to request a parking utilization and management study.

PURPOSE AND NEED

City investments, such as inclusion of Sherman Way in the Mayor’s Great Streets program; and Councilmember Bob Blumenfield’s initiative, Reseda Rising, aimed to implement streetscape improvements and small business assistance programs, have been reciprocated with renewed interest from property developers. The majority of ongoing and pending projects consist of mixed-use and multi-family developments, which are concentrated along the Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard corridors or surrounding blocks. While existing parking in the area is ample, future multimodal transportation enhancements such as bike lanes will result in the loss of some on-street parking within the study area. By maximizing the use of existing resources, improved parking management can help to mitigate the loss of spaces in lieu of constructing new supply, which is costly in terms of capital and land use potential.

The purpose of this plan is to address the following issues in Reseda:

- Availability of spaces in prime retail areas
- Underutilization of off-street spaces
- Parking spillover into residential areas
- Future multimodal improvements
- Growth in development

In order to address these issues, the following goals were developed to shape the vision of this plan:

- Reduce circling for parking in busy areas
- Ensure customers can easily access local businesses during busy hours
- Reduce congestion and spillover parking into residential areas
- Use parking resources efficiently
- Ensure there is enough parking to accommodate future growth
- Provide incentives for employees away from retail streets, in a safe, accessible area
- Keep parking regulations easy to understand
Ensure parking investments and policies anticipate changes in vehicle technology and travel behavior
Ensure parking system complements future multimodal improvements

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Focus groups, an online survey, and a public outreach meeting were conducted to better understand the views and needs of stakeholders, residents, business owners, and visitors. Key feedback from the community outreach process includes the following:

- The main topic of discussion revolved around upcoming development and what that would mean for the neighborhood.
- There is excitement for upcoming historic redevelopment projects. However, there is some concern with the projects not providing parking.
- Although there was some discussion of the removal of on-street parking with proposed multimodal transportation projects, this was not a major concern.
- There is a desire for better safety and maintenance of public LADOT lots.
- Driving alone is the primary mode of transportation to Reseda.
- The top reasons cited for not patronizing the Reseda CBD were a lack of shopping, dining, and/or service destinations, and safety. Parking was the least cited reason.
- The three most desired improvements to parking and access were more off-street parking, better walking conditions, and more on-street parking near destinations.
- There was general support for parking management strategies that would allow better use of underutilized spaces. Strategies discussed included better wayfinding and signage, a valet pilot, better enforcement of off-street lots, and employee parking.

FINDINGS

In total, there are 5,516 non-residential parking spaces in the study area, including both private and public on-and off-street parking. There are a total of 1,753 public parking spaces located in the study area. Of these parking spaces, approximately 83% (1,453 spaces) are located on-street and 17% (300 spaces) are off-street. Just 23% (331 spaces) of on-street spaces are priced, with all public off-street spaces free.

Utilization, turnover, and parking duration counts were conducted for both on-street and off-street supplies on typical weekdays and Saturdays from February 15th to March 17th, 2018. Counts were conducted at 2-hour intervals from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., with one count conducted between midnight and 5:00 a.m. to calculate overnight utilization. The findings from this analysis includes the following:

- On-street parking utilization for the study area as a whole peaks at 12:00 p.m. on both weekdays (46%) and weekends (48%).
- Off-street utilization for the entire study area as a whole peaks at 45% on weekdays and 41% on weekends, both during the midday period (12:00 p.m.).
- Most block faces of Baird and Canby Avenues exceed 85% utilization throughout the day.
- Public lots that offer free parking, particularly on Baird Avenue, often exceed 85% utilization during weekday and weekend midday periods.
Most private lots east of Canby Avenue seldom exceed 75% utilization. These lots are generally larger parcels of single-use/big-box-format retail uses.

Block faces along Reseda Boulevard and Sherman Way, the two primary commercial corridors in the study area, seldom exceed 50% utilization on weekdays or weekends.

The public lot at 7170 Darby Avenue (LADOT Facility #640) seldom exceeds 50% utilization on weekdays or weekends.

On- and off-street utilization rates for the entire study area are relatively low because utilization is concentrated along several non-metered blockfaces on streets parallel to Reseda Boulevard, particularly Baird and Canby Avenues. That parking utilization is higher on these residential streets, and not on the key retail corridors of Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard, may be an indication that parking demand in the area is generated more from employees and residents than visitors/shoppers.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Potential strategies were evaluated within the context of the project goals and then refined for recommended implementation appropriate for the study area. Recommended strategies are listed below in order of priority:

**Adjust Time Limits**

- **Recommendation:** Consolidate and relax on-street time limits.
- **Next Steps:** Relax on-street metered time limits to four hours.

**Expand Metered Area**

- **Recommendation:** Price on-street parking on blockfaces that have high utilization and are near primary arterials which are metered and have low utilization.
- **Next Steps:** Identify block faces near Sherman Way that are highly utilized and primarily non-residential to introduce metered spaces.

**Shared Parking**

- **Recommendation:** Incentivize private off-street supply into the public system through voluntary agreements.
- **Next Steps:** Work with property owners to lease spaces at times when they are underutilized. Plan for new development to share parking when a mix of uses exhibit different times of peak demand.

**Improve Signage and Wayfinding**

- **Recommendation:** Install new directional signage to facilitate access to off-street options.
- **Next Steps:** Replace damaged signage and improve directional wayfinding at LADOT lots.

**Refurbish City-owned Lots**

- **Recommendation:** Perform surface and landscaping maintenance.
- **Next Steps:** Repave and restripe LADOT lots and perform tree and shrub maintenance.

**Enhance Enforcement at City-owned Lots**

- **Recommendation:** Establish perception of on the ground enforcement and improve security.
- **Next Steps:** Utilize targeted enforcement techniques and install security cameras and/or additional lighting at LADOT lots.

**Off-Street Pricing**

- **Recommendation:** Implement pricing of City-owned off-street lots.
- **Next Steps:** Implement pricing for LADOT lots that experience peak utilization rates above 90%.

**Employee Parking Program**

- **Recommendation:** Allow qualified local business employees to park in designated off-street facilities, and allow exemption from posted regulations during a specific time period with ownership of a permit.
- **Next Steps:** Work with businesses, such as retail and restaurants, to develop a program for their employees and identify underutilized lots for the program.

**Transportation Demand Management**

- **Recommendation:** Require TDM Plans to mitigate demand from future developments.
- **Next Steps:** Require Site Transportation Plans and Performance Reporting for new development in accordance with the City’s future TDM Ordinance Update.

**Progressive Pricing**

- **Recommendation:** Price parking according to level of convenience and demand.
- **Next Steps:** Consider zone-based progressive pricing if warranted by future demand.
2 INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Reseda is an older, fully urbanized community situated in the West San Fernando Valley. In recent years, the community has experienced a growing interest in redevelopment, particularly in the Central Business District (CBD). Reseda Boulevard and Sherman Way – two of the Valley’s busiest commercial corridors – traverse the CBD and are identified as prime sites for redevelopment. The majority of ongoing and pending projects are concentrated along these two corridors and consist of mostly mixed-use and multi-family residential.

The City of Los Angeles has invested in projects such as the inclusion of Sherman Way in the Mayor’s Great Streets program; and Councilmember Bob Blumenfield’s Reseda Rising initiative that seeks investment in streetscape improvements and small business assistance programs. These efforts have been reciprocated with renewed interest from property developers. The Council Office is also overseeing the revitalization of former Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) properties, which include the Historic Reseda Theatre as well as the Reseda Skating Rink. Furthermore, the Department of City Planning (DCP) is currently considering rezoning the Reseda Orange Line station area directly south of the CBD to allow for pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented development.

While existing parking in the area is ample, changes related to the upswing in development have raised concern regarding parking availability, particularly in regards to a loss of parking zones that line the rear of commercial uses along Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard. As such, Councilmember Bob Blumenfield has requested a parking utilization and management study for the Reseda CBD to address these concerns. This report presents an analysis and summary of existing parking conditions as well as recommendations for potential parking management strategies and steps towards implementation.

PURPOSE AND GOALS

The purpose of this plan is to address the following issues in Reseda:

- Availability of spaces in prime retail areas
- Underutilization of off-street spaces
- Parking spillover into residential areas
- Future multimodal improvements
- Growth in development

In order to address these issues, the following goals were developed to shape the vision of this plan:

- Reduce circling for parking in busy areas
• Ensure customers can easily access local businesses during busy hours
• Reduce congestion and spillover parking into residential areas
• Use parking resources efficiently
• Ensure there is enough parking to accommodate future growth
• Provide incentives for employees to park away from retail streets, in a safe, accessible area
• Keep parking regulations easy to understand
• Ensure parking investments and policies anticipate changes in vehicle technology and travel behavior
• Ensure parking system complements future multimodal improvements

STUDY AREA

The study area is roughly bounded by Valerio Street to the north, Lindley Avenue to the east, Kittridge Street to the south, and Wilbur Avenue to the west (see Figure 1). The study area is centered on the Reseda Boulevard and Sherman Way commercial corridors. Single-family residential is the area’s predominant land use outside of these two commercial streets. The Reseda Orange Line station is also located directly 0.7 miles south of the study area. The Orange Line provides direct bus rapid transit (BRT) connections to Chatsworth and the North Hollywood Station on Metro’s Red Line.

Figure 1 Study Area
PLANNING CONTEXT

The following plans and initiatives govern the existing approach to transportation and land use planning in the study area.

Existing Plans


The Southwest Valley Plans consist of three community plans that comprise part of the land use element of the General Plan. These plans have two key goals for the southwest Valley:

1. Plan for projected population and employment growth for the next 25 years; and
2. Apply the City’s new zoning code structure.

The Reseda-West Van Nuys Community Plan is one of the three plans and serves as a land use development guide for Reseda and West Van Nuys. The Plan was adopted in November 1999 and recognizes the Reseda CBD as a major opportunity site and potential business improvement district (BID). The Department of City Planning is currently updating the Community Plan.


The community design overlay (CDO) establishes design guidelines and standards to improve the visual quality of development by addressing building features such as façade treatments, parking areas, landscape buffers, and pedestrian walkways. The CDO was approved in September 2004 and promotes small-scale commercial retail character for the CBD. Together, the two plans encourage the integration of public and private space, and a cohesive design concept. Parking guidelines include having will-lit parking areas, providing pedestrian passages through parking lots, integrating parking structure design into the overall design scheme, screening parked cars in structures from public view, providing pedestrian crossings for lots that have more than 25 spaces, landscaping parking areas, and keeping existing lots in good repair.


The Streetscape Plan complements the CDO and was approved in September 2004. It provides guidelines and standards for public and private development in the Reseda CBD. The goals are to provide standards and direction for improvements to the public right-of-way (e.g. street furniture, lighting), create a pedestrian-friendly environment, and enhance the identity of the area. Given available funding, the Plan prioritized improvements to the Sherman Way Corridor first.

The Streetscape Plan also includes streetscape standards for streets based on the level of anticipated pedestrian activity of each segment and its physical characteristics. Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard are recognized as major streets most heavily traveled and have the potential for greater pedestrian traffic. The role of the remaining streets in the CBD is to provide access to stores, offices, residential areas, and parking facilities.

City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035

The Mobility Plan 2035 was adopted in September 2016 and serves as an update to the City’s General Plan Transportation Element last adopted in 1999. The Plan incorporates complete streets principles and is the policy foundation for the city’s transportation system. The Plan
outlines five goals: (1) Safety First, (2) Access for All Angelenos, (3) World Class Infrastructure, (4) Collaboration, Communication, and Informed Choices, and (5) Clean Environments & Healthy Communities.

The Plan also calls for balancing on- and off-street parking with other transportation and land use objectives. Rather than oversupplying parking and providing it at no cost, the Plan calls for appropriately pricing short-term parking so mobility needs can be accommodated while reducing adverse impacts onto the surrounding environment.

**Existing Initiatives**

**Reseda Rising**

Reseda Rising is a multi-faceted initiative led by Councilmember Bob Blumenfield to reinvest in Reseda and reestablish its former glory as a center for entertainment and small business. The initiative was launched in response to the dissolution of the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) in 2011.

**Great Streets**

Launched by Mayor Eric Garcetti, the Great Streets Initiative helps reimagine neighborhood centers by focusing on one main street at a time – one of which is Sherman Way. The first phase of the initiative developed community partnerships and targeted city services to activate streets as public spaces. Great Streets investments on Sherman Way have included implementing proactive infrastructure maintenance such as concrete sidewalk repairs, initiating weekly overnight street sweeping, and installing solar-powered benches that provide free electric charging for devices.


In 2014, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) released its first Vision Zero strategic plan, with the goals of reducing traffic deaths by 20 percent by 2017, and eliminating traffic fatalities citywide by 2025. In 2015, the plan was adopted by the City Council as a core objective under “Safety First” in its Mobility Plan 2035.

The action plan includes the following approaches to implementation:

- **Engineering and Planning.** Focusing on high priority intersections and corridors in its High Injury Network, the City will increase visibility of the most vulnerable people on the road, such as pedestrians and bicyclists, children, and older adults; reduce conflicts; and set speed limits that protect human life. Safety projects will be prioritized based on crash profiles, cost effectiveness, and proven countermeasures.

- **Enforcement.** Enforcement will focus on high crash locations and target unsafe travel behavior (e.g., driving under the influence, distracted driving, failure to yield to people in crosswalks). Enhanced reporting statistics, including expanding pedestrian collisions reporting by LAPD and developing strategies based on long term collision trends, will assist in directing safety efforts to high injury areas.

- **Education and Outreach.** The City will partner with community and neighborhood groups (especially in areas with high collision rates) and will develop safety campaigns to encourage safe travel behavior and draw attention to the most vulnerable people.
• **Evaluation and Monitoring.** The City will continue to collect and analyze collision, public health, and land use data to prioritize locations for (and evaluate results of) engineering, enforcement, and education efforts.

• **Partnerships.** Partners include County of Los Angeles Public Health, Los Angeles Unified School District, and the City’s police, fire, and public works departments. The City will continue to work with community partners to improve safety at the neighborhood level.

• **Equity.** Prioritizing safety initiatives will focus on communities with both high levels of collisions and poor health outcomes.
3 EXISTING SYSTEM

This section examines existing parking conditions for non-residential uses, which includes the current parking supply, utilization and turnover during different times of day, and management (including relevant policies and programs, minimum requirements, pricing, time restrictions, payment methods, and other regulations). This analysis identifies the factors that influence parking demand and distribution in and around Reseda.

PARKING SUPPLY

Public parking supply data was collected on 124 on-street blockfaces and at 183 off-street parking facilities. In total, there are 5,516 non-residential parking spaces in the study area, including both private and public on-and off-street parking. There are a total of 1,753 public parking spaces located in the study area. Of these parking spaces, approximately 83% (1,453 spaces) are located on-street and 17% (300 spaces) are off-street.

On-Street Inventory

The distribution of on-street public parking spaces in the study area is summarized in Figure 2. Over one-half of on-street parking is unrestricted, while the remainder are regulated by time and/or metering.

On-street parking inventory and regulation types are shown in Figure 3. Blockfaces marked “partially” have a mix of regulations. There is no metered parking west of Amigo Avenue or east of Etiwanda Avenue; rather, most metered parking is located on blockfaces that parallel or intersect Reseda Boulevard. Unrestricted blockfaces are clustered toward the periphery of the study area, particularly along Baird Avenue and Gault Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Type</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Limited</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Off-Street Inventory

Off-street inventory is shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5. There are a total of four publicly-owned lots, making up seven percent of the total off-street parking in the study area. These lots provide free parking for up to ten hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation Type</th>
<th>Total Facilities</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privately-Restricted Parking</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3,763</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parking (all free)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4,063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utilization, turnover, and parking duration counts were conducted for both on-street and off-street supplies on typical weekdays and Saturdays from February 15th to March 17th, 2018. Counts were conducted at 2-hour intervals from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., with one count conducted between midnight and 5:00 a.m. to calculate overnight utilization.

Weekday and weekend parking utilization, by time of day, are shown in Figure 6 through Figure 13. The results of these findings are summarized below:

- On-street parking utilization for the Reseda study area as a whole peaks at 12:00 p.m. on both weekdays (46%) and weekends (48%).
- Off-street utilization for the entire study area as a whole peaks at 45% on weekdays and 41% on weekends, both during the midday period (12:00 p.m.).
- Most block faces of Baird and Canby Avenues exceed 85% utilization throughout the day.
- Public lots that offer free parking, particularly on Baird Avenue, often exceed 85% utilization during weekday and weekend midday periods.
- Most private lots east of Canby Avenue seldom exceed 75% utilization. These lots are generally larger parcels of single-use/big-box-format retail uses.
• Block faces along Reseda Boulevard and Sherman Way, the two primary commercial corridors in the study area, seldom exceed 50% utilization on weekdays or weekends.

• The public lot at 7170 Darby Avenue (LADOT Facility #640) seldom exceeds 50% utilization on weekdays or weekends.

• On- and off-street utilization rates for the entire study area are relatively low because utilization is concentrated along several non-metered blockfaces on streets parallel to Reseda Boulevard, particularly Baird and Canby Avenues. That parking utilization is higher on these residential streets, and not on the key retail corridors of Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard, may be an indication that parking demand in the area is generated more from employees and residents than visitors/shoppers. This pattern could also indicate that parking supplies in the area are sufficiently abundant that visitors/shoppers prefer to walk farther to reach their destinations than to pay for metered, on-street parking on Reseda Boulevard.

**Weekday Occupancy**

Weekday on-street utilization in the study area varies relatively little throughout the day, from an observed maximum of 46% at 12:00 p.m. to its minimum of 39% at 8:00 p.m (Figure 6). Blockfaces with the highest on-street utilization are typically on streets without parking restrictions, such as Baird Avenue, Hart Street, Gault Street, and Canby Avenue (south of Sherman Way). This reflects the predominant pattern that metered blockfaces have lower utilization than unrestricted blockfaces, as many parkers will opt to walk farther to reach their destinations in order to avoid paying for on-street parking.

Off-street parking utilization varies more widely, from a maximum of 45% at 12:00 p.m. to its minimum of 28% at 8:00 p.m. Lots with higher utilization are typically smaller and located in the retail core of Reseda, west of Canby Avenue. This is due to the more diverse land use mix, which creates more evenly distributed parking demand, as well as lower parking ratios in this area. In particular, the three public lots offering free parking on Baird and Canby Avenues see the highest peak utilization, exceeding 85% at times. A notable exception to this pattern is found in the public lot on Darby Avenue, where utilization seldom exceeds 50%. As shown in Figure 7, public lots are well utilized until 6 p.m. when utilization decreases from 73% to 58%.

Private lots in the area west of Canby Avenue tend to have more moderate utilization, between 50% and 85%. On the other hand, the Sherman Way corridor, east of Canby Avenue, has lower land use diversity and larger, single-use parcels with higher parking ratios. As a result, larger private lots in this area rarely exceed 50% utilization.
**Figure 6**  Weekday Occupancy by Time Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>On-Street</th>
<th>Off-Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7**  Weekday Occupancy by Time Period – Public Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8  Weekday Occupancy (10 AM – 12 PM)
Figure 9  Weekday Occupancy (12 – 2 PM)
Figure 10  Weekday Occupancy (2 – 4 PM)
Figure 11  Weekday Occupancy (4 – 6 PM)
Figure 12  Weekday Occupancy (6 – 8 PM)
Weekend Occupancy

Weekend utilization patterns do not differ significantly from weekday utilization patterns, with utilization for the study area never exceeding 50% for either on- or off-street parking. Weekend on-street utilization in the study area varies relatively little throughout the day, from an observed maximum of 48% at 12:00 p.m. to its minimum of 43% at 8:00 p.m. As with weekday utilization, blockfaces with the highest weekend on-street utilization are typically on streets without parking restrictions, such as Baird Avenue and Canby Avenue, which exceed 85% utilization throughout the day. This reflects the predominant pattern that metered blockfaces have lower utilization than unrestricted blockfaces, as many parkers will opt to walk farther to reach their destinations in order to avoid paying for on-street parking.

As with weekday utilization patterns, weekend off-street parking utilization varies more widely than on-street utilization, from a maximum of 41% at 12:00 p.m. to its minimum of 21% at 8:00 p.m. The lack of a weekend utilization peak during the evening is a reflection of the study area’s relative lack of major nighttime destinations such as bars, restaurants, or theaters that attract evening visitors. Lots with higher utilization are typically smaller and clustered in the retail core of Reseda, between Amigo Avenue and Canby Avenue. This is due to the more diverse land use mix, which creates more evenly distributed parking demand throughout the day, as well as lower parking ratios in this area.
In particular, the public lots offering free parking, on Baird Avenue and Canby Avenue, see the highest peak utilization, typically between 50% and 85%. A notable exception to this pattern is found in the public lot on Darby Avenue, where utilization seldom exceeds 50%. Private lots in the area between Amigo and Canby Avenues tend to have more moderate utilization, between 50% and 85%. On the other hand, the Sherman Way corridor, east of Canby Avenue, has lower land use diversity and larger, single-use parcels with higher parking ratios. As a result, larger private lots in this areas rarely exceed 50% utilization.

Figure 14  Weekend Occupancy by Time Period
Figure 15  Weekend Occupancy by Time Period – Public Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16 Weekend Occupancy (10 AM – 12 PM)
Figure 17  Weekend Occupancy (12 – 2 PM)

SATURDAY OCCUPANCY (12PM)
Figure 18  Weekend Occupancy (2 – 4 PM)
Figure 19  Weekend Occupancy (4 – 6 PM)
Figure 20  Weekend Occupancy (6 – 8 PM)
LENGTH OF STAY

In addition to parking utilization, average parking duration is another key measure of parking space availability. Longer parking durations indicate lower space turnover and greater difficulty for visitors/patrons to find a space upon arrival to Reseda. If supplies are kept constant, blocks with shorter parking durations can satisfy higher parking demand – defined as the number of unique parking transactions – than areas with longer parking durations.

A summary of weekday and weekend average parking durations, for on-street and off-street parking as well as the entire study area as a whole, is provided in Figure 22. The Reseda study area sees average parking durations of 3.2 hours on both weekdays and weekends. Because more than 50% of on-street parking is unrestricted, average on-street parking durations (3.4 hours on weekdays and 3.9 hours on weekends) are higher than average off-street parking durations (2.8 hours on weekdays and 2.4 hours on weekends). Average parking durations are sorted according to parking regulation in Figure 23. Metered and partially metered on-street parking exhibit the shortest average durations on both weekdays and weekends (1.3 to 1.5 hours). Private off-street parking has average durations of 2.8 hours on weekdays and 2.4 hours on weekends. Unrestricted on-street parking shows the longest average durations, between 3.7 and 4.1 hours on weekdays and 5 and 6.7 hours on weekends. Because most on-street parking in the study area is unrestricted, this indicates that most publicly accessible parking has longer parking durations than is typically desirable for commercial/retail or mixed-use districts.
Maps of average parking durations in the study area are shown in Figure 24 and Figure 25. Public off-street parking facilities have relatively short parking durations of typically 2-4 hours, weekdays and weekends. The public lot on Baird Avenue, between Wyandotte Street and Sherman Way, is the sole exception to this trend, with average durations of between 1 and 2 hours on weekends. As expected, metered on-street blockfaces on Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard show the shortest average parking durations (generally less than 2 hours), while the longest average parking durations are on unrestricted blockfaces. Each of these conditions occur on both weekdays and weekends. These unrestricted blocks include Baird Avenue, Canby Avenue, Gault Street, and Cantlay Street, among others. Many of these blockfaces also experience the study area’s highest utilization throughout the day, an undesirable trend that indicates the parking supplies in highest demand are least likely to be available to arriving visitors/patrons.

**Figure 22  Weekday vs. Weekend Average Duration (hrs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Street</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Study Area</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 23  Average Duration (hrs) by Regulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Metered or Time-Limited</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Limited</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Time-Limited or Unrestricted</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Metered or Unrestricted</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Off-Street</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 24  Weekday Average Duration

WEEKDAY DURATION

Average Length of Stay

- 1 to 1.9 hours
- 2 to 3.9 hours
- 4 to 5.9 hours
- 6 to 7.9 hours
- 8 or more hours

Time Limits on Block

- 0.5: 30-minute parking
- 1: 1-hour parking
- 2: 2-hour parking
- 4: 4-hour parking

Study Area
PARKING MANAGEMENT

The Reseda study area’s parking policies and requirements are determined by the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. While the area is subject to the Reseda Central Business District CDO, this plan does not make any adjustments to citywide minimum parking requirements. Likewise, the study area is not included in any of the City’s Preferential Parking District zones.1 The study area’s generalized zoning consists of a mix of commercial, light manufacturing, and single- and multi-family residential uses.

Parking Fees and Regulation

On-street metered parking is enforced from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Metered rates are $1 per hour, and most time limits are one or two hours, with a small number of 15- and 30-minute metered spaces. Most non-metered, time-limited parking is enforced from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Time limits are also one or two hours. On-street parking is free and not time-restricted on Sundays.

1 https://data.lacity.org/widgets/2ckn-xmjp
All four public parking lots are free and allow patrons to park for a maximum of ten hours. With the exception of one lot, time limits are enforced from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Overnight parking is also prohibited from 12 a.m. to 6 a.m. at these lots. The lot at Darby Avenue and Sherman Way has a ten-hour time restriction throughout the entire day.

**Minimum Parking Requirements**

Minimum automobile parking requirements for each of the most common land uses in the study area are provided in Figure 26. Likewise, the minimum bicycle parking requirements for typical uses in the area are provided in Figure 27.

**Figure 26 Minimum Automobile Parking Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Parking Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>2 spaces per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family residential – Studios</td>
<td>1 space per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family residential – 1-bedroom</td>
<td>1.5 spaces per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family residential – 2-bedroom +</td>
<td>2 spaces per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/coffeeshop/bar/nightclub</td>
<td>1 space per 100 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1 space per 250 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1 space per 500 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light manufacturing</td>
<td>1 space per 500 s.f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety, City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.21. General Provisions)

**Figure 27 Minimum Bike Parking Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Bike Parking Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 25</td>
<td>1 space per 10 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 100</td>
<td>1 space per 15 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 200</td>
<td>1 space per 20 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201+</td>
<td>1 space per 40 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/coffeeshop/bar/nightclub</td>
<td>1 space per 2,000 s.f. (min. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1 space per 10,000 s.f. (min. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1 space per 10,000 s.f. (min. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light manufacturing</td>
<td>1 space per 10,000 s.f. (min. 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.21. General Provisions) Table 12.21 A.16.(a)(2)

---

Adjustments to Minimum Parking Requirements

Bicycle parking replacement of required automobile parking. ³

Bicycle parking, may replace automobile parking under some conditions specified below.

- **Reduced parking requirements for general uses.** New or existing automobile parking spaces required by the City for all uses may be replaced by bicycle parking at a ratio of one (1) automobile parking space for every four (4) required or non-required bicycle parking spaces provided. No more than 20% of the required automobile parking spaces for nonresidential uses may be replaced at any site. For residential buildings, including hotels, motels and apartment hotels, no more than 10% of the required automobile parking may be replaced with bicycle parking. Larger replacements are allowed for transit-oriented development.

- **Transit-oriented development.** Automobile parking spaces for nonresidential projects located within 1,500 feet⁴ of a major transit stop may replace up to 30 percent of the required automobile parking spaces with bicycle parking. For residential projects within 1,500 feet of a major transit stop, up to 15% of the required automobile parking spaces may be replaced with bicycle parking.

- **Affordable housing development.** Residential buildings that include at least the minimum number of affordable units to qualify for the City’s density bonus program may replace up to 30% of automobile parking with bicycle parking, regardless of the project’s location.

**Other reductions to automobile parking requirements.**

- **Change of use exemption.** ⁵ Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, any existing building within the Specific Plan area is exempted from the requirements to provide increased parking if the project does not increase floor area and the uses of the building will have the same or lower parking requirements for which the existing building is permitted.

- **Senior/disabled housing.** Parking requirements for housing units for seniors (i.e. senior independent housing, assisted living, but excluding nursing homes) and disabled people may be reduced up to 50%.

- **Affordable housing.** ⁷ Projects with the minimum number of affordable units to qualify for the City’s Density Bonus program may reduce their minimum parking requirement either via reduced parking ratios for all units (not just affordable units), at 1 space per unit for 1-bedroom units and 2 spaces per unit for 2+ bedroom units, or via reduced parking ratios for only affordable units, at 0.5 parking spaces per affordable unit, regardless of unit size.

- **Remote off-site parking or transportation alternatives.** ⁸ The City may authorize parking requirement reductions of up to 40% for commercial or industrial sites with at

---

³ City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.21.A
⁴ As measured by Euclidean distance.
⁵ Reseda Central Business District Specific Plan.
⁶ City of Los Angeles Municipal Code Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.21.A.4(u)
⁷ City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.22A.25
⁸ City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.21.A.4(y)
least 100 employees that provide an unspecified range of transportation alternatives (e.g. carpools, vanpools, transit, buses, or bicycles) at its discretion. The project must demonstrate “an achievable level of employee and/or tenant use of transportation alternatives.”9 Likewise, the City may also allow developers of commercial or industrial sites with at least 100 employees to provide up to 75 percent of required automobile parking at a remote facility, provided the remote facility is within 1,500 feet of the project site and the project provides employee transportation between the site and the remote facility.10 Reduced parking requirements based on either the transportation alternatives or remote off-site parking authorizations require submission of a parking management plan to the City.

- **Parking waiver.**11 Parking requirements may be waived when the lot involved is located in an assessment district for the acquisition of publicly owned parking facilities, or is located adjacent to land currently being used for publicly owned parking facilities.

- **Modified Parking Requirement (MPR) District.** The City Council or City Planning Commission may establish by ordinance an MPR District, with potential parking requirement reductions, in areas not already governed by a Specific Plan. The MPR District must adopt at least one of the parking management strategies listed below:
  - Off-site parking – Any required parking may be provided off-site, within 1,500 feet (network distance) of the site.
  - Reduced parking requirements lower than established in Section 12.21 A.4 of the Municipal Code, provided that parking reductions do not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood and there exist sufficient parking management or TDM programs to negate the need for parking.
  - Increased parking requirements, provided the City finds that there is a lack of transit service in the area, there is a high potential for spillover parking impacts on adjacent residential streets, or there is low probability that TDM programs in the area will be effective.
  - Commercial parking credits – Commercial uses may partially satisfy their parking requirements through the purchase of commercial parking credits in lieu of on-site spaces. The number of commercial parking credits is established by a neighborhood-level survey of underutilized public parking spaces in the District at various times of day.
  - Maximum parking requirements – MPR Districts may establish maximum parking requirements in addition to any existing minimum parking requirements.

**Shared Parking**

With the approval of the Zoning Administrator, properties within 750 feet of one another may share off-street parking spaces, provided that the required parking for each use is available during its respective hours of operation.12 A parking demand analysis is required to establish compliance with this condition.

---

9 City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.24.X.17(a)
10 City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.24.X.17(b)
11 City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.21.A.4(o)
12 City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. Ch. 1, Article 2, Sec. 12.24.X.20
STATE OF FACILITIES

In early October 2018, the project team conducted an on-site assessment of the LADOT municipal lots within the study area. There are four municipal lots located within four blocks of each other in the study area. These lots are:

- Lot 621 - Sherman Way/Baird Avenue (S)
- Lot 622 - Sherman Way/Canby Avenue
- Lot 624 - Sherman Way/Baird Avenue (N)
- Lot 640 - Sherman Way/Darby Avenue

Three of the lots (Lots 621, 622 and 640) are located one-half block south of Sherman Way and the fourth lot (Lot 624) is located one-half block north on Sherman Way. All four lots offer free parking with daily time limits ranging from two hours to 10 hours. The installation of wayfinding signage along Reseda Boulevard and Sherman Way assisted in the location of each parking facility. The wayfinding signs combine the LADOT-branded parking “P” with directional arrows to make it easier to identify the location of the municipal facilities.

Each lot is open-access (not gate-restricted) with separate single entrance and exit lanes providing street access. Lots 621, 622, and 624 also provide access from the adjacent alleyway. The single entry and exit lanes combined with no pavement markings (navigation arrows) and poorly located directional signage to direct traffic flow hinder the parking experience. Directional signage is small, one-sided (only facing the street) and covered in graffiti. Overall, each lot is in poor condition with cracked and stained pavement, buildup of trash and litter, and faded pavement striping. The condition of the parking lot signage is also problematic as most are worn-down due to wear and tear, damaged, or painted over with graffiti.

At Lot 640 overgrown trees and shrubs have obscured the view of point-of-entry signage. Lot 622 also had inconsistent signage, indicating vehicles can park for two or 10 hours, depending on the parking space. The lack of time-limit signs is very confusing to parkers, as is the inconsistent time limits with the other three Reseda lots.

Parking lot enforcement also appeared to be an issue at the four lots. During the site visit multiple oversized vehicles (RV’s) were identified in Lot 621. A perceived lack of enforcement patrolling the lots to identify issues, provide security, and enforce parking rules can contribute to deteriorated lot conditions that have occurred in many of these lots.
4 COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

A successful communications strategy is key to maximizing understanding and participation. The project team engaged in public outreach efforts to understand the views and needs of stakeholders, residents, business owners, and visitors. Focus groups, an online survey, and a public outreach meeting resulted in a better understanding of the existing parking conditions, key parking issues, and downtown dynamics in Reseda.

FOCUS GROUPS

The project team held focus groups with local stakeholders including businesses operators, property owners, developers, residents, and community organizations. These focus groups explored a range of concerns relating to the study area and the role of parking in addressing these concerns.

These discussions yielded the following findings:

- The main topic of discussion revolved around upcoming development and what that would mean for the neighborhood.
- There was overall excitement for the upcoming historic redevelopment projects. However, some concern was raised with the projects not providing parking.
- Although there was some discussion of the removal of on-street parking with proposed active transportation projects, this was not a major concern.
- Stakeholders expressed a desire for better safety and maintenance of public lots.
- One stakeholder advocated for better walking conditions and encouraged the relationship between street design, parking, and pedestrian safety.

PARKING SURVEY

An online parking survey was distributed to Reseda business owners, employees, residents, and visitors. The survey included questions regarding travel modes and choices as well as parking preferences and patterns. The survey was open from July to August 2018, and yielded a total of 123 responses. Key findings are summarized below. See Appendix A for a more detailed analysis of survey results.

- Driving alone is the primary mode of transportation to Reseda. Ninety-six percent get to Reseda by driving alone. However, respondents also reported using other modes, including carpool, walking, bicycling, and public transit (Figure 28).
- The top reasons why respondents do not go to Reseda are a lack of shopping, dining, and/or service destinations, safety, and they cannot find what they need (Figure 29). Parking is the least cited reason for not going to Reseda.
Proximity to one’s destination is the most important factor in choosing where to park (Figure 30). As such, 85% park less than one block away from their destination.

Safety is a concern. Thirty-five percent do not go to Reseda due to safety, and nearly half choose where to park based on safety/security.

Residents who have difficulty finding parking in their neighborhood indicated too many residents and non-residents as issues.

Most (80%) park at free spaces in public parking lots, private parking lots, and on-street unmetered spaces (Figure 31).

One-third of respondents typically park for more than eight hours (Figure 32). Thirty-five percent park for less than one hour.

Parking takes five minutes to find on an average day and 11 minutes on the worst day.

Nearly half of respondents prefer to keep time limits the same as opposed to extending (30%) or reducing them (21%).

The three most desired improvements to parking and access are more off-street parking, better walking conditions, and more on-street parking near destinations (Figure 33).
Figure 29  Survey - Reasons I Don't Go to Reseda

- Not enough shopping, dining, and/or service: 51%
- Safety: 35%
- Cannot find what I need: 32%
- Not convenient to walk around commercial corridors: 28%
- Too much traffic: 28%
- Parking is difficult to find: 23%
- Other: 22%
- Parking is expensive: 2%

Figure 30  Survey - How do you choose where to park?

- Location (near final destination): 78%
- Safety/security: 49%
- Ease of finding a space: 47%
- Type of parking (street/lot): 30%
- Price/cost: 12%
- Time limit: 11%
- Other: 5%
Figure 31  Survey - Where did you park today or on the most recent day you drove to Reseda?

- Private parking lot: 34%
- On-street unmetered: 24%
- Public parking lot: 22%
- Other: 13%
- On-street metered: 7%

Figure 32  Survey - How long do you typically park for?

- < 15 minutes: 6%
- 15-30 minutes: 12%
- 30 minutes-1 hour: 17%
- 1-2 hours: 21%
- 2-3 hours: 6%
- 4-8 hours: 6%
- 3-4 hours: 0%
- More than 8 hours: 33%
A community meeting was held on August 28, 2018 in Reseda, where nine attendees represented residents and/or members of the business community. The project team presented results from the existing conditions analyses as well as preliminary parking policy recommendations. The purpose was to gather community input, concerns, and recommendations on potential strategies before refinement and final plan development.

Key findings from the community meeting include:

- Attendees indicated not being able to find a space as their top parking challenge.
- There was general support for parking management strategies that would allow better use of underutilized spaces. Strategies discussed included a better wayfinding and signage, a valet pilot, better enforcement of off-street lots, and employee parking.
- There is concern the ice skating rink and Laemmle Theater will not have a sufficient off-street supply.
- Safety and maintenance of parking lots are also a concern. Some expressed a desire for improved lighting, safety, and enforcement of underutilized lots to encourage patrons to park there.
- There was a general consensus in support of shared parking. Potential candidates for a shared parking agreement were Wells Fargo and Laemmle Theater. The parking lot between CVS and Goodwill was also mentioned as a potential site for shared parking.
- Many stores on Sherman Way discourage front entrance access, and instead direct patrons to enter from the parking lot.
- Similar to the parking survey, attendees indicated a desire for better walking conditions.
5 FUTURE DEMAND

METHODOLOGY

A future demand analysis was conducted to gain a better understanding of potential demands placed on the area due to developments being proposed, approved, or currently under construction. Demand figures were informed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation, 4th Edition, which estimates parking demand incurred from a given type of development. It should be noted that ITE demand figures do not account for the presence of any transportation demand management (TDM) programs on the sites, which can significantly decrease parking demand in locations with robust transit service. Additionally, demand rates are calculated for each individual land use on each individual development, and thus do not account for the possibility of sharing between uses with varying peak periods. Therefore, this future parking demand rate should be considered the maximum level of peak parking demand from all future developments and not necessarily the anticipated peak demand across an average day.

RESULTS

As shown in Figure 34, all identified developments (regardless of phase) – which are all located within the Reseda area – are projected to yield a parking demand of 702 residential spaces and non-residential 225 spaces. In order to determine the net future non-residential demand, adjustments were made to existing demand to account for developments that would be replaced by new development. The net future non-residential demand is estimated to be 2,471 spaces.13

Figure 34   Future Parking Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Residential Demand</th>
<th>Non-Residential Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to Existing15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Net future residential demand is not calculated because existing residential occupancy counts were not available and future residential developments will be self-parked and provide sufficient parking.

14 Existing demand is gleaned from the utilization analysis and reflects actual peak weekday occupancy at 12 p.m.

15 The adjustment represents the total peak demand of all parking facilities that will be replaced by new development.
Similar to parking demand, net future non-residential parking supply was determined by accounting for new parking spaces from future development as well as parking spaces that would be replaced by new development. As shown in Figure 35, the non-residential parking supply in the study area is projected to increase from 5,516 spaces to 5,646 spaces.

Recommended parking supply is determined by assuming that no more than 90% of the parking supply should be full. This creates a 10% “reserve” of parking spaces that can be used for overflow during events, overlap during peak times, and additional operational reserve. As shown in Figure 35, even with the recommended 10% reserve of 2,718 spaces, the projected future non-residential demand can be absorbed by the future parking supply. The result is a surplus of approximately 2,622 spaces. To accommodate future demand and avoid building more parking, the existing supply can be leveraged through better management strategies outlined in the following chapter.

Figure 35  Non-Residential Parking Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th># of Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>5,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New from Future Development</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to Existing</td>
<td>-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Future</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,646</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Supply</td>
<td>2,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus</strong></td>
<td><strong>+2,928</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Non-residential parking supply numbers for future developments were informed by the Department of City Planning (DCP) documents where available. For those that could not be found, parking supply was determined by using the one space per 250 s.f. requirement for retail uses in the Building Code.
6 STRATEGIES

Based on the previous findings and analyses, various management strategies were identified to address the aforementioned parking constraints and opportunities in Reseda. The following section evaluates a preliminary evaluation matrix, strategy recommendations, and an implementation table.
### STRATEGY EVALUATION

**Figure 36  **Strategy Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Reduce circling for parking in busy areas</th>
<th>Ensure customers can easily access local businesses during busy hours</th>
<th>Reduce congestion and spillover parking into residential areas</th>
<th>Use parking resources efficiently</th>
<th>Ensure there is enough parking for future growth</th>
<th>Provide incentives for safe and accessible employee parking away from retail streets</th>
<th>Keep parking regulations easy to understand</th>
<th>Ensure parking investments and policies anticipate changes in vehicle technology and travel behavior</th>
<th>Ensure parking system complements future multimodal improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust time-limits. Consolidate and relax on-street time limits.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand metered area. Price on-street parking on under regulated high-utilization block faces near primary arterials.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared parking. Incentivize private off-street supply into the public system through voluntary agreements.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve signage and wayfinding. Install new directional signage to facilitate access to off-street options.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbish City-owned lots. Perform surface and landscaping maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance enforcement at City lots. Establish perception of on the ground enforcement and improve security.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Reduce circling for parking in busy areas</td>
<td>Ensure customers can easily access local businesses during busy hours</td>
<td>Reduce congestion and spillover parking into residential areas</td>
<td>Use parking resources efficiently</td>
<td>Ensure there is enough parking for future growth</td>
<td>Provide incentives for safe and accessible employee parking away from retail streets</td>
<td>Keep parking regulations easy to understand</td>
<td>Ensure parking investments and policies anticipate changes in vehicle technology and travel behavior</td>
<td>Ensure parking system complements future multimodal improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-street pricing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Implement pricing of City-owned off-street lots.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee parking program</strong>&lt;br&gt;Allow qualified local business employees to park in designated off-street facilities exempt from posted regulations during a specific time period with ownership of a permit.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Demand Management</strong>&lt;br&gt;Require TDM Plans to mitigate demand from future developments.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progressive pricing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Price parking according to level of convenience and demand.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

Adjust Time Limits

*Consolidate and relax on-street time limits.*

While relaxing time limit restrictions makes parking more convenient for drivers, doing so does not mean that all people will park longer. Extending time limits simply allows individuals to park longer if they want to. At present, a majority of time limits for on-street parking in the study area are one or two hours. Limits less than 2-hours may be detrimental to districts looking to achieve a “park once” environment where patrons can park once and frequent shops, dining, and entertainment all within a single trip. Moving to a demand-based pricing system (see progressive parking) reduces the reliance on time limits. Fewer time limits result in fewer citations and a more positive parking experience for visitors.

Potential time limit adjustments strategies that may be beneficial to time restricted on-street parking in the study area include the following:

- **Three/Four hours**: The typical/default parking meter time limit could be relaxed to three to four hours. This allows the City to try relaxed time limits, without eliminating them. Four hours typically allows plenty of time for someone to dine and run multiple errands without fearing a parking citation.

- **No limit (with demand-based pricing)**: True demand-based pricing eliminates the need for parking meter time limits, as availability is managed through price rather than arbitrary limits to how long one can stay.

Expand Metered Area

*Price on-street parking on under regulated high-utilization block faces near primary arterials.*

Parking meters should be added where and when parking management is needed. Meters are most typically needed where occupancy/demand is very high, and on or near blocks where many businesses are open. In order to mitigate the future loss of on-street spaces as a result of multimodal improvements, pricing should be considered for under regulated (i.e. free 1-hr parking) for block faces near Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard that are not primarily residential in nature. In conjunction with this change, time limits should be increased to 4-hours in order to convey a park-once environment.

Shared Parking

*Incentivize private off-street supply into the public system through voluntary agreements.*

Shared parking agreements are arrangements with private parking lot owners that provide for privately owned off-street parking to be available to the public during specified periods of time, usually when the parking lot is in low demand for its associated tenants. Compensation for use of private lots may be made in the form of lease agreements that also outline specific provisions related to maintenance, operations, security, and liability.

A typical example of shared parking would be a land use that creates parking demand during the day, which could then become available to the public during non-business hours (evenings and/or weekends) or at other times when there is an overabundance of available parking. The agreement...
with the parking lot owner would stipulate the times during which public users may park in the lot and terms for compensation and operation.

Potential shared parking candidates within the study area include the following:

- CVS (18247 Sherman Way)
- Goodwill (18225 Sherman Way)
- St. Catherine of Siena Church (18115 Sherman Way),
- Magnolia Science Academy (18238 Sherman Way)

In order to provide shared parking within the study area, the City should seek voluntary agreements with private owners as follows:

1. **Leasing of a private lot**: Under this arrangement, parking spaces would essentially be “rented” from the property owner and the City would be entitled to establish regulations during “shared” use hours. Upgrades (lighting, striping, signage, etc.) could be made and the City would enforce compliance with regulations.

2. **Private ownership, public enforcement**: Under this arrangement the private property owner would open their lot to the public and establish regulations (including any pricing). The owner could choose to charge for parking, depending on parking demand. The City would enforce compliance with regulations and collect citation revenue.

3. **Third-party management**: It may be simpler and more cost-effective for the City to contract with a private company with experience facilitating shared parking arrangements instead of creating and managing its own agreements. This company would also establish regulations (including any pricing).

For any agreement, the City or other appropriate organization would work with the property owner and/or tenants to address the issues that typically arise from such agreements, including:

- **Financial compensation**: Some property owners may want to be compensated for use of their property. In such cases, spaces would need to be leased, as described above. While not inexpensive, the costs of such agreements would be far less than building an equivalent number of new spaces.

- **Liability**: Liability issues often emerge as a potential concern, yet these issues are typically covered in standard liability coverage in any land use policy to cover public passage. In addition, liability can be more comprehensively addressed through well-written lease agreements that include provisions about requiring the lessor to maintain a good state of repair, ADA access, etc. and the lessee to provide adequate and appropriate signage for patrons and take actions to avoid overcrowding or other hazardous situations.

- **Operation and Maintenance**: Ongoing costs associated with operation and maintenance is a common concern. These issues should be addressed as part of the shared parking agreement, which would depend on the degree of shared parking between private and public users.

- **Displacement of tenants**: Displacement of current tenants’ customers is often a key concern—“If this lot is open to the public, where will my customers park?” To address this issue, it is recommended that agreements be only pursued with land uses whose peak parking demand does not occur during the evening or on weekends, which is typically the busiest or bars and restaurants. For example, ideal locations to pursue agreements with
include banks, schools, and post offices, which are typically closed by 5 p.m. or 6 p.m. during weekday evenings, and even earlier on weekends.

**Improve Signage and Wayfinding**

*Install new directional signage to facilitate access to off-street options.*

The goal of communications and wayfinding is to make parking easier to find and make the parking system easier to understand through targeted branding and education. Communicating parking locations, rules, and availability is highly complementary to efforts to redistribute parking using pricing and regulations. Wayfinding and signage helps to orient visitors, shoppers, and residents alike, pointing them to area parking facilities, local businesses, transit stations, and other key destinations. Wayfinding strategies seek to efficiently coordinate movement within a neighborhood, pointing users of all modes of travel to the best access routes for their destination. Through maximization of underutilized resources, successful wayfinding can help to dispel perceived shortages of parking in busy commercial districts.

Parking wayfinding should be designed to direct motorists to underutilized off-street facilities, helping to free up coveted on-street spaces and eliminate congestion generated by those “cruising” for parking. Wayfinding is most successful when it is consistent; all signage should be produced in a similar style, and organized by type (parking, transit, bicycle/pedestrian, retail).

Specific recommendations for improving signage and wayfinding for LADOT municipal lots in the study area include the following:

- Replace all damaged signage, including point-of-entry, wayfinding, and informational.
- Install new directional signage at points-of-entry and exit.
- Relocate point-of-entry signage to locations that are more visible from the roadway.
- Install new wayfinding signage to guide people to/from nearby parking facilities and destinations.

**Refurbish City-owned Lots**

*Perform surface and landscaping maintenance.*

On-site evaluations of public off-street lots within the study area identified that the facilities are in a poor state of repair. Aside from degrading user experience and sense of security, the condition of the facilities inhibits the visibility of lots from points of access and is detrimental to traffic flow.

Specific recommendations for improving the conditions of LADOT municipal lots in the study area include the following:

- Maintain trees and shrubs to eliminate overhang from obscuring visibility of parking signage.
- Repave parking lot surfaces to eliminating cracks and stains.
- Restripe pavement markings.
- Install pavement directional arrows to improve traffic flow.
Enhance Enforcement at City-owned Lots

*Establish perception of on the ground enforcement and improve security.*

Perceived lack of enforcement and security was observed at LADOT municipal lots within the study area during on-site evaluation. While these lots are currently not priced, enforcement may be needed to discourage length of stay violations and loitering. While resources may be limited to conduct enforcement of free lots, the level of parking enforcement is less critical than the perception to the public of conducting some form of parking compliance. Many jurisdictions that are not able to frequently check their facilities implement targeted enforcement to better establish a sense of enforcement. To be most effective, times of enforcement should be randomized so as not to be predictable. For lots within the study area that may have concerns about vagrancy and security, enforcement may be implemented during evening hours when utilizations are the lowest in order to identify vehicles that are overstaying length of stay requirements.

- Implement targeted enforcement of public off-street lot regulations.
- Install Optical Camera Technology to remotely monitor illegal activity and identify when parking lot maintenance is required.
- Increase lighting levels to provide increased visibility and security.

Off-Street Pricing

*Implement pricing of City-owned off-street lots.*

At present the City does not charge for parking within the four LADOT municipal lots in the study area. With the exception of Lot 640, which was not observed to have utilization rates above 50%, municipal lots in the study area experience peak utilization rates above 90% on weekdays. Lot 621 experiences the highest use with utilization above 80% throughout the day on weekdays and weekends. Typically, target utilization rates for off-street facilities where turnover is less frequent than on-street spaces is between 90-95%. Although current levels of parking utilization within the study area do not indicate an immediate need for pricing, it is recommended that the City consider gradual implementation of off-street pricing in anticipation of future demand. Pricing for off-street lots can be priced below that of on-street spaces in order to incentivize their use (reducing vehicle circulation) and establishing a premium for curb spaces that may be more convenient for customers of businesses.

Employee Parking Program

*Allow qualified local business employees to park in designated off-street facilities exempt from posted regulations during a specific time period with ownership of a permit.*

Many cities have implemented employee parking permit (EPP) programs as a means to move employees of businesses in busy commercial districts from on-street parking spaces to off-street parking facilities. The objective of employee parking programs is to reduce long-term on-street parking in commercial districts and to alleviate traffic congestion in these areas. Typical EPP programs allow qualified business employees to park in designated off-street facilities exempt from posted regulations during a specific time period with ownership of a permit. Ownership of a permit, however, does not guarantee the availability of a parking space. For this reason, it is important not to sell permits far in excess of parking supply. Many conventional EPP programs do not prohibit non-employee parking, but allow the general public to park within the area, subject to posted parking restrictions.
Strong employer support is a crucial component to any successful EPP program. Employers are needed to inform their employees about the program, facilitate participation, and ensure that the program guidelines are adhered to. Employers must also work with City staff to provide feedback and modify the program as needed. It is also important to note that this strategy will be much more effective if enforcement of time limits is enhanced, providing employees with more of an incentive to seek out spaces that allow for longer term parking.

Lot 640, which does not experience utilization rates above 50% and sees significantly low rates of utilization during evenings and weekends may be a potential site for employee permit parking.

**Transportation Demand Management**

*Require TDM Plans to mitigate demand from future developments.*

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plans that require developers to meet site-specific SOV trip reduction targets through mitigation measures have the ability to shift mode shares and reduce parking demand related to new development. The City of San Francisco introduced TDM Plan requirements within its zoning code through adoption of the SF SHIFT Program, which requires new developments of particular scale to mitigate transportation impacts through target based TDM Plans. The program is designed to recognize more significantly impactful forms of TDM as having a greater value in mitigation, but also allows less costly or complicated methods to be used and layered together through a menu of TDM measures.

The City of Los Angeles is currently in the process of developing a draft TDM Ordinance Update and Guidelines that will serve as a tool for the City to require TDM plans for development similar to the SF SHIFT program. Upon adoption of the ordinance, applicable new developments within the study area should be subject to Site Transportation Plan and travel survey requirements.

**Progressive Pricing**

*Price parking according to level of convenience and demand.*

Progressive pricing, or performance-based pricing, is central to an improved parking system. This involves moving from a static pricing system to a demand-based one in which rates are adjusted over time based on data. The goal is to set prices so that approximately 10% of spaces are available at any time. Systems can range from simple to complex, and will likely require some updates to equipment and operations over time.

The simplest way to introduce progressive pricing is a zone-based model which identifies premium, value, and discount zones and then tiers the rates accordingly, based on convenience. More complex models, such as LA Express Park which LADOT operates in Downtown and Westwood, periodically adjust parking rates based on collection and analysis of utilization data. In the case of the study area, metered spaces along Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard would be an example of premium spaces. However, in part due to the abundance of free parking, utilization of these spaces is lower than those on less regulated side streets which suggests the market may not be ready for progressive pricing. Progressive pricing is recommended for long-term consideration within the study area but should not be considered as a priority for implementation.
IMPLEMENTATION

The table below provides next steps, high-level costs, timeframe, and primary leads and partners for the recommended strategies.

**Figure 37  Implementation of Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Leads/Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust time-limits</td>
<td>Relax on-street metered time limits to four hours.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand metered area</td>
<td>Identify under regulated high-utilization block faces near Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard that are primarily non-residential to introduce metered spaces.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared parking</td>
<td>Work with property owners to lease spaces at times when they are underutilized and plan new development to share parking when mixes of uses exhibit different times of peak demand.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Businesses, Property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding and Signage</td>
<td>Replace damaged signage and improve directional wayfinding.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbish City-owned lots</td>
<td>Repave and restripe LADOT lots, perform tree and shrub maintenance.</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance enforcement at City-owned lots</td>
<td>Utilize targeted enforcement techniques and install security cameras and/or additional lighting at LADOT lots.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street pricing</td>
<td>Implement pricing for LADOT lots that experience peak utilization rates above 90%.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>LADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee parking program</td>
<td>Work with businesses, such as retail and restaurants, to develop a program for their employees to park in designated off-street facilities exempt from posted regulations during a specific time period with ownership of a permit.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
<td>Require Site Transportation Plans and Performance Reporting for new development in accordance with the City’s future TDM Ordinance Update.</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Developers, DCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive pricing</td>
<td>Consider zone-based progressive pricing if warranted by future demand.</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>LA Express Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

Parking Survey Analysis
Appendix A  Parking Survey Analysis

Going to Reseda

- The majority of respondents go to Reseda because they are residents and/or shop, run errands, or have appointments there (Figure 38).
- Driving alone is the primary mode of transportation to Reseda. Ninety-six percent get to Reseda by driving alone. However, respondents also reported using other modes, including carpool, walking, bicycling, and public transit (Figure 39).
- The top reasons why respondents do not go to Reseda are a lack of shopping, dining, and/or service destinations, safety, and they cannot find what they need (Figure 40).

Figure 38  Survey - Reasons I Go to Reseda

- 89% I live in or near Reseda
- 54% I shop, run errands, or have appointments in Reseda
- 37% I dine in Reseda
- 9% I work in Reseda
- 5% Other
- 3% I own a business in Reseda
Parking in Reseda

- Most park at free spaces in public parking lots, private parking lots, and on-street unmetered spaces (Figure 41).
- Proximity to one’s destination is the most important factor in choosing where to park (Figure 42). Thus, 85% park less than one block away from their destination (Figure 43).
- One-third of respondents typically park for more than eight hours (Figure 44). Thirty-five percent park for less than one hour.
- Parking takes five minutes to find on an average day and 11 minutes on the worst day.
As shown in Figure 45, residents who have difficulty finding parking in their neighborhood indicated too many residents and non-residents as issues.

Figure 41  Survey - Where did you park today or on the most recent day you drove to Reseda?

Figure 42  Survey - How do you choose where to park?
Figure 43  Survey - How close to your primary destination did you park?

Figure 44  Survey - How long do you typically park for?
### Figure 45 Survey - How is on-street parking in your neighborhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents have problems finding a space because there are too many residents parking on the street</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents sometimes have difficulty because non-residents use much of the on-street parking</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents have difficulty parking on the street</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking is easy to find because parkers are primarily residents of the neighborhood</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents and non-residents park on the street without a problem</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parking is permitted on the street</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure shows the distribution of responses to the survey question about on-street parking. The highest percentage (35%) indicates that residents have problems finding a space because there are too many residents parking on the street. The second highest percentage (26%) shows that residents sometimes have difficulty because non-residents use much of the on-street parking.
Parking Preferences

- As shown in Figure 46, nearly half of respondents prefer to keep time limits the same as opposed to extending (30%) or reducing them (21%).
- The three most desired improvements to parking and access are more off-street parking, better walking conditions, and more on-street parking near destinations (Figure 47).

Figure 46  Survey - Which scenario would you prefer for parking time limits?

Figure 47  Survey - What would improve your parking and access experience?