

Item 5.K: Disposition of 4th/5th/Arizona & Parking Structure 1 (Homeless-Related Housing Negotiations)

Sponsors / Requesting Councilmembers:

City staff housing team; *negotiated with multiple affordable and supportive housing developers*

What the agenda item does:

Authorizes closed-session negotiations to dispose of City-owned downtown parcels and parking assets to affordable and permanent supportive housing developers.

Potential impacts:

Permanent loss of public land and parking assets; increased concentration of homelessness-related services downtown; long-term land use decisions made without public input at the negotiation stage.

Arguments in favor:

Supporters argue City-owned land should be leveraged aggressively to meet affordable housing and homelessness goals, especially given regional housing shortages.

Arguments against / concerns:

Opponents argue the City is permanently giving up scarce public assets, overconcentrating impacts downtown, and bypassing transparent planning and neighborhood engagement. Additionally, **Parking Structure 3 was torn down for affordable housing and human services but project stalled.** City now leases that land for a pickle ball court. Demolishing a parking structure decreased city revenue from paid parking, impacts businesses and downtown community, and impacts tourism. *Why are we removing parking assets for another affordable housing project when the first demolition of Parking Structure 3 failed?*

Questions Council should answer before voting:

- Why downtown again, versus geographic distribution?
- What public assets are being permanently lost?
- How will neighborhood impacts be mitigated?
- What alternatives were considered?
- **Why are we doing this again when the housing project requiring demolition of Parking Structure 3 was unsuccessful?**

- **Why are we doing this when the new city managers revitalization plan explicitly focuses on recovery of the downtown area, which specifically focuses on moving human services out of the concentrated downtown business area?**

Context Residents Need to Know

- **Santa Monica has already removed a downtown public parking structure for affordable housing and human services.** That site was justified to residents as a permanent, high-priority public good.
- **Today, that same land is not serving housing or essential services — it is being rented for pickleball courts.**

Now, Council is again considering:

- Disposing of **another downtown parking structure and adjacent public parcels**
- For homelessness-related or supportive housing
- Via **closed-session negotiations**, before public debate

Residents are reasonably asking:

Why are we doing this again — when the last time did not deliver what was promised?

What's different this time?

Nothing fundamental.

- Same **public asset type** (parking structure / city-owned downtown land)
- Same **justification** (housing + human services urgency)
- Same **process pattern** (negotiation first, public later)
- Same **irreversibility** (once land is gone, it's gone)

What's new?

- The **precedent now exists** of public land being permanently removed from inventory
- And then **repurposed for temporary or revenue uses** unrelated to the original justification

Relevant Historical Context Council Must Address

Previous Council Actions

- Downtown parking structure demolished for affordable housing and human services
- Residents were told the loss of public parking was justified by long-term public benefit

Current Reality

- **The site is now leased for recreational pickleball courts**
- Housing and services are not operating on the site as originally framed

Why This Matters

- Council is again proposing disposal of downtown public land
- Without a candid accounting of what happened last time
- Or why residents should believe the outcome will be different

Questions Council Should Answer Before Voting

Core Accountability Questions

- What lessons were learned from the prior parking structure demolition?
- Why is that site now being rented for pickleball instead of housing or services?
- Was this outcome disclosed to residents at the time of the original vote?
- What guarantees exist that this will not happen again?
- If housing delivery is delayed or fails, what prevents another temporary repurposing?

Process Questions

- Why is the City negotiating disposal of public land again before a public planning process?
- Why are downtown neighborhoods repeatedly asked to absorb asset loss and service concentration?
- What alternative sites were seriously evaluated, and why were they rejected?

Public Comment

30-Second Comment:

Why is downtown again being asked to absorb more homelessness-related housing? What public assets are being permanently lost, and what alternatives were considered?

60-Second Comment:

This item disposes of scarce public land and parking assets downtown for supportive housing. Residents deserve to know why downtown is repeatedly selected, what assets are gone forever, and how neighborhood impacts will be mitigated before these negotiations proceed.