Parking Survey Results

Summary of Survey Results

Staff prepared the survey that was distributed, which is intended to provide a general understanding of the range of opinions of stakeholders in the community. Some stakeholders were critical of the survey as representing a specific point of view. Staff's intent was to simply provide an overview of the parking issues the Planning Commission and City Council are discussing to obtain a broader cross section of public opinion than is obtained through public meetings that generally draw the same stakeholders. There were 447 questionnaires completed. Given that the nighttime population of Culver City is approximately 40,779 and the daytime population is approximately 71,863, it is understood the number of surveys submitted is just a small sample size and is not necessarily representative of the average stakeholder.

Based on the results (below), respondents were primarily Culver City residents (392), with 270 being residents only and the remaining 122 indicated they were also a business owner, architect, design professional, developer, or other of the available categories. Only 55 of the respondents were not Culver City residents. Nearly all (92.4%) respondents utilize a single-occupancy vehicle(s) as a primary mode of transportation, although only 125 of the respondents use this mode exclusively. The next most utilized mode of transportation reported was walking, followed by bicycling.

Of the respondents that indicated they are Culver City business owners, most indicated they were an office use (21 of 53; 39.6%), followed by 'general services' and by 'media production and creative office'. Most business owners responding had a small number of employees, with the majority (28 of 53; 52.8%) ranging between 1 and 5 employees. A majority indicated they have parking for everyone employed and guests/customers (35 of 53; 66%). At the same time, business owners were evenly split between those indicating there is insufficient parking (43.6%) and those indicating adequate parking (43.6%) around their place of business or employment. Further, most (35 of 55, 63.6%) indicated no incentives are provided for use of alternative transportation.

A majority of architects and design professionals (18 of 24; 75%) work on projects in Culver City. Of the development professionals, nearly all worked on just a few projects (between 1 and 5) in Culver City. Most work on commercial and mixed-use projects, with just a few working on residential or industrial. The scale of projects varied but were primarily large-scale commercial (100,001+ sq. ft.), with the next most being medium-scale (30,001-60,000 sq. ft.) commercial. The two respondents that indicated they represented a school or institution did not respond to the corresponding questions (15 through 18) relating to their scale and parking conditions.

Residents responding to the questionnaire live throughout the various neighborhoods in the City, but a majority (18.4%) live in the Park East neighborhood, which includes Carlson Park, followed by the Park West neighborhood (9.9%). Respondents were nearly evenly split between those who feel there is insufficient parking and adequate parking on residential properties; only a few considered that there is too much parking on residential properties. Most residents felt they live in a transit-friendly area and an even higher percentage felt that they live in a neighborhood with adequate mobility. Based on a list of choices given and a ranking methodology, when asked which mobility features residents would like to see in their neighborhood the highest-ranking measure was shuttle bus service, followed by bikeshare, carshare, more frequent transit service, micro-mobility, closer transit stop(s), unbundled parking, and other. (Methodology: points were assigned to each response based on how the respondent ranked each item. Those points were then summed and averaged across all responses and then the choices ranked based on the final average of points).

Most respondents (61%) indicated there is insufficient parking in larger commercial centers, with very few indicating there is too much parking in such centers. Among residents, 62.8% indicated this response, while among non-residents 49% responded the same. For larger commercial centers, most respondents (50.7%) indicated there is an adequate supply of parking; 56.5% of residents and non-residents responded in this manner. However, most non-residents (38%) indicated such centers have too much parking, while only 9.7% of residents agreed with that statement.

Regarding parking reductions, though most respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed (314 to 317 of 447) with reducing parking requirements in general; most (317 of 447) strongly disagreed or disagreed with general parking reductions for residential development. Conversely, only 22 to 23 percent (approximately 100 of 447) respondents agree, somewhat agree, or strongly agree with general parking reductions. A slight, but noticeable, shift is seen when asked about parking reductions for development near transit. Fewer respondents strongly disagree or disagree (222 to 233 of 447), while more somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree with parking reductions for development near transit, than compared to the original prompt. Still, residential development was the least supported for parking reductions even when near transit. Similarly, respondents most (290 of 447, of which 270 are residents) strongly disagreed or disagreed with parking reductions for mobility measures most when associated with residential development. Further, of the respondents agreeing in some way with reductions for mobility measures, most agreed with this in the case of mixed-use development (170 to 195 of 447 respondents, of which 142 to 165 are residents), similar in trend to responses for general reductions and reductions near transit.

Responses to the statements regarding requiring TDM measures for different developments indicate a wider range of sentiment. Although most respondents strongly disagree or disagree with requiring TDM for any of the development types, it is significantly less so than for the parking reduction prompts. In addition, more of the respondents somewhat agree, agree, or strongly agree with requiring TDM measures than those that agree with parking reductions, particularly for large-scale commercial development. Specifically, 222 of 447 respondents disagreed (to some degree) with requiring TDM for large-scale residential development, 198 for large-scale commercial development, and 200 for large-scale mixed-use development; of these respondents 206, 179, and 184 (respectively) are residents. Respondents that agreed in some form with requiring TDM for the 3 development types were 170, 195, and 188 of 447, while 142, 165 and 158, respectively, were residents.

Similarly, responses to the statements regarding implementing parking maximums for different developments indicate a wider range of sentiment, like the prompt regarding TDM. Although most respondents strongly disagree, it is significantly less so than for the parking reductions posed in the prior prompts. In addition, like the previous prompt, the large-scale residential development category received the most responses of strongly opposed. In summary, 140 of the 447 respondents agree (in some form) with implementing parking maximums for large-scale residential development, 142 for large-scale commercial development, and 147 for large-scale mixed-use development, of which 115, 117, and 121 (respectively) are residents. On the other hand, 239 of 447 respondents disagree (in some form) with implementing parking maximums for large-scale residential development, 232 for large-scale commercial development as well as for large-scale mixed-use development, of which 215, 208, and 209 (respectively) are residents.

One trend of note is that for these questions, responses from non-residents were more evenly spread; however, a higher percentage of these respondents favor parking reductions than residents. On the other hand, favorable responses decreased for requiring TDM measures and implementing parking maximums.

Lastly, respondents were asked to rank a preset list about what mobility measure(s) respondents would most like to see in new developments. The highest-ranking measure was bikeshare, followed by carshare, carpool/vanpool, shuttle bus service, ride-hail loading zone, TAP cards, end-of-trip facilities, micro-mobility, unbundled parking, and other. This was based on assigning points to each response based on how the respondent ranked each item; those points were then averaged across all responses and then the choices ranked based on the final average of points.

Survey Results/Responses

Section 1 – General Questions

Question 1 – Please provide your name and email (optional)
Only 197 people provided this information

Question 2 – Please check all that apply to you below.

- I am a Culver City resident (392)
- I am a developer (14)
- I am an architect or design professional (24)
- I am a Culver City business owner (53)
- I am an owner/landlord of commercial property within Culver City (30)
- I am a landlord of residential property within Culver City (54)
- I am an employee at a business located within Culver City (47)
- I represent a school or an institution (2)
- Other (30)

Question 3 – Which option best represents your gender identity?

- Woman (205)
- Man (219)
- Non-binary (3)
- Other (6)
- No response (14)

Question 4 – What is your age range?

- Under 18 (0)
- 18-24 (7)
- 25-34 (29)
- 35-44 (64)
- 45-54 (99)
- 55-64 (103)
- 65+ (145)

Question 5 – What modes of transportation do you regularly use to get around? (check all that apply)
"Regularly" means at least 3 times per week.
Single-Occupancy Vehicle means any type of vehicle whose only occupant is the driver (please note this refers to a status and usage, not the vehicle type)

- Single-Occupancy Vehicle (excluding carshare) – (413)
- Carpool/Vanpool (rideshare) – (26)
- Ridehail services (Uber/Lyft) – (50)
- Shared mobility services (carshare, bikeshare, scooter-share) – (19)

- Bus/Rail – (77)
- Bike – (140)
- Walking – (286)
- Personal micro-mobility (e-bike, e-scooter, skateboard) – (21)
- Other – (15)

Section 2 – Business Owners (If you selected business owner in Question 2 above, please respond to questions 6 through 10 below (otherwise check Not Applicable to Question 6 and go to the next section).

Question 6 – What type of business do you have?

- Automobile sales, auto repair – (0)
- Beauty salon, barber shop, nail salon, spa, etc. – (1)
- Daycare (child, adult) – (0)
- Education – (1)
- Fitness and studios (e.g. art, ballet, yoga, martial arts, etc.) – (0)
- Hotel, motel – (0)
- Manufacturing – (1)
- Media Production and creative office – (5)
- Medical – (1)
- Office (accounting, architect, attorney, etc.) – (21)
- Restaurant and food service (coffee shops, donut shops, juice shops, etc.) – (2)
- Retail (except vehicle sales) – (1)
- Other service (banks, check cashing, dry cleaners, pet daycare, tailor, etc.) – (6)
- Other – (14)

Question 7 – How many people do you employ?

- None – (13)
- 1-5 – (28)
- 6-10 – (7)
- 11-24 – (4)
- 25-49 – (1)
- 50-100 – (0)
- More than 100 – (0)

Question 8 – Do you have parking for everyone employed and guests/customers?

- Yes (35)
- No (17)
- No response (1)

Question 9 – What is your opinion of the current parking supply around your Culver City business or place of employment?

- There is insufficient parking around my business or place of employment – (23)
- There is an adequate supply of parking around my business or place of employment – (23)
- There is too much parking around my business or place of employment – (6)
- No response (1)

Question 10 – Are employees provided with incentives for use of alternative transportation?

- No – (35)
- Yes, I provide transit subsidies (e.g. Tap cards, etc.) – (5)
- Yes, I provide a parking space cash-out program – (1)
- Yes, I provide priority carpool/vanpool parking – (0)
- Yes, I provide other incentives – (6)
- No response (6)

Section 3 – Architects, Design Professionals, and Developers (If you selected architect, design professional, or developer, in Question 2 above, please respond to questions 11 through 14 below (otherwise check Not Applicable and go to the next section).)

Question 11 – If you are an architect or other design professional, do you work on projects in Culver City?

- Yes – (18)
- No – (6)

Question 12 – If you are a developer, how many projects have you developed in Culver City?

- None – (2)
- 1-5 – (12)
- 6-10 – (1)
- 11-20 – (0)
- 21-35 – (0)
- More than 35 – (0)

Question 13 – What types of projects have you developed? (check all that apply)

- Residential – (3)
- Commercial – (11)
- Industrial (manufacturing, warehouse, distribution, etc.) – (1)
- Mixed-Use (residential with commercial) – (7)

Question 14 – How large are the projects you've developed? (select all that apply)

- Residential: 0-3 dwelling units – (2)
- Residential: 4-9 dwelling units – (0)
- Residential: 10+ dwelling units – (4)
- Commercial: up to 5,000 sq. ft. – (0)
- Commercial: 5,001 – 15,000 sq. ft. – (3)
- Commercial: 15,001 – 30,000 sq. ft. – (1)
- Commercial: 30,001 – 60,000 sq. ft. – (5)
- Commercial: 60,001 – 100,000 sq. ft. – (2)

- Commercial: 100,001+ – (9)
- Mixed-Use: containing up to 10 dwelling units – (0)
- Mixed-Use: containing 11 to 35 dwelling units – (1)
- Mixed-use: containing 36 to 65 dwelling units – (1)
- Mixed-use: containing 65 to 100 dwelling units – (0)
- Mixed-use: containing 101+ dwelling units – (4)

Section 4 – Schools and Institutions (If you represent a school or an institution, in Question 2 above, please respond to questions 15 through 18 below (otherwise check Not Applicable to Question 15 and go to the next section).)

Question 15 – How many people are employed?

- 0-10
- 11-24
- 25-49
- 50-100
- More than 100

Question 16 – Are employees provided with parking?

- Yes, parking is provided free of charge
- Yes, parking is provided for a fee
- No

Question 17 – Are students provided with parking?

- Yes, parking is provided free of charge
- Yes, parking is provided for a fee
- No

Question 18 – Do you have a robust bus/van/shuttle program?

- Yes
- No

The two respondents indicating they represented a school or institution did not respond to questions 15 through 18 in the corresponding section above.

Section 5 – Culver City Residents (If you selected 'Culver City resident' in Question 2 above, please respond to questions 19 through 23 below (otherwise check Not Applicable to Question 19 and go to the next section).)

Question 19 – What Culver City neighborhood do you live in?

- Blair Hills – (7)
- Blanco/Culver Crest – (29)
- Clarkdale – (26)
- Culver West – (18)
- Downtown – (19)
- Expo/TOD District – (5)
- Fox Hills – (13)
- Lucerne/Higuera – (23)
- McLaughlin – (12)
- McManus – (17)

- Park East (including Carlson Park) – (72)
- Park West – (39)
- Studio Village – (29)
- Sunkist Park – (32)
- Washington Culver (incl Studio Estates) – (15)
- Other – (34)

Question 20 – What is your opinion of the current parking supply in your Culver City residential neighborhood?

- There is insufficient parking on residential properties – (185)
- There is an adequate supply of parking on residential properties – (177)
- There is too much parking on residential properties – (27)
- No response – (3)

Question 21 – Do you feel you live in a transit-friendly area? (An area that is comfortable, safe, and convenient for transit riders)

- Yes – (226)
- No – (157)
- No response – (9)

Question 22 – Do you live in a neighborhood with adequate mobility (such as bike lanes, etc.)?

- Yes – (227)
- No – (106)
- No response – (9)

Question 23 – If you could have more transportation infrastructure and/or mobility measure(s) near or at your place of residence, which would you most like to see? Please rank the following options (1=higher priority and 10=lower priority):

1. Bikeshare
2. Carshare
3. Micro-mobility (electric bikes/scooters, skateboard parking, etc.)
4. Shuttle bus service
5. Unbundled parking (parking spaces leased separately from the residential unit)
6. Closer transit stop(s)
7. More frequent transit service
8. Other

The above shows the final rankings after participants responded to this prompt.

Section 6 – Parking and Mobility

Question 24 – What is your opinion of the current parking supply for buildings along commercial corridors? (Examples of commercial corridors include but are not limited to Washington Blvd., Sepulveda Blvd., Culver Blvd., and Jefferson Blvd.)

- There is insufficient parking on properties along the City's commercial corridors – (273; 246 are residents)
- There is an adequate supply of parking along the City's commercial corridors – (133; 119 are residents)
- There is too much parking along the City's commercial corridors – (41; 27 are residents)

Question 25 – What is your opinion of the current parking supply for buildings in larger commercial centers? (Examples of commercial centers include the Westfield Mall, Culver Center, and Studio Village Shopping Center.)

- There is insufficient parking in larger commercial centers – (161)
- There is an adequate supply of parking in larger commercial centers – (227)
- There is too much parking in larger commercial centers – (59)

Question 26 – Please rate the following statements. I support reducing parking requirements for:

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
All new residential development	Resident	262	31	24	20	17	38
	Non-res	18	6	3	1	8	17
All new commercial development	Resident	247	43	30	16	19	37
	Non-res	19	5	3	2	7	19
All new mixed-use (commercial with residential) development	Resident	252	39	26	16	21	38
	Non-res	17	7	3	2	6	20

- Item 1: 62.6%, 8.3%, 6.3%, 4.9%, 5.6%, 12.3% - Most strongly disagree
- Item 2: 59.5%, 10.7%, 7.4%, 4%, 5.8%, 12.5% - Most strongly disagree
- Item 3: 60.2%, 10.3%, 6.5%, 4%, 6%, 13% - Most strongly disagree

Question 27 – Please rate the following statements. I support reducing parking requirements for:

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
All new residential development if within close proximity to transit	Resident	218	54	24	29	20	47
	Non-res	15	5	3	3	6	23
All new commercial development if within close proximity to transit	Resident	208	51	27	34	23	49
	Non-res	14	6	4	2	6	23
All new mixed-use (commercial with residential) development if within close proximity to transit	Resident	211	50	24	38	22	47
	Non-res	14	6	4	4	3	24

- Item 1: 52.1%, 13.2%, 6%, 7.2%, 5.8%, 15.7% - Most strongly disagree
- Item 2: 49.7%, 12.8%, 6.9%, 8.1%, 6.5%, 16.1% - Most strongly disagree, but not the majority
- Item 3: 50.3%, 12.5%, 6.3%, 9.4%, 5.6%, 15.9% - Most strongly disagree

Question 28 – Please rate the following statements. I support reducing parking requirements for:

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
All new residential development if the project incorporates mobility measures	Resident	215	56	24	24	30	43
	Non-res	15	4	3	7	7	19
All new commercial development if the project incorporates mobility measures	Resident	201	54	35	32	24	46
	Non-res	15	4	3	9	6	18
All new mixed-use (commercial with residential) development if the project incorporates mobility measures	Resident	210	46	28	35	27	46
	Non-res	15	4	4	9	5	18

- Item 1: 51.5%, 13.4%, 6%, 6.9%, 8.3%, 13.9% - Most strongly disagree
- Item 2: 48.3%, 13%, 8.5%, 8.5%, 7.4%, 14.3% - Most strongly disagree, but not the majority
- Item 3: 50.3%, 11.2%, 7.2%, 8.9%, 8.1%, 14.3% - Most strongly disagree

Question 29 – Please rate the following statements. I support requiring Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures for:

(TDM is the alteration of travel behavior through programs of incentives, services, and policies. TDM addresses alternatives to single occupancy vehicles such as carpooling and vanpooling, and changes in work schedules that move trips out of the peak period or eliminate them altogether.

Examples of "large-scale" development include, but are not limited to, the following:
Residential: Multi-unit residential (10 or more dwelling units)
Commercial: Platform, 8777 Washington Blvd
Mixed-use: Ivy Station, Access Culver City, the Haven, the Oliver, the Lucky)

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
New large-scale residential development	Resident	163	38	49	40	42	60
	Non-res	16	5	6	6	10	12
New large-scale commercial development	Resident	147	32	48	39	58	68
	Non-res	14	2	9	7	8	15
New large-scale mixed-use (commercial with residential) development	Resident	151	33	50	35	56	67
	Non-res	14	2	9	9	6	15

- Item 1: 40%, 9.9%, 12.3%, 10.3%, 11.6%, 16.1% - Most strongly disagree, but not the majority
- Item 2: 36%, 7.6%, 12.8%, 10.3%, 14.8%, 18.6% - Most strongly disagree, but not the majority
- Item 3: 36.9%, 7.8%, 13.2%, 9.8%, 13.9%, 18.3% - Most strongly disagree, but not the majority

Question 30 – Please rate the following statements. Please rate the following statement. I support parking maximums for:
(Parking maximums are caps on parking, whether setting a maximum rate by use or a maximum on surplus parking.)

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
New large-scale residential development	Resident	174	41	62	29	31	55
	Non-res	17	7	6	5	7	13
New large-scale commercial development	Resident	166	42	67	26	35	56
	Non-res	17	7	6	3	8	14
New large-scale mixed-use (commercial with residential) development	Resident	169	40	62	29	35	57
	Non-res	17	6	6	4	9	13

- Item 1: 42.7%, 10.7%, 15.2%, 7.6%, 8.5%, 15.2% - Most strongly disagree, but not the majority
- Item 2: 40.9%, 11%, 16.3%, 6.5%, 9.6%, 15.7% - Most strongly disagree, but not the majority
- Item 3: 41.6%, 10.3%, 15.2%, 7.4%, 9.8%, 15.7% - Most strongly disagree

Question 31 – What mobility measure(s) would you most like to see in new developments? Please rank the following options (1=higher priority and 10=lower priority):

1. Bikeshare
2. Carshare
3. Carpool/vanpool
4. End-of-trip facilities and other amenities (e.g., showers, changing rooms, clothes lockers, pet relief areas, bicycle repair, ATMs)
5. Ride-hail loading zone
6. Micro-mobility (electric bikes/scooters, skateboard parking, etc.)
7. Shuttle bus service
8. TAP cards for residents and/or employees
9. Unbundled parking (parking spaces leased separately from residential unit or commercial tenant space)
10. Other

The above shows the final rankings after participants responded to this prompt.