



Safe storage and parking lots: anti-homeless laws and homeless service spaces in Los Angeles

Faiza Moatasim

To cite this article: Faiza Moatasim (2023): Safe storage and parking lots: anti-homeless laws and homeless service spaces in Los Angeles, Urban Geography, DOI: [10.1080/02723638.2023.2169502](https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2023.2169502)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2023.2169502>



Published online: 23 Jan 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Safe storage and parking lots: anti-homeless laws and homeless service spaces in Los Angeles

Faiza Moatasim 

School of Architecture, University of Southern California, USA

ABSTRACT

A new architecture that provides essential services (like property storage and vehicle parking) to unhoused people now exists in cities like Los Angeles, where thousands of people live on streets and sidewalks. This paper shows how homeless storage spaces are historically linked to mandatory “homeless sweeps” and laws that restrict the amount of personal property an unhoused person can legally keep. Similarly, the paper highlights how officially designated parking lots for people who live in their cars and vans paradoxically attempt to provide secure parking for unhoused people in a city that prohibits vehicle dwelling in other, safer parts of the city. Together, these insights help establish new homeless storage and parking spaces as products of institutional mechanisms that criminalize homelessness. Awareness of this history is critical to developing compassionate homeless policy without punitive undertones and creating built environments that preserve human dignity and reduce the stigma of homelessness.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 18 November 2021
Accepted 5 January 2023

KEYWORDS

Homelessness; services; Los Angeles; criminalization

Spaces of homelessness in advanced capitalist nations mostly include temporary shelters, and encampments, and permanent housing for the unhoused. But in cities like Los Angeles (LA), safe parking lots and storage facilities constitute a new architecture of homelessness that offers essential services to unhoused people. While these facilities maintain an external anonymity to protect privacy of their unhoused patrons (McNeil & Guirguis-Younger, 2014), they incorporate design criteria rooted in the stigmatization of homelessness. For instance, the Bin provides the unhoused residents of Skid Row with a sixty-gallon plastic bin – just like the ones used for collecting household waste in the United States – to store their clothes, medications, documents, and other valuables.¹ A program called Safe Parking LA manages parking lots and provides legal parking and outreach services to individuals and families who live in their vehicles. But how did a bin designed to contain household waste find its way into support facilities for people experiencing homelessness? Despite the abundance of vacant parking spaces in Los Angeles at night, why is it that only a few parking areas can legally accommodate unhoused residents? This paper explores these questions by tracing the history of homeless parking lots and storage facilities in Los Angeles. It establishes homeless service

CONTACT Faiza Moatasim  faiza.moatasim@gmail.com  School of Architecture, University of Southern California, 850 Bloom Walk, Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA

© 2023 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

spaces for parking and storage as the spatial manifestations of municipal laws that prohibit the unhoused from using public spaces. This paper demonstrates that, despite providing essential relief to people experiencing homelessness, service spaces for homeless parking and storage embody institutional anxieties and biases against the unhoused.

There is a long-standing cultural association within Europe and North America between spaces of poverty and danger, trash, and disease. Places where impoverished populations live historically have been seen as unhygienic and unsanitary areas, as breeding grounds for both immorality and the outbreak of contagious diseases. Nineteenth-century accounts of the insanitary and cramped living conditions of working-class neighborhoods in industrial cities in advanced capitalist nations declared them as places of crime and disease; these associations helped establish public-health measures and policing as high priorities in modern city-planning ideals (Booth, 1889; Engels, 1892; Riis, 1890). Today, disease metaphors like “epidemic” continue to be used to describe the rising rate of homelessness in cities like LA, and places like Skid Row are routinely reported as dangerous and the epicenter of crime, disease, and contagion in the city.² Because of these negative associations of the spaces that the unhoused occupy in a city, the control of homeless bodies and behaviors – often through punitive measures – emerges as one of the main official responses to managing homelessness.

The policing and criminalization of homeless bodies and behaviors in urban space is thus a dominant theme in existing research on poverty management in advanced capitalist nations (Amster, 2003; Feldman, 2004; Gowan, 2002). The “regulation of homelessness,” Forrest Stuart explains, “is spatially contingent” (2004, p. 1912). In general, management of homelessness in urban areas entails a spatial purification process that forcibly displaces unhoused people from prime locations and contains them in undesirable parts of the city (Davis, 1990; Dear & Wolch, 1987; McNeil & Guirguis-Younger, 2014). Moreover, policing in “marginal spaces” where homeless bodies are tolerated works to discipline and transform unhoused individuals into “sober, self-governing and responsible citizens” (Stuart, 2014, p. 1911). Homeless service providers like shelters and charities can sometimes facilitate the capitalist urban revitalization processes by working with the police to displace homeless populations from desirable parts of the city (Hennigan & Speer, 2019). Antonin Margier terms this displacement of unhoused people from public spaces to spaces of care as the “compassionate invisibilization of homelessness” (2021).

But the policing and regulation of unhoused people continues beyond urban public areas in spaces reserved for homeless care and service. Existing studies on homeless service spaces has warned against the idealized notion of “spaces of care,” as they may be experienced by some as “spaces of fear” (Boyd et al., 2016; Hennigan & Speer, 2019; Johnsen et al., 2005). Research on homeless shelters in particular has highlighted how negative social perceptions about homelessness restrict the construction of homeless shelters in undesirable areas and how shelters function as sites of containment and control (Brinegar, 2003; Wasserman & Clair, 2010; Wright, 1997). Moreover, research on sanctioned tent encampments in American cities highlights their paradoxical function as “‘safe spaces’ where the homeless, to varying degrees, have some level of autonomy,” and as spaces that complement exclusionary policies that neutralize “the ‘homeless threat’ across the city” (Herring, 2014, p. 306; Herring & Lutz, 2015, p. 698; Sparks, 2017). The regulation and criminalization of homeless bodies and behaviors is not

limited to activities that take place *within* spaces of care; that regulation can be materially manifested in urban built environments. What remains unexplored in existing research is how anti-homeless laws and procedures can also *rationalize* the development of new service spaces, for instance, those facilities in which unhoused people seek essential services for a few hours a day. The gap in research on new transitional spaces becomes critical when we consider the important role that community-based facilities and services play in mitigating the impact of homelessness.

Lee et al. (2010) identify “shelter and service usage” as one of the “coping strategies” that the unhoused depend upon for their everyday survival. Community and shelter-based services are an essential component of homeless policy in advanced capitalist nations like the United States. For instance, homeless services are an integral feature of the Continuum of Care model, which is based on a stepwise housing process that offers outreach services, temporary shelter, and transitional housing to unhoused people before placing them in permanent housing or permanent supportive housing (housing that comes with supportive services like case management, rental subsidy, and health and behavioral care). Unhoused populations rely heavily on community and shelter-based services even in cities like Los Angeles that are now transitioning to the Housing First model, which is based on placing the unhoused directly into permanent or permanent supportive housing without having them first meet any prerequisites (Hennigan, 2017; Padgett et al., 2016). Non-housing transitional service spaces for the unhoused, including soup kitchens, mail delivery, parking, storage, and personal hygiene spaces, thus play an important role in mitigating the impact of homelessness, especially in places where the supply of permanent housing and temporary shelters for the unhoused is extremely limited.

In many large American cities, new “spatial and temporal structures designed to regulate and manage the spillover costs associated with so-called disruptive populations” are now commonplace (DeVerteuil et al., 2009, p. 652). Geoff DeVerteuil uses the term “post-revanchist city” to describe how unhoused populations are “grudgingly” being supported, mainly through taxpayer housing initiatives in cities like Los Angeles since the 2010s (2019). This recent trend marks a shift from Neil Smith’s “revanchist city” concept, which describes the processes of criminalization and banishment of the unhoused from public spaces in cities like New York and Los Angeles in the 1990s (1996; see also Davis, 1990). But a shift from revanchism to post-revanchism, through increased supportive measures like outreach practices and new residential and service spaces, does not indicate an end to punitive practices (see also Margier, 2021). This paper shows that the motivations and ideologies underlying punitive measures can live on in new material forms and guises, such as in the architecture of supportive spaces that provide essential services to the unhoused. It attempts to highlight that homeless storage and parking are not simply transitional spaces where essential services are offered; they are spatial responses to accommodate essential living needs *after* they have been outlawed from other places.

This paper moves from an overview of homeless services in the United States to a historical analysis of the relationship between municipal laws and procedures and storage facilities and parking spaces for unhoused people in Los Angeles. It is based on archival and ethnographic research conducted in Los Angeles over four months in 2021 and two months in 2022. I traced the history of municipal laws and the development of storage

and parking spaces using LA City Council files, public records, relevant municipal codes, and ordinances since the 1930s, and news reports. To develop a deeper understanding of LA's homeless parking and storage programs, I interviewed senior officials at three non-profit organizations: Chrysalis (the Bin), and Safe Parking LA, and Central City East Association (CCEA). I followed up the interviews with visits to several Safe Parking LA sites. While I was not authorized access to the Bin, I observed their buildings from the outside and consulted online newspaper reports to gain a visual understanding of their interior spaces. I also visited two Navigation Centers, which the City of Los Angeles built around 2020 to offer homeless transitional services including storage spaces that are similar in design and functionality to the Bin.³ I interviewed site managers at the two Navigation Centers to learn about their routine operations. Conversation with a city official involved in the development of LA's first Navigation Center helped trace its history in the context of LA's recent investment in homeless housing and services. I interviewed two architects involved in the construction of different Navigation Centers to learn about their design approaches and the constraints associated with these projects. I asked the site managers, architects, and city official why trash bins were used in the design of the Navigation Centers and how they felt about this use. To understand the routine displacement of unhoused people because of the mandatory street and sidewalk clean-ups, I interviewed two volunteers with a coalition of community organizers called Street Watch LA. Street Watch LA volunteers routinely track, observe, and document LA Sanitation's clean-up drives (aka "homeless sweeps") that take place all over the city. I also watched online videos of the homeless sweeps to learn about how sanitation workers and the police carry out these clean-up drives. By examining the development of homeless parking and storage facilities in the light of the laws and procedures that necessitate their existence, this paper provides fresh insights into how the criminalization of unhoused bodies and behaviors forms the basis of a new architecture of homelessness. These insights into the biases embedded in the design of existing homeless spaces can help city officials, designers, and service providers to develop service facilities that are not seemingly guided by the goal of erasing and containing the signs of homelessness, but that support everyday activities and preserve the dignity of the unhoused.

Homeless assistance

The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 (renamed the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act in 2000) paved the way for the development of homeless emergency services in the United States. The act included support for emergency food and shelter, child and adult education, job training, health care, and mental-health and substance-abuse services, in addition to transitional and permanent housing. This act was a part of deinstitutionalization measures that began after the Second World War and entailed a shift in the treatment of the mentally ill, vulnerable, and incarcerated from long-term centralized institutional settings (like asylums, psychiatric hospitals, penitentiaries, and orphanages) to less restrictive and socially integrated settings (like family homes, community-based shelters, and clinics).

While progressive social reformers and service professionals advocated deinstitutionalization as a humane approach to address the diverse needs of vulnerable individuals, many governments found the shift from centralized institutions to community-based

facilities to be cost effective, and hence, more desirable. But government methods of enacting deinstitutionalization measures in places like the United States contributed to an increase in the rate of homelessness among vulnerable populations, as well as the spatial segregation and containment of unhoused populations in many cities (Dear & Wolch, 1987; Johnson, 1990; Lamb, 1984).

The inadequate implementation of deinstitutionalization left many vulnerable people to “fend for themselves” in inner-city ghettos where affordable housing and other forms of support networks were already available (Dear & Wolch, 1987, p. 65). Moreover, in cities across the United States, new health and housing services for the vulnerable, unhoused, and mentally disabled (replacing centralized institutions) were mostly built in inner-city or industrial areas, which resulted in the creation of what Dear and Wolch (1987) refer to as “service-dependent ghettos.” McNeil and Guirguis-Younger explain that homeless facilities are sited in marginal areas because of their increased “visibility and ... accessibility to clients and potential clients” and “reduced community opposition” (2014, pp. 240–241). Proximity to vulnerable people and lack of resistance from the larger community make inner-city ghettos (as opposed to wealthier neighborhoods and suburbs) attractive sites for the placement of various community clinics and outreach facilities (Dear & Wolch, 1987; McNeil & Guirguis-Younger, 2014; Von Mahs, 2013; Wright, 1997). Von Mahs explains that warehousing and containment of the unhoused in the “most impoverished parts of town” lead to undesirable effects like shame, worsened drug and alcohol addictions, and segregation from the larger community (2013, p. 89). Skid Row in downtown LA similarly developed along the lines of a service-dependent ghetto, with the largest geographical concentration of homeless services and unhoused people in the city (approximately 6% of LA County’s total unhoused population in 2022) (LAHSA, 2022b).

While homeless services remain concentrated in the Skid Row area, two new kinds of service spaces have developed in different parts of the city since the 2010s: spaces that allow unhoused people to store personal belongings, and parking facilities where they can sleep in their cars at night. The proliferation of new homeless storage and parking areas in LA should not be interpreted as proof that the city has shifted its approach from one of harassment to one of care. These new spaces arose because of changing policy measures that paradoxically prohibited homeless actions while investing heavily in new supportive facilities. Both Safe Parking Program and Navigation Centers (with storage, shower, laundry, and outreach) are funded from Proposition HHH, a \$1.2 billion bond measure that LA voters passed in 2016 to fund homeless housing and services (Council City of Los Angeles, 2016).

But around the same time that the city was investing in service spaces and housing for the unhoused, city council members were busy creating or amending laws that made it illegal for people to live in their vehicles or store their belongings on city streets and sidewalks. Below, I focus on the history of two municipal ordinances that criminalize homeless storage and vehicle dwelling in LA (LAMC 56.11 and LAMC 85.02, respectively). Coincidentally, Venice Beach council members initiated two key motions that resulted in the passing of these ordinances (Motion by Pat Russel, 1983 and Motion by Mike Bonin, 2014). Venice Beach is an iconic LA neighborhood that, since the 1980s, has attracted both affluent gentrifiers and people rendered homeless through poverty and disabilities. Venice and other affluent neighborhoods like Santa Monica, Hollywood,

and Downtown now have a visibly high number of people living on their streets and sidewalks because of high costs of living, soaring property values, unemployment, poverty, and inadequate support for mental health and substance abuse in the city (DeVerteuil, 2019). To manage homelessness in their fast-gentrifying neighborhood, Venice officials developed legislative mechanisms that gave police the tools to displace unhoused people from streets and sidewalks or confiscate their belongings, not just in Venice, but all over the city (Deener, 2012; Fredriksen, 2021).

Responding to the new laws that resulted in their routine harassment, groups of unhoused people and their allies took city officials to court. While the courts upheld the constitutional rights of unhoused people, city officials responded by developing new procedures *and* spaces that allowed people to store their belongings and sleep in their vehicles in designated areas. But outside these assigned spaces, unhoused people continue to be penalized for vehicle dwelling or storing their property on streets and sidewalks. Extending Wolch and DeVerteuil's (2003) study on how poverty management strategies end up contributing to the production of landscapes of poverty, the following sections show how new service spaces have arisen precisely as spatialized responses to anti-homeless policies.

A place to store

Everybody understands the different colors of our trash receptacles? If its gray, it means people are using it to store their stuff, blue recycle, green mulch, black just regular trash ... [T]hese have been highly successful, people love 'em, 'cause they can put their IDs, their valuables, whatever, and then go off to ... medical appointments, their jobs.⁴

Imagine storing all your personal belongings in a sixty-gallon plastic waste bin, similar to the kind that housed Americans put out on the curb every week for recycling and trash collection (Figure 1). In Los Angeles, trash bins are repurposed as storage containers for unhoused people to store their clothes, medicines, documents, and other valuables. The Mayor's statement above highlights the use of a trash bin as a storage container for the unhoused as an institutional practice; the city has a dedicated color to differentiate personal storage bins for unhoused residents from bins that housed residents use for discarded things like trash, mulch, and recyclables.

The idea of a homeless storage space using trash bins first developed when members of a local not-for-profit business corporation, Central City East Association (CCEA), established a storage facility called the Check In Center (CIC) for the unhoused in Skid Row in December 2002 (BID, 2002). CCEA administers a downtown business improvement district (BID), which spans about half of the Skid Row area. According to a CCEA's senior official, property and business owners associated with CCEA at the time came up with the idea of a free "Check In Center" as a solution to the problem of unhoused people storing their belongings on the sidewalks in front of their businesses in the BID (Interview with CCEA's senior official, 2021).

But CCEA did not create a homeless storage space *only* to provide an essential service to the unhoused in the area; CCEA had been involved in many instances of harassment of unhoused people (Stop LAPD Spying Coalition, 2021). A few months before it established the Check In Center, CCEA had even settled with a group of unhoused residents



Figure 1. Storage bins in a LA Navigation Center. Photograph by author.

after the latter filed a class action law-suit claiming that CCEA's private security guards routinely harassed, and detained them, and confiscated their personal belongings (Cervantes v. International Security, 2002; Dozier, 2019, p. 184). The Check In Center thus developed as an architectural response to the settlement and numerous complaints against CCEA's staff for removing the belongings of unhoused people from the BID area.

To set up the storage center, a CCEA board member donated a 20,000 sf warehouse on East Seventh street in the Skid Row area (Gold, 2009; Interview with CCEA's senior official, 2021). Support from the City of Los Angeles came in the form of trash cans donated as storage bins, while CCEA paid for the services of a non-profit organization called Chrysalis to manage the facility (Interview with CCEA's senior official, 2021). CCEA and Chrysalis developed a new system to manage this first-of-its-kind Check In Center for the unhoused. Trash bins in blue, black, or green were numbered and stored in neat rows in the large warehouse building (Lopez, 2019). Users had to check in at the front reception area with a staff member who would retrieve the assigned bin from the warehouse to a designated area where people could go through their bins. A

changing area was later built for people who needed to change clothes for school or work. Because of the high demand for storage bins among people living on streets and sidewalks or residents of nearby single room occupancy (SRO) housing, CCEA maintained an active waiting list and added more bins to the warehouse. As long as users checked in at the front reception once a week to renew their storage bins, they were allowed to keep their belongings there for free.

Homeless storage facilities offer an invaluable service to people living on streets and sidewalks by providing them a safe and legal place to store their belongings. Yet, as Blomley et al. argue, “the governance of personal possessions often becomes a form of governance of people through things” (Blomley et al., 2020, p. 173). This is true in the management of homelessness in Los Angeles, where the storage of personal belongings of the unhoused has been historically associated with the draconian practice of homeless encampment cleanups. Notoriously referred to as “homeless sweeps,” the mandatory cleanups typically involve the confiscation and destruction of personal belongings of the unhoused, as they are displaced from their campsites while the occupied streets and sidewalks are restored by the sanitation staff and the police to their desirable function, that is, for the movement of people and not for shelter.

The practice of immediately destroying seized personal property belonging to the unhoused went on unabated until 2012, when a court injunction established a requirement that the city hold unhoused people’s belongings for 90 days, thus providing an opportunity for retrieval, before it could discard the belongings (Lavan v. City of Los Angeles, 2012). The plaintiffs were nine unhoused residents of the Skid Row area who had momentarily left their personal belongings on the sidewalks as they went to eat, shower, use rest rooms, or attend court. Even though they had stored their belongings in wheeled carts provided respectively by two social service organizations (Everyone Deserves a Roof and Hippie’s Kitchen), the city treated their personal property as abandoned and destroyed it immediately.⁵ The court noted in its injunction that the city destroyed the property of unhoused people even when they themselves and others were present to explain that the property was not abandoned.⁶

After the court decided that it is illegal for the city to confiscate and immediately destroy the personal belongings of unhoused people, the city partnered with CCEA to develop new procedures that involved the storage of seized homeless property for 90 days in its Skid Row Check In Center (Dozier, 2019, p. 189). The Check In Center thus became a space in the city for both the voluntary and involuntary storage of personal belongings. Around 2014, the City of Los Angeles decided to expand the storage program to another location and asked CCEA to manage the new facility (BID, 2014a). After consideration, CCEA decided to hand over the storage center to the city and the non-profit Chrysalis to manage an expanded program (BID, 2014b). As CCEA’s senior official recalls,

We started out at 500 [bins] and at the end it was 1,500, it was a lot of responsibility, and a lot of liability. While we were happy to help shelterless individuals with a place to store their belongings, we were also happy to hand it over to people who could take it further. (2021)

After the city and Chrysalis took over the administration of the homeless storage program, it was relocated to another warehouse building in the Skid Row area and was renamed “The Bin” (BID, 2014c; Interview with CCEA’s senior official, 2021).

The Bin is a large white building that spans an entire block in the Skid Row area. The main entrance to the storage space is accessed through a part of the parking area that is enclosed in a high wall and fence system. Due to an increased demand for storage spaces among people experiencing homelessness, two additional Bin storage facilities were subsequently opened in nearby locations. With the support from the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), Chrysalis now manages over 2,500 bins, which the organization refers to as “safe storage spaces,” in three storage facilities in the Downtown Los Angeles area, mostly serving the unhoused residents of Skid Row (Chrysalis, 2020).

The Bin serves as a model for other homeless storage programs in the city. Since 2020, the City of Los Angeles has inaugurated three Navigation Centers (in the North Hollywood, San Pedro, and South Los Angeles areas), facilities developed specifically to address the essential needs of unhoused populations. Navigation Centers offer people experiencing homelessness access to toilets, showers, laundry machines, and storage for their personal belongings, and connect them to housing and community services through onsite case managers. It’s no coincidence that personal storage spaces in these Navigation Centers are equipped with gray 60-gallon, plastic-wheeled bins. As LA’s mayor explained at the inauguration of a Navigation Center, gray is now the officially designated color for trash bins that are used as homeless storage containers.

Undoubtedly, storage facilities like the Bin and Homeless Navigation Centers help unhoused people shed obvious signs of homelessness by keeping their belongings in a safe place as they go to work, school, medical appointments, or attend to other commitments. Their usefulness is evident in the positive feedback of unhoused users of safe storage spaces posted in online videos, Google reviews, and the fact that the storage bins at the Bin and Navigation Centers are always occupied. But how does a bin designed for storing household waste find its way into a supportive facility for people experiencing homelessness? What can service spaces like the Bin teach us about the management of homelessness in LA?

One way to answer these questions is to try to understand storage spaces like the Bin as an architectural representation of a municipal law, Section 56.11, which prohibits the storage of personal possessions on public spaces beyond an authorized limit. In the first edition (1936) of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), Section 56.11, titled “Sidewalks, Merchandise and Baggage,” declared it illegal for any person to “leave or permit to remain, any merchandise, baggage, or any article of personal property” on sidewalks and parkways. Based on the language in the code, the law was presumably intended to discourage obstruction of sidewalks and parkways by businesses, to avoid fire hazards.⁷

Section 56.11 remained unchanged in subsequent editions of the LAMC until 2014, when the City Council approved a motion (initiated by a councilmember representing Venice) to revise this law to better address the issue of “pronounced visual blight and impeded access for pedestrians, especially for the disabled” caused by the storage of personal property on sidewalks in the city (Motion by Mike Bonin, 2014). The outcome of this motion was a new ordinance in 2015 that repealed Section 56.11 in its entirety and replaced it with a new section called “Storage of Personal Property.”⁸

The motion *prima facie* supported “pedestrianism,” a concept that recognizes “the sidewalk as a site for circulation [of pedestrians], not for rights [of the unhoused]” (Blomley, 2010, p. 85). But the legislative intent of the new law was frank about its

anti-homeless bias, since it was intended to address the “misappropriation of public areas for personal use.” Moreover, the new Section 56.11 declared the storage of personal property on public areas completely illegal. It also permitted the removal and impoundment of stored personal property by the City after the issuance of a 24-hour written notice of removal (either posted on the encampment site or served directly to unhoused people). The City was allowed to discard seized property if it was not claimed from a storage facility after a 90-day period. The 90-day grace period provision was included to address the above mentioned 2012 preliminary court injunction that required the city to maintain seized property from homeless individuals in a secure location for a 90-day period before destroying it (*Lavan v. City of Los Angeles*, 2012).

Section 56.11 was amended again in 2016 to “balance the needs” of the unhoused and housed populations.⁹ This amendment was supported in part by the Mayor of Los Angeles, who called for a revised law that may “enable smarter enforcement, ensure more compassionate treatment of homeless Angelenos, and strengthen the City’s ability to withstand legal challenge” (Mayor of Los Angeles, 2015).¹⁰ In the amended law, “compassion” toward unhoused populations, in particular their need to store personal belongings, took the form of allowing unhoused people a limited amount of stuff that could be held legally in public spaces.

The law now differentiates between two types of personal property: “Essential Personal Property” and “Excess Personal Property.” The two categories are based on a volumetric calculation of property that may be legally stored in public spaces. “Essential” personal property is allowed “two cubic feet in volume.” The municipal code gives the example of “a backpack” to illustrate the total volume that can be considered essential personal property while “excess” personal property is property that does not “fit in a 60-gallon container with the lid closed.” Even though unhoused people are limited to a backpack for their essentials, additional property may be stored on public streets and sidewalks as long as it remains under the excess personal property limits.¹¹

I’d like to consider the official choice in citing a standard 60-gallon container with a lid – identical to a standard household plastic waste bin – as the measure for what is considered an acceptable volume of possessions for an unhoused person to have at any given time.¹² The way that the authors of the municipal code have used a waste bin as a measure for permitted excess personal property implies the suitability of the unhoused people to store their valuables in a container designed for storing discarded waste generated by people living in houses and apartments. With the possible exception of individuals who suffer from hoarding disorders, unhoused people are not confused about the distinction between their private property and trash. But the law seems to recognize personal property of unhoused people in the same way that trash is supposed to be stored in a standard waste container, with the lid closed. Section 56.11 also defines a “storage facility” for the unhoused with implicit reference to a standard municipal waste bin: a place for “voluntary storage, free of charge, for a homeless person to store Personal Property up to the equivalent of the amount of property that would fit into a single 60-gallon container with the lid closed.” Imposing limits on the volume of personal belongings an unhoused person can legally store and designing new homeless storage spaces based on the size of a standard trash bin are not arbitrary decisions; these are examples of discriminatory treatment of unhoused people and their belongings.

A place to park

Supervisors instructed officers to look for vehicles containing possessions normally found in a home, such as food, bedding, clothing, medicine, and basic necessities ... Supervisors directed officers to issue a warning and to provide information concerning local shelters on the first instance of a violation, to issue a citation on the second instance, and to make an arrest on the third.¹³

Every night, nearly 30% of the total unhoused population in LA County sleep in their cars, campers, vans, and RVs.¹⁴ With parking spaces covering about 14% of the total area of LA County, and over 13 million non-residential off- and on-street parking spots, finding a place to park to rest overnight should not be difficult (Chester et al., 2015).¹⁵ But for people living in their vehicles, finding a spot to sleep while in their vans, cars, and RVs is an all-consuming effort, because municipal ordinances and community resistance make vehicle-dwelling illegal in most parts of the city. There are serious repercussions for vehicle dwelling in LA: cars and vans suspected of functioning as dwelling places may be impounded and their dwellers arrested.

Resistance to vehicle-dwelling mainly comes from housed people who do not wish to share the streets in their neighborhoods with people living in their vehicles. Community resistance is supported by institutionalized mechanisms that discourage vehicle habitation, for instance, neighborhood-only parking permit programs and overnight street parking prohibitions. Since 1979, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) has been running the Preferential Parking District (PPD) Program, which aims to discourage “parking practices” that “negatively impact” residential areas (Covarrubias, 2008; LADOT, 2018). PPDs are set up with the support of at least 75% of property owners in a neighborhood and function as gated enclaves – without the physical gates – by making it illegal for those without a permit to park. In addition to the PPDs, LADOT also designates Overnight Parking Districts (OPDs), which restrict “parking by vehicles without permits between 2:00 AM and 6:00 AM in order to reduce the impact of criminal and public nuisance activities associated with non-resident vehicles parked late at night” (LADOT, 2021). Currently, there are 197 authorized PPDs and about 40 OPDs in LA County (LADOT, 2020a; LADOT, 2020b; LADOT Public Records, 2021).

Parking restrictions supported by neighborhood associations are not the only mechanisms that keep vehicle dwellers out of desirable areas. Municipal laws facilitate this process by prohibiting the use of most public spaces to park a vehicle used for living. Section 85.02 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code was first enacted in 1982 to make it illegal for any person to use a vehicle on city streets as “living quarters, either overnight, day-by-day, or otherwise” (City of Los Angeles Municipal Ordinance No. 157, 216, 1982). The intent of this law was apparent in the language of the City Council motion that called for the drafting of an ordinance that would prohibit people from residing in their vehicles. The motion declared the situation of people living in their vehicles as both “upsetting to property owners” and presenting “a potential danger to the residents of a neighborhood due to the presence of these transients” (Motion by Hal Bernson, 1982). Section 85.02 was amended a year later to “empower the Police Department” to enforce a ban on vehicle-dwelling on city streets and in all public parking lots in the city and on its beaches (Motion by Pat Russell, 1983). A council member who represented Venice initiated this motion, which rationalized the need for an amendment based on

“numerous complaints” “regarding the overnight parking, overnight sleeping and the unsanitary conditions of people living” in public parking lots at Venice Beach (Motion by Pat Russell, 1983).

The city-wide ban against the use of vehicles for dwelling on all public streets and parking lots remained in effect until 2014, when the Ninth Circuit Court declared its enforcement unconstitutional (*Desertrain v. City of Los Angeles*). The city responded to the court order in 2016 by repealing Section 85.02 and replacing it with a new law that restricts the use of vehicles for dwelling to certain areas of the city. According to the new Section 85.02, it is illegal for any person to use a vehicle for dwelling overnight from 9:00pm to 6:00am on any residential street, or at any time within a 500-foot radius of a park, a licensed school, preschool, or daycare (City of Los Angeles Municipal Ordinance No 184590, 2016). While the amended Section 85.02 allows vehicle dwelling in some areas of the city, it maintains an overall stance of demonizing people who live in their vehicles, considering them unfit to be around schools, daycares, and parks at all times, and other people’s homes at night. Even though the ordinance amending Section 85.02 came with a sunset provision (meaning the law expires unless renewed), the ordinance has been extended twice (in 2018 and 2019), and a motion for its extension is currently under review by the Los Angeles City Council (Motion by Bob Blumenfeld, 2019).

At the same time that the law criminalizing vehicle-dwelling in most parts of the city came into effect in 2017, the LA City Council approved a pilot program to develop a new form of urban space called “safe parking lots.” A safe parking lot is an officially designated public or private parking lot, associated with either a church, public library, health facility, or convention center, and is used after-hours to provide “vehicle dwellers with a safe and legal place to park and sleep at night” (LAHSA, 2017; LAHSA, 2022d). LAHSA administers LA’s Safe Parking Pilot Program (SPPP) based on similar programs for vehicle dwellers in cities like Santa Barbara and Seattle (LAHSA, 2017). Around the time the SPPP was being established in 2017, the City passed an ordinance that made it illegal to enforce Conditional Use Restrictions against people experiencing homelessness (Interview with Safe Parking LA’s senior official, 2021). Prior to this ordinance, Conditional Use Restrictions prohibited the use of existing parking lots for sleeping purposes.

Safe Parking LA is one of the main nonprofit organizations that manages parking facilities in the SPPP; it manages spaces for 209 vehicles (over 750 people) every night in the city of Los Angeles (Interview with Safe Parking LA’s senior official, 2021). Safe Parking LA opened its first “safe parking lot” in 2018 in Koreatown, but the program has now expanded to ten lots attached to public libraries, health facilities, and LA’s convention center. To access one of Safe Parking LA’s sites, an unhoused person needs a valid driver’s license, vehicle registration, and insurance. Safe Parking LA also provides financial assistance to help people renew vehicle-related documents like car registration, license, and insurance so that they may benefit from the parking program. While services vary according to the location, most safe parking lots have toilets, waste disposal, electricity outlets, case management, outreach services, and security. In 2021, most of the clients were 45 years and older, with a higher percentage of male clients (62%) than female (34%). Most clients are either White (41.74%) or Black (33.94%), and in many cases, more than one person resides in a car (Safe Parking LA).

The lots open nightly between 7:30pm and 8:30pm, and people must vacate with their vehicles between 6:30am and 7:30am each morning. Every night, individuals and families who live in their cars pull into one of the Safe Parking LA lots in the city, where they are greeted by security guards. A senior official of Safe Parking LA explained important considerations for a safe parking site:

We exist in spaces that have other uses during the day. That is an intentional action. We want to create nighttime uses for spaces that have things going on in them during the day ... [W]hat we are looking for in a new space is that it is well lit, it is in a space that isn't going to get any visitors or people coming to park in the middle of the night. Preferably, we love to be in spaces that have some sort of fencing, some of our spaces have boundaries like trees and shrubbery. These create enclosures in which we have a security guard.

Spaces are not assigned, so people choose a spot as they drive into the lot. Based on my observations of two Safe Parking LA lots (an open lot and a parking structure), most people parked their cars leaving as much space between themselves and other cars as was possible. Each Safe Parking LA area accommodates anywhere from 10 to 30 cars, with most functioning at a 20-car capacity. Except for visits to the toilet, people mostly remain quietly in their vehicles, with the windows rolled up. There is very little movement of people in the lot except for the case managers, who go from car to car to give updates to their residents on their financial and housing assistance applications, employment opportunities, and case management services.

At present, about seven LAHSA-approved nonprofits maintain about 614 parking spots, which means that less than 5% of all vehicles used for dwelling can be *legally* accommodated in one of the safe parking lots in the city (LAHSA, 2020). In a city like LA, which has an abundance of vacant parking spaces at night, the lack of accessible legal parking for the unhoused is the direct result of restrictive anti-homeless policies. In contrast to homeless encampments that encroach on sidewalks or parks designed for pedestrian circulation and public recreation, a vehicle used for dwelling parked in a designated parking space is not an obstruction or encroachment of public space. It is an example of nonconformity to the intended use of designated parking spots, which are planned as spaces only for the parking of unattended vehicles, and not as places for living.

Discussion and conclusion

This paper's investigation of the incongruous use of trash bins as storage containers in the design of homeless storage spaces has revealed enduring connections between anti-homeless municipal laws and a new architecture of homeless services. The use of the trash bin in the design of homeless storage spaces in LA is not an isolated example; infrastructural elements often inspire the design of spaces for precariously housed people. For instance, in 2020, a British millionaire presented his design for a "really cosy, comfortable and dry" homeless sleeping pod made from two waste bins attached with a removable hinge (Blackburn & Boyd, 2020). In 2017, a Hong Kong based architect developed affordable housing (OPod Tube Housing) inspired by the improvised dwellings made from large left-over concrete pipes near

construction sites by impoverished people in India and the Philippines (BBC, 2018; James Law Cybertecture, 2019).

The problem with using objects like concrete pipes and trash bins as design elements is that they are restricted *only* to the design of spaces for marginalized populations. This approach claims to be cost saving, but it comes at the price of creating spaces that perpetuate the dehumanization and stigmatization of the poor. As a Navigation Center supervisor questioned, “I don’t know why these trash bins are offered as storage to the unhoused ... especially since we are trying to help them live in a dignified way.” The architects and service providers of LA’s new Navigation Centers mostly agree that the use of bins in these service spaces have bad “aesthetics” and “optics” (Interviews with architect and supervisor, Navigation Center, 2022). They claimed that it was the city’s decision to furnish these facilities with 60-gallon trash bins as storage units. A city official involved in the construction of a Navigation Center explained that the company that provides the city with trash bins offered to provide bins in gray color for free (Interview, 2022). The city welcomed this donation because it helped offset the over-budget construction costs of the project (Interview with city official, 2022). Service spaces like Navigation Centers cost millions of dollars each to build and maintain, but the unquestioned use of trash bins in the design of homeless storage facilities demonstrates how much work is needed to humanize unhoused people and their needs; it should be jarring to even consider offering unhoused people trash containers to store their valuables.

Offering unhoused people trash bins to store their personal belongings is insulting and degrading. Similarly, to allow unhoused people to sleep in their cars only in parking lots located at a remove from residential areas is to imply that they are a threatening, contaminated population that needs to be kept away from “decent people.” The Safe Parking Pilot Program offers “vehicle dwellers with a safe and legal place to park and sleep at night” (LAHSA, 2022d). The official designation of SPPP parking spaces for vehicle dwellers as “safe” raises the question, whose safety are these lots supposed to ensure? Is it the safety of vehicle dwellers or that of homeowners who do not wish to allow unhoused people in their neighborhoods? If the safety of vehicle dwellers is improved by parking their vehicles in one of the authorized safe parking sites, then what compromises the safety of vehicle dwellers in the first place are policing and enforcement of municipal ordinances that force them out of safe spaces like residential neighborhoods into unsafe areas, such as underpasses and bridges or in industrial and commercial areas that are mostly deserted at night (Pruss, 2019). Ironically, one of the highest costs of running safe parking sites in LA is the hiring of security staff (Interview with the Associate Director, Safe Parking LA, 2019). But safe parking sites do offer other kinds of protections: perceived safety to higher-income neighborhoods from the presence of vehicles used for dwelling purposes, and safety to vehicle dwellers from being prosecuted for unauthorized parking elsewhere in the city.

There is a documented increase in the criminalization of homelessness in recent years in the United States, with the passing of numerous laws that make it illegal to sleep, sit, lie down, or store personal belongings in public areas of most cities (Mitchell, 1997; National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, 2014). As Don Mitchell argues, these laws in effect annihilate “the spaces in which the homeless *must* live” (1997, p. 305). In architecture and urban design, the recent trend of “hostile architecture”

complements legal mechanisms that discourage unwanted uses of urban public spaces by marginalized populations like the unhoused (Petty, 2016; Rosenberger, 2020). But the impact of anti-homeless ordinances goes beyond the processes of spatial purification and expulsion of unhoused bodies from urban public spaces. As this paper demonstrates, the annihilation of existing spaces of homelessness is accompanied by the creation of new kinds of spaces like homeless storage facilities and parking lots that serve important needs of the unhoused community.

But without addressing the symbolism – whether intentional or not – of requiring unhoused people to keep their stuff in a garbage can or restricting them to sleep in their cars away from desirable residential areas, spaces prioritizing transitional relief for the unhoused can reaffirm their stigmatization and segregation. The discriminating and dehumanizing aspects of homeless architecture is the reason why members of the unhoused community and their allies have been critical of LA’s new transitional housing programs, like Project Room Key and Tiny Home Villages, which they routinely describe as instances of carceral housing.¹⁶ Severing the relationship between homeless spaces and punitive practices is essential to build spaces that serve the needs of unhoused people in a dignified manner. Committing millions or billions of dollars to address homelessness is not enough; attending to the implicit and explicit biases embedded in official homeless policies *and* places is the only way to ensure that meaningful and sustainable assistance and support is available to people experiencing homelessness.

Notes

1. Skid Row is a part of LA’s downtown area with the highest concentration of unhoused people in LA County. Total sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons in Los Angeles County is 69,144 (LAHSA, 2022b) while the total sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons in Skid Row, LA is 4,402 (LAHSA, 2022c).
2. A “Skid Row strain” of tuberculosis was reported in the media in 2013 (Gorman & Blankstein, 2013). Deshonay Dozier argues that the fabrication of a health scare in Skid Row was a part of a concerted strategy involving the city, CCEA (a BID), and the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) to highlight the health and safety risks associated with unhoused people’s belongings (2019, pp. 188–189). In 2018, a typhus outbreak with over 100 cases was reported in the city. The city responded with a plan to keep the streets clean of trash and waste by designating a region in the downtown area the “Typhus Zone”; the boundaries of this zone were nearly identical to the Skid Row area (Tinoco, 2018; Karlamangla, 2018).
3. The Bin, Safer Parking LA, and Navigation Centers are operated by non-profit service providers in partnership with the city.
4. Mayor of Los Angeles at the inauguration of the Homeless Navigation Center, 8th District (South Los Angeles) (Garcetti, 2021).
5. *Lavan v. City of Los Angeles*, 2012.
6. *Lavan v. City of Los Angeles*, 2012.
7. For instance, 56.11 in LAMC (1936) was enforced in a central downtown area demarcated by Ordinance No. 49014 (approved June 18, 1924), which established fire districts in the City of Los Angeles. The code refers to “boxes, barrels, and other receptacles for merchandise [that] may be unpacked and their contents removed ... such boxes, barrels and other receptacles are removed immediately thereafter.”
8. City of Los Angeles Municipal Ordinance No. 183,762 (2015).

9. Amended by City of Los Angeles Municipal Ordinance No. 184,182 (2016). A Council member who voted for this ordinance considered it a less draconian alternative to the policy of prohibiting personal storage on sidewalks (Holland, 2016).
10. The Mayor of LA had previously returned the City Council-approved Los Angeles Municipal Ordinance No. 183,762 (2015) without signature because he didn't think that the proposed ordinance adequately balanced the need to maintain the "sidewalks with the right so people who have no other choice to live on them" (Communication from the Mayor of Los Angeles, 2015).
11. The law also specifies that in places where there are homeless storage facilities, a ban could be placed on the storage of any property in public areas that exceeds the essential personal property (the size of a backpack).
12. The standard allotment of bins for each dwelling unit in Los Angeles is one 60 gallon container for refuse.
13. Description of the training given to the officers in the Venice Homelessness Task Force formed to cite and arrest homeless people living in their vehicles (*Desertrain v. City of Los Angeles*, 4–5).
14. Number of vehicles (cars, vans, campers/rvs) used as dwellings = 12,875; Estimated persons in cars, vans, campers/rvs in Los Angeles = 19,402 (LAHSA, 2022a). Total sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons in Los Angeles = 69,144. (LAHSA, 2022b).
15. The number of 13 million excludes 5.5 million private home driveways and dedicated covered spaces (Chester et al., 2015).
16. Project Room Key was established in the early 2020 to house LA's medically vulnerable unhoused people (at risk of contracting COVID-19 and developing medical complications) in hotel and motel rooms that were sitting vacant during the pandemic. Since the early 2021, several Tiny Home Villages have been built in LA to provide emergency shelter and services to unhoused people in a 8 ft × 8 ft prefabricated shed. Two people share each tiny home, which comes with a single bed, shelf, windows, door, and an air conditioner.

Acknowledgements

I thank Michael Holland, City Archivist at the City of Los Angeles, for graciously fulfilling my endless requests for scanned documents during the COVID-19 lockdown when most archives remained closed to the public. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their critical comments and guidance which informed revisions to this paper.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by USC School of Architecture's Research in Architecture grant.

ORCID

Faiza Moatasim  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5829-9736>

References

Cervantes, A., et al. v. International security services Inc. and the Central City East Association' No. BC220226 (2002, March 27).

- Desertrain v. City of Los Angeles, 754 f. 3d 1147 (9th Cir. 2014).
- Lavan v. City of Los Angeles, 693 F. 3d 1022, 1027 (9th Cir. 2012). <https://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-9th-circuit/1611251.html>
- Amster, R. (2003). Patterns of exclusion: Sanitizing space, criminalizing homelessness. *Social Justice*, 30(1), 195–221.
- BBC. (2018). Homes made of concrete tubes could solve the housing crisis. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20180301-homes-made-of-concrete-tubes-could-solve-the-housing-crisis>
- BID. (2002, December 10). Downtown industrial district- board of directors meeting minutes.
- BID. (2014a, June 6). Downtown industrial district- board of directors meeting minutes.
- BID. (2014b, July 23). Downtown industrial district- board of directors meeting minutes.
- BID. (2014c, November 25). Downtown industrial district- board of directors meeting minutes.
- Blackburn, R., & Boyd, M. (2020, February 6). Multimillionaire invents 'bin pods' for rough sleepers by joining wheelee bins together. <https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/multimillionaire-invents-bin-pods-rough-21397084>
- Blomley, N. (2010). *Rights of passage: Sidewalks and the regulation of public flow*. Routledge.
- Blomley, N., Flynn, A., & Sylvestre, M.-E. (2020). Governing the belongings of the precariously housed: A critical legal geography. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 16(1), 165–181. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-021020-105357>
- Booth, C. (1889). *Life and labour of the people in London*. Macmillan and Co.
- Boyd, J., Cunningham, D., Anderson, S., & Kerr, T. (2016). Supportive housing and surveillance. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 34, 72–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2016.05.012>
- Brinegar, S. J. (2003). The social construction of homeless shelters in the phoenix area. *Urban Geography*, 24(1), 61–67. <https://doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.24.1.61>
- Chester, M., Fraser, A., Matute, J., Flower, C., & Pendyala, R. (2015). Parking infrastructure: A constraint on or opportunity for urban redevelopment? A study of Los Angeles County parking supply and growth. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 81(4), 268–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2015.1092879>
- Chrysalis. (2020, February 5). City officials, LAHSA, and Chrysalis celebrate a new safe storage location in Skid Row. <https://www.changelives.org/newsroom/chrysalis-enterprises/city-officials-lahsa-and-chrysalis-celebrate-a-new-safe-storage-location-in-skid-row/>
- City of Los Angeles Municipal Ordinance No. 157,216. (1982). LA City Council file no. 82-0670 and 82-0670 S1. https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/1982/82-0670_ORD_157216_10-26-1982.pdf
- City of Los Angeles Municipal Ordinance No 184590. (2016). Council File No. 14 1057-S1. https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2014/14-1057s1_ORD_184590_11-23-16.pdf
- Council City of Los Angeles. (2016). Resolution. <http://clkrep.lacity.org/election/final%20homelessness%20hhh%20for%20web.pdf>
- Covarrubias, A. (2008, May 24). L.A. says it needs their spaces. *Los Angeles Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2008-may-24-me-laparking24-story.html>
- Davis, M. (1990). *City of quartz: Excavating the future in Los Angeles*. Verso.
- Dear, M., & Wolch, J. (1987). *Landscapes of despair: From deinstitutionalization to homelessness*. Princeton University Press.
- Deener, A. (2012). *Venice: A contested bohemia in Los Angeles*. University of Chicago Press.
- DeVerteuil, G. (2019). Post-revanchist cities? *Urban Geography*, 40(7), 1055–1061. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2019.1640034>
- DeVerteuil, Geoffrey, May, Jon, & von Mahs, Jürgen. (2009). Complexity not collapse: recasting the geographies of homelessness in a 'punitive' age. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(5), 646–666. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0309132508104995>
- Dozier, D. (2019). Contested development: Homeless property, police reform, and resistance in skid Row, LA. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 43(1), 179–194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12724>
- Engels, F. (1892). *The condition of the working-class in England in 1844: With a pref. written in 1892*. Allen & Unwin.

- Feldman, L. C. (2004). *Citizens without shelter: Homelessness, democracy, and political exclusion*. Cornell University Press
- Fredriksen, M. M. S. (2021). *Venice California, gentrification in a Neo-Bohemian beach town: Structural violence, power structures, and ideological justification for injustice, exclusion, and dis-possession* [MA thesis]. University of Bergen.
- Garcetti, E. (2021). Press conference at the inauguration of homeless navigation center, 8th district (south Los Angeles). <https://www.facebook.com/MayorOfLA/videos/1086419645096806>
- Gold, S. (2009, February 6). Small service makes big difference on L.A.'s skid row. *Sun Sentinel*. <https://www.sun-sentinel.com/la-me-outthere6-2009feb06-story.html>
- Gorman, A., & Blankstein, A. (2013, February 21). Persistent strain of TB claims victims on L.A.'s skid row. *LA Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/local/la-me-tb-outbreak-20130222-story.html>
- Gowan, T. (2002). The nexus. *Ethnography*, 3(4), 500–534. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138102003004007>
- Hennigan, B. (2017). House broken: Homelessness, housing first, and neoliberal poverty governance. *Urban Geography*, 38(9), 1418–1440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2016.1254496>
- Hennigan, B., & Speer, J. (2019). Compassionate revanchism: The blurry geography of homelessness in the USA. *Urban Studies*, 56(5), 906–921. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098018762012>
- Herring, C. (2014). The new logics of homeless seclusion: Homeless encampments in America's west coast cities. *City & Community*, 13(4), 285–309. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cico.12086>
- Herring, C., & Lutz, M. (2015). The roots and implications of the USA's homeless tent cities. *City*, 19(5), 689–701. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2015.1071114>
- Holland, G. (2016, March 30). L.A. council OKs law limiting homeless people's belongings to what can fit in a trash bin. *Los Angeles Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-homeless-belongings-20160331-story.html>
- James Law Cybertecture. (2019). OPod 1: Hong Kong. <http://www.jameslawcybertecture.com/?id=1087§ion=projects>
- Johnsen, S., Cloke, P., & May, J. (2005). Day centres for homeless people: Spaces of care or fear? *Social & Cultural Geography*, 6(6), 787–811. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360500353004>
- Johnson, A. B. (1990). *Out of bedlam: The truth about deinstitutionalization*. Basic Books.
- Karlamangla, S. (2018, October 11). L.A. typhus outbreak adds fuel to the debates over homelessness and housing. *Los Angeles Times*.
- LADOT. (2018). Parking permits program. https://www.ladotparking.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/LADOT-PPD-Brochure_English-1.pdf
- LADOT. (2020a). LADOT preferential parking districts. <https://data.lacity.org/Transportation/LADOT-Preferential-Parking-Districts-PPD-/2ckn-xmjp/data>
- LADOT. (2020b). LADOT overnight parking districts. <https://data.lacity.org/Transportation/LADOT-Overnight-Parking-Districts/jk9n-burj/data>
- LADOT. (2021). Preferential parking district (PPD) permits. <https://ladotparking.azurewebsites.net/permits/ppd-permits/>
- LADOT Public Records. (2021). Data on preferential parking districts in the City of Los Angeles received via email from Senior Administrative Clerk, Risk Management Division.
- LAHSA. (2017). *Safe parking pilot program - Structure and budget (C.F. 15-1138-S15)*. http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2015/15-1138-S15_rpt_LAHSA_6-20-17.pdf
- LAHSA. (2020). Administered safe parking programs. <https://www.lahsa.org/documents?id=4371-safe-parking-program-flyer.pdf>
- LAHSA. (2022a). Vehicles, tents, and makeshift shelters counted by geographic area, 2020 Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count. <https://www.lahsa.org/documents?id=6533-cvrtm-summary-by-geography>
- LAHSA. (2022b). *Greater Los Angeles homeless count- Los Angeles County*. <https://www.lahsa.org/documents?id=6515-lacounty-hc22-data-summary>
- LAHSA. (2022c). *Greater Los Angeles homeless count—Skid row*. <https://www.lahsa.org/documents?id=6560-skid-row-hc2022-data-summary>

- LAHSA. (2022d). *LAHSA-administered safe parking sites in Los Angeles*. <https://www.lahsa.org/news?article=592-safe-parking>
- Lamb, H. R. (1984). Deinstitutionalization and the homeless mentally ill. *Hospital Community Psychiatry*, 35(9), 899–907. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.35.9.899>
- Lee, B. A., Tyler, K. A., & Wright, J. D. (2010). The New homelessness revisited. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36(1), 501–521. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115940>
- Lopez, S. (2019, July 31). The city has a growing mountain of possessions confiscated from homeless people. *LA Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2019-07-30/homeless-possessions-storage-skid-row-steve-lopez-column>
- Margier, A. (2021). The compassionate invisibilization of homelessness: Where revanchist and supportive city policies meet. *Urban Geography*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2021.1970915>
- Mayor of Los Angeles. (2015, July 7). Communication to the Los Angeles City Council. https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2014/14-1656_misc_07-07-15.pdf
- McNeil, R., & Guirguis-Younger, M. (2014). Dignity in design: The siting and design of community and shelter-based health facilities for homeless persons. In M. Guirguis-Younger, R. McNeil, & S. W. Hwang (Eds.), *Homelessness & health in Canada* (pp. 233–251). University of Ottawa Press.
- Mitchell, D. (1997). The annihilation of space by law: The roots and implications of anti-homeless laws in the United States. *Antipode*, 29(3), 303–335. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00048>
- Motion by Bob Blumenfeld, Councilmember 3rd District. (2019, November 26). Los Angeles Council File: 14-1057-S8.
- Motion by Hal Bernson, Councilman, 12th District. (1982). Los Angeles Council File No. 82-0670.
- Motion by Mike Bonin, Councilmember 11th District. (2014, December 3). Los Angeles Council File: 14-1656.
- Motion by Pat Russell, Councilwoman Sixth District. (1983, April 22). Council File no. 83-0627.
- National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty. (2014). *No safe place: The criminalization of homelessness in U.S. cities*. https://www.nlchp.org/documents/No_Safe_Place
- Padgett, D., Henwood, B., & Tsemberis, S. (2016). *Housing first: Ending homelessness, transforming systems, and changing lives*. Oxford University Press.
- Petty, J. (2016). The London spikes controversy: Homelessness, urban securitisation and the question of ‘hostile architecture’. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 5(1), 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcsd.v5i1.286>
- Pruss, G. (2019). *A home without a home: Vehicle residency and settled bias* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Washington.
- Riis, J. A. (1890). *How the other half lives: Studies among the tenements of New York*. Charles Scribner’s Sons.
- Rosenberger, R. (2020). On hostile design: Theoretical and empirical prospects. *Urban Studies*, 57(4), 883–893. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019853778>
- Smith, N. (1996). *The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city*. Routledge.
- Sparks, T. (2017). Citizens without property: Informality and political agency in a Seattle, Washington homeless encampment. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 49(1), 86–103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X16665360>
- Stop LAPD Spying Coalition’s Land and Policing Workgroup. (2021). Containment, development, and the fight for freedom in skid row. In *Automating banishment* (pp. 32–49). <https://automatingbanishment.org/assets/AUTOMATING-BANISHMENT.pdf>
- Stuart, F. (2014). From ‘rabble management’ to ‘recovery management’: Policing homelessness in marginal urban space. *Urban Studies*, 51(9), 1909–1925. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013499798>
- Tinoco, M. (2018, October 22). Is the skid row typhus outbreak a manufactured crisis? *LAist*. <https://laist.com/news/downtown-la-typhus-outbreak-skid-row>
- Von Mahs, J. (2013). *Down and out in Los Angeles and Berlin*. Temple University Press

- Wasserman, J., & Clair, J. (2010). *At home on the street: People, poverty, and a hidden culture of homelessness*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Wolch, J. R., & DeVerteuil, G. (2003). New landscapes of urban poverty management. In N. Thrift & J. May (Eds.), *Timespace: Geographies of temporality* (pp. 149–168). Taylor and Francis.
- Wright, T. (1997). *Out of place: Homeless mobilizations, subcities, and contested landscapes*. State University of New York Press.